

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY

OU_170196

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY

OUP—2272—19-11-79—10,000

R OSMANIA UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

Call No. 030..2

Accession No. 27451

Author MIR

Title

This book should be returned on or before the date last marked below.

A RATIONALIST
ENCYCLOPÆDIA

A RATIONALIST ENCYCLOPÆDIA

A BOOK OF REFERENCE
ON RELIGION, PHILOSOPHY,
ETHICS, AND SCIENCE

BY
JOSEPH McCABE

LONDON
WATTS & CO.
5 & 6 JOHNSON'S COURT, FLEET STREET, E.C.4



THIS BOOK IS PRODUCED IN
COMPLETE CONFORMITY WITH THE
AUTHORIZED ECONOMY STANDARDS

Printed and Published in Great Britain by C. A. Watts & Co. Limited,
5 & 6 Johnson's Court, Fleet Street, London, E.C.4

FOREWORD

THE distinctive feature of this book is that it challenges the widespread conviction that all that is most precious in our civilization has been derived from Christianity. Not only are the majority of histories and encyclopædias based on this presupposition, but our statesmen take for granted, in legislating, that morality is a Christian monopoly. One of the arguments used by the Minister of Education when religious instruction was made compulsory in all schools in Great Britain was that such a step would check the growth of crime and juvenile delinquency. He offered no evidence to support this view, and hardly anyone disputed it. In face of the acquiescence of those presumed to be experts, the general public could hardly be blamed for regarding it as an established fact. Yet there are statistics available for a number of countries and large cities of Britain and America which show that the exact contrary is the case.

This is but one example of the need for a critical re-examination of the prevailing belief that Christianity is the mainspring of social progress and individual morality, that "Christian values" and "civilized values" are synonymous. Even the scholars and historians, on whom we so largely depend for our information, refrain from judging according to the evidence, of which they must be perfectly well aware. It does not seem to occur to them that what they regarded as a self-evident truth, which it would be merely eccentric to deny, may be no better than a fallacy. They make a tacit assumption a touchstone for the selection of facts and for deciding their relative importance, and whatever seems to contradict it is either suppressed or minimized. The black pages in the history of the Church are hastily turned over and attention is focused on the best periods. The sanctity of the few is magnified, and the depths of infamy into which so many descended are dismissed as brief aberrations from the norm, even though they characterized many centuries. Ugly deeds and inhuman doctrines are glossed over, relegated to footnotes, or "buried in the decent obscurity of a learned language."

Mr. McCabe breaks this conspiracy of silence. He removes the tinted spectacles through which we are tempted, and all but compelled, to view the age-long struggle between obscurantism and reaction on the one side, and science and humanism on the other. He lays before

us a mass of evidence that is not usually admitted to court, but its credentials are unimpeachable. We are free to draw what conclusions we think reasonable, but he insists that we should look at the quite startling facts that he has adduced—facts known to specialists but rarely alluded to in writings intended for the general public. The searchlight of Mr. McCabe's original and scholarly mind lights up dark places indeed and compels us to re-examine much that perhaps we have previously accepted on authority or without troubling to question. The effect on some readers will be profoundly disturbing, but all who dip into the 1,800 concise articles in this remarkable volume will share the intellectual excitement of re-discovering the past. Familiar outlines will disappear; individuals we admired will be seen without the halo of legend; some characters whom we had been taught to execrate will be viewed in another light altogether. Long periods of history to which we have looked back nostalgically will stand revealed in a new perspective. It may be that all history is written with bias, but it is certain that history cannot be written without facts. To retrieve from neglected archives and ancient manuscripts facts which challenge the pre-suppositions of some of our best historians is a tremendous personal achievement.

The treatment of subjects in this book is necessarily condensed. For those who wish further to extend their knowledge the author indicates reliable literature in all subjects that are controversial. On historical matters, which occupy a large part of the work, he gives references to ancient Christian and medieval writers, and for more extensive quotations from these the reader is referred to his book *THE TESTAMENT OF CHRISTIAN CIVILIZATION* (Watts & Co.).

P. R. C.

A.

A priori Knowledge. [See Empiricism; Intuition; Psychology.]

Abbot of Unreason, The. Among the normal features of mediæval life which are now commonly suppressed, or falsely described, because they discredit the myth of the "simple piety" of the people, were a number of annual festivals. These usually began with more or less blasphemous parodies of the Mass in the cathedrals and churches, often in monasteries and convents, and continued with gross and indecent revels on the streets. One of these was that of the Abbot of Unreason (also called the Abbot, or Lord, of Misrule, the Abbot of Joy, or the Pope of Fools), which was held on different dates in different regions. A layman was hilariously elected and robed as abbot for the express purpose of suspending for a day all rules of discipline and decency. Scott (*The Abbot*, Ch. XIV) describes the feast as it was held in Scotland, but he wrongly imagines that it was a popular festival which the clergy resented. The clerical as well as the civic dignitaries commonly took part in these festivals, and the occasional zealots who protested were powerless. We trace the Feast of the Abbot throughout the Middle Ages, from Scotland to Greece, until the pressure of Protestantism, in the sixteenth century, put an end to so many scandals. On account of the reticence on such matters of modern historians one has to go back for the details, which are often very obscene [see *Ass, Feast of the, and Fools, the Feast of*], to Du Cange's *Glossarium mediæ et infimæ Latinitatis* (1678, "Abbas lætitiæ") and, especially, Du Tilliot's *Mémoires* (1741).

Abd-er-Rahman III (891–961), most successful of Moslem Caliphs. Although he accomplished one of the greatest feats in the history of kingcraft, he is not among "the Heroes of the Nations" because he was a sceptic and very far from spiritual in his personal life. A descendant of the Syrian Caliphs, who despised Mohammed, he inherited the Arab dominion in Spain

when it was as dilapidated as Rome after the barbaric invasions, raised it in twenty years, leading his armies in person, to a prosperity and splendour without parallel until modern times, and ruled it with a social justice that shames Christendom; and he so openly defied the Koran that Moslem writers have tried to suppress the eulogy of him which Al-Makkari, the famous Arab historian, left in his History. S. P. Scott (*Moorish Empire in Europe*, 3 vols. 1904) speaks of him as "sensual to the verge of insanity" and finds that he spread "the destructive poison of infidelity," and then describes his marvellous achievement and the happiness of his people in lyrical language. Stanley Lane-Poole (*The Moors in Spain*, 1897) says that he raised Spain to a height of civilization "such as the wildest imagination can hardly conjure up" (p. 126). His story is vitally relevant to the question of religion and civilization, and it is never noticed in that connection.

Abélard, Peter (1080–1142), the first apostle in Christian Europe of the supremacy of Reason. The mental awakening of Europe from the torpor of the Dark Age began, under Arab-Spanish influence, in Southern France—see the rare picture of its life in the second half of the eleventh century in L. Palustre's *Histoire de Guillaume IX* (1882)—and long before the Crusades, to which it is wrongly attributed. Abélard, son of a Breton nobleman, found school-life well developed and joined the wandering scholars. He settled in Paris and became the most brilliant master of his age. His connection with Heloise led to his emasculation by order of her uncle, a Canon of the Cathedral—life was still so barbaric that Abélard demanded the like punishment, by law, of the Canon—which dimmed his brilliance, but he still wrote unorthodox books (*Dialogue* and *Yes and No*, a cynical collection of 1,800 contradictory texts from the Fathers), and he was twice (1121 and 1141) condemned by the Church, chiefly for his

thesis that "Reason takes precedence of Faith." See McCabe's *Peter Abélard* (1901). Helen Waddell's *Peter Abélard* (1931) is an historical novel, and J. G. Sikes's *Peter Abailard* (1932) a study of his theology, but otherwise unreliable.

Abgar, The Alleged Letters of Jesus and. These documents—a letter purporting to have been written by a legendary King of Edessa and the reply of Jesus—are still quoted in popular religious literature. They are such clumsy forgeries, quoting gospels which no one claims to have existed until forty years later, that even the *Catholic Encyclopædia* rejects them. They appear first, in the fourth century, in the *Ecclesiastical History* (I, 13) of Bishop Eusebius, a diligent collector of fairy-tales about the early Church.

Abiogenesis. The theory that living things are, or once were, developed from inanimate matter by what used to be called Spontaneous Generation, or by natural chemical processes. Until the sixteenth century it was generally held that animals (insects, etc.) arose from decaying matter, but by the nineteenth century the Law of Biogenesis, *Omne vivum e vivo* (All living things come from living things), was accepted in science. This law refers to nature to-day, not to a past which was then unknown. An attempt of Pouchet to refute the law by experiment was defeated (1859) by Pasteur and—a fact now generally ignored—by the Materialist Tyndall. In 1906 Butler Burke renewed the attempt (*The Origin of Life*) and Dr. Bastian [see] maintained the claim all his life, but it was held that the living organisms found in his cultures came from spores which had survived the imperfect sterilization of his flasks. It is, however, quite incorrect to say that "science" does not admit abiogenesis in nature to-day. A number of authorities—Sir E. Sharpey-Schäfer, in his Presidential Address to the British Association in 1912 (p. 14); Sir P. Chalmers Mitchell, in *Materialism and Vitalism* (1930, p. 16); Prof. B. Moore, in *The Origin and Nature of Life* (1913, p. 63); Sir A. Thomas, in *Concerning Evolution* (1925, p. 48)—have held that living matter may be evolving from non-living in nature, though bacteria and

fungi may absorb it as it is formed; but the general feeling is that the evolution took place in the very different thermal and electrical conditions of the earth 1,500 to 2,000 million years ago. Whatever theory of the formation of the earth we accept, the vast masses of early volcanic rock testify to this difference of conditions. The theory (held by Helmholtz, Kelvin, and Arrhenius) that a meteorite may have brought the germs from another world, would, apart from the destructive action on them of the intense cold and ultra-violet rays in space, merely shift the problem to unknown conditions.

Science assumes, in the absence of proof that there is anything in the living thing which could *not* be evolved, that the first organisms, like all other contents of the universe, come under the law of evolution or arose from inorganic matter by a very slow and gradual series of chemical changes. The best detailed suggestion of this evolution is in Prof. B. Moore's *Origin and Nature of Life* (1913), in the Home University Library. Since the publication of that work the increasing recognition of the importance of enzymes (ferments) in the living body has led many to believe that these may have been the first outcomes of the primitive chemical evolution. More recently the discovery of viruses (the ultra-microscopic causes of certain diseases) has raised the question whether life may not have begun in this form. A few useful pages on the subject will be found in Julian Huxley's small popular book, *Beginnings of Life* (1938), and in H. H. Newman's section of the symposium, *The World and Man as Science Sees Them* (1937); but the best general survey is that of Prof. L. L. Woodruff in the symposium, *The Evolution of the Earth and Man* (ed. by Prof. G. A. Baitself, 1929, Ch. III). See also R. Beutner, *Life's Beginnings on the Earth* (1939).

Most biologists take little interest in these theories, because the conditions on the primitive earth are still too obscure for profitable discussion. The position of the Rationalist is, like that of biologists generally, that the attempt to show that "life" or "vitality" is an immaterial something which *could not* have

been evolved from matter has failed [see Vitalism] and it would therefore be absurd to suppose that, while our million species of advanced organisms are the outcome of evolution, the earliest and most primitive of all were not evolved. It is one of the elementary fallacies of apologetics that the Rationalist, especially if he is a Materialist, is bound to supply a detailed theory of a phenomenon (origin of life, consciousness, etc.) when he rejects the mystic "explanation." On obscure matters his attitude is logically negative. Organic chemistry is, however, making such progress that the origin of life cannot be called a mystery. In regard to criticisms of what is called Haeckel's Carbon Theory—he never advanced any theory—see **Carbon Theory of Life**. The importance of carbon in this connection is now much more appreciated than ever.

Abolitionism. [See Slavery.]

Abraham. It is a matter of indifference to Rationalists whether there is some sort of tribal tradition preserved in the Abraham stories in *Genesis*. They were in the last century confronted with the claim that the book had been written by Moses and contained no errors, and they pointed out that certain features show that it is late and legendary. The name Abraham, an obvious fiction, is recognized by all authorities to be of doubtful meaning even in Hebrew—it certainly does not mean "Father of a multitude of peoples," as the writer of *Genesis* represents (xvii, 5)—and only a very much later writer could speak of "Ur of the Chaldees," since the Chaldeans (or Kaldi) did not rule Ur for more than 1,000 years after the supposed date of Abraham. These criticisms are unaltered, and the joy of bibliolaters when archaeology unearths names of cities or kings which are said to correspond, often by a strain, with names in *Genesis* is misplaced. This misrepresentation of the Rationalist position is unfortunately endorsed by Sir Leonard Woolley in his recent *Abraham* (1936). It is regrettable that the learned archaeologist chose that title, since he does not claim to have found a shred of proof that such a person ever existed, and the few and faint correspondences of the Bible story with his own description of life in

Ur prove nothing. No one questions that the ancestors of the Hebrews may have come from that region or that the final "redactors" of *Genesis* lived, or had lived, in Babylonia. Sir Leonard's claim that in a certain dialect of Arabic the name BRM—written Semitic language omits the vowels—might be written BRHM leaves the crude blunder of the writer of *Genesis* just where it was.

Absolute, The. Eisler, in his *Dictionary of Philosophy*, gives a score of different meanings of this word in different systems of philosophy. In its broadest meaning it denotes a reality postulated by metaphysics (not proved to exist) which is not related to other realities or definable in terms of them: the ultimate, all-embracing, all-unifying reality. The assumption does not imply that it is a personality or is the cause (or creator) of the realities of which we have experience, but in most systems, especially Hegel's, with which it is particularly identified, it is Mind or Spirit and excludes the existence of material things. Viscount Haldane (*The Reign of Relativity*, 1921) and others tried to find confirmation of it in mathematical Relativity, but in this the word "relative" has an entirely different meaning. Some modern theologians, moved by the discredit in philosophy of all arguments for the existence of God, fall back upon the postulate of the Absolute, though this is hardly less discredited. [See **Philosophy, Modern**.]

Abyssinia and the Papacy. British and American Catholics often claim that Pope Pius XI condemned the rape of Abyssinia by the Italians. In fact he never made, and they cannot quote, any explicit reference of his to it. E. Price Bell, of the *Chicago Daily News*, was sent to Rome to get a declaration from him, and it was refused. See the article by Bell in *Liberty*, Oct. 19, 1935. On July 28, 1935, the Pope made a vague statement that he was sure that the rulers of Italy would do nothing against charity and justice (*Times*, July 29). On Aug. 20 he (knowing that Mussolini declared Italy's action to be defensive) explained in the *Osservatore* that "defence can very well of itself alone be justified" (see the *Times*, Aug. 29 and 30). Fear of English and American Catholics kept him

silent after that date, but the entire hierarchy and Church in Italy—obviously with his approval—enthusiastically supported the war, and at the close ordered prayers for God's blessing on "Italy's rulers and the glorious army which once more is used in defence of the Christian civilization." As soon as the conquest was completed large numbers of priests, monks, and nuns were taken to, and churches built in, Abyssinia at the expense of the Italian Government (*International Review of Missions*, Jan. 1937, p. 103). The Pope Pius XII was then Secretary of State and directed the entire policy.

Acosmism. Disbelief in the existence of a material world. It is found in various systems of modern philosophy, notably those of Berkeley and Hume, and in the theories of Sir J. Jeans [see] and Sir A. Eddington [see].

Acquired Characters and Heredity. Since Lamarck's and, in less degree, Darwin's theory of evolution involved a belief that acquired characters—structural modifications which (like the pugilist's arm-muscles) have been acquired during the individual's life—are passed on to the next generation, some writers confusedly raise doubts about the truth of evolution because, they say, the inheritance of such characters is now denied. The fact of evolution [see] is independent of the Darwinian or any other theory of its mechanism, and Darwin was fully conscious that in his time little was known about heredity. The statement, however, that the theory of the inheritance of acquired characters is now dead (W. F. Wheeler, *Inheritance and Evolution*, 1936, p. 94, A. E. Watkins, *Heredity and Evolution*, 1935, p. 5, etc.) is inaccurate. In an address to the Royal Institution on "The Hereditary Transmission of Acquired Characters" (printed in *Nature*, June 20, 1931), Prof. MacBride claimed that several series of recent experiments proved such transmission, and the late Prof. Kammerer and a few other high authorities agreed with him. Prof. J. B. S. Haldane, criticizing these views (*Nature*, July 4 and 11, 1931) judiciously said that these characters are transmitted "so rarely that the exceptions are of little importance." As Prof. A. F. Shull says in his

Heredity (1938), a standard work, the old idea is "generally" abandoned. This does not mean that, as some represent, environment is no longer important in evolution. Prof. H. S. Jennings (*Genetics*, 1937) thinks it "overwhelmingly important in some cases," and the general attitude now is that genetical claims of a few years ago were greatly exaggerated, and heredity and environment are co-operating agencies. [See *Evolution*.]

Acton, Baron John Emerich Edward Dalberg (1834–1902), Catholic historian. As Lord Acton is the only Catholic historian of Great Britain or America whose distinction is recognized in the academic world, many wonder what was his attitude towards the painful facts of Papal history. He abhorred what he called the crimes and vices of the Popes. His opinions will be found best in *Selections from the Correspondence of the First Lord Acton* (1917), the revelations in which were so disturbing that the promised second volume never appeared. See, especially, the letter on p. 53. He says—and he refers chiefly to the nineteenth century—that "the Papacy contrived massacre on the largest and also on the most cruel and inhuman scale"; that the Popes were "wholesale assassins"; and that the modern Catholic movement for the glorification of the Papacy is a scheme for "the promotion of sin." He had a passionate love of liberty and tolerance, but he was emotionally attached to the Church, though it twice condemned him.

Acts of the Apostles, The. This book of the New Testament, which is sometimes called the second volume of Luke, purports to tell the history of the Church from the supposed Resurrection to the year 63. As some "physician" named Luke is mentioned in one of the Epistles (*Col.* iv, 14), the orthodox tradition is that this man was a companion of Paul and wrote the third Gospel and *Acts*. When criticism began it was noticed that, while the narrative is generally objective, large sections are written in the first person ("we"), and it was said that here at least the writer quotes some sort of diary of a companion of Paul. The fact that the authenticity of the *Epistle to the Colos-*

sians itself is seriously disputed weakens the basis of this flimsy structure of reasoning, and liberal divines further discredit it. Kirsopp Lake (professor of divinity at Harvard) shows that, not only is there not the least suggestion that the author of the "we" section was a physician, but he gives an entirely different account of Paul's experience in the primitive Church (quarrels, etc.) from that conveyed by the Pauline Epistles (*Introduction to the New Testament*, 1937). He concludes that the "we" is "a purely literary device." Dr. B. W. Bacon (professor of New Testament Criticism at Yale) and others also stress these vital differences (*The Making of the New Testament*, 1912, Home Univ. Lib.). The author of *Acts* never mentions any letter written by Paul, and he mixes supernatural and natural events in the familiar Gospel manner. The book is of unknown date and authorship, includes myths of late date like the Resurrection, is inconsistent with the Pauline documents, and is not quoted by any early Christian writer. It is therefore, on the ordinary canons of history, not a document upon which we can rely for events of the first century.

Adam and Eve. The name Adam is the Hebrew word for "man"—the Greek translators of the Old Testament were often uncertain whether to take it as "man" or as a proper name—and Eve does not mean "Mother of the Living." It is an obscure word, possibly connected with "life" or "serpent." The names are obviously fictitious and the story is the Hebrew variant of the world-wide folk-story of the origin of the human race. Sir J. G. Frazer collects, in his *Creation and Evolution in Primitive Cosmogony* (1935, pp. 3-34), a large number of local variants of the myth, showing that the childlike idea of the gods forming the first men from clay or earth was widely spread over Polynesia, Southern Asia, and North America, as well as in Babylonia; Egypt, and Greece. Some of the Polynesians (Tahitians and Maoris) even said that, while the gods made the first man out of earth, they made the woman out of one of his bones while he slept. The Greeks knew the very spot where Prometheus had

formed the first man out of clay. The Hebrew version, while giving names of its own to the first man and woman, was clearly derived, though possibly through intermediate nations, from the Babylonian story of the creation [see *Creation Stories*, Sir E. A. T. W. Budge's *Babylonian Legends of the Creation* (1931), W. C. Leonard's *Gilgamesh, the Epic of Old Babylonia* (1934), and for a separate epic, with early man living in the garden of the gods and eating the forbidden fruit, Prof. Langdon's *Sumerian Epic of Paradise, the Flood, and the Fall of Man* (1915).]

Adams, John (1755-1826), second President of the United States and one of the compilers of the Constitution. Adams, a lawyer by profession and one of the most cultivated of the revolutionaries, was, like large numbers of the middle-class colonials, drawn into the Rationalist Movement which French and English Deistic literature inspired in the eighteenth century. He did not share the dogmatic Materialism of his friend Jefferson, but he was just as contemptuous of the Christian creed, and was practically an Agnostic. Writing to Jefferson (their correspondence is in *The Works of John Adams*, 10 vols., 1856) in the last year of his life, he calls the doctrine of the Incarnation an "awful blasphemy" (Jan. 22, 1825). Nominally a Deist, he defined God as "an essence that we know nothing of" (Jan. 17, 1820), and he thought the attempt of theologians and philosophers to get beyond this "a game of push-pin." This Agnosticism is expressed even more strongly in his letter of Jan. 22, 1825. The statement of his attitude to religion in his grandson's *Life of John Adams* (1871) is not in accordance with his own words.

Adamson, Professor Robert (1852-1902), philosopher. Described in the *Cambridge History of Modern Literature* (XIV, 48) as "the most learned of contemporary philosophers," he was professor of philosophy and political economy at Owen's College 1876-93, of logic at Aberdeen 1893-5, and then of logic at Glasgow University 1895-1902. Manchester University honours him with an annual Adamson Lecture. In spite of his high academic

position he was an outspoken Agnostic, a utilitarian in ethics, and a Monist (holding that mind and matter are aspects of one reality) in philosophy. In his essay "Moral Theory and Practice," in the symposium *Ethical Democracy* (1900) he writes that "the world conquered Christianity" instead of Christianity conquering the world.

Addams, Jane (1860-1937), American reformer and Nobel Prize-winner. After graduating from Rockford and studying social conditions in Europe (1883-5) she founded Hull House—"the first and most famous settlement house in the United States," the *Encyclopædia Americana* says—in Chicago, and she directed it for forty-six years. It is a social and educational centre on the model of Toynbee Hall and has rendered invaluable service in Chicago. A newspaper questionnaire reported her the most eminent woman in modern America. She was also founder, and President for seven years, of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom and was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize in 1931. In her works (*Democracy and Social Ethics*, 1902, *Twenty Years at Hull House*, 1910, etc.) she avoids religion, but J. W. Linn, in his biography of her (*Jane Addams*, 1935), shows that she never departed from the Rationalism she had learned from her father, and that she joined the Congregational Church only "as she might join a labour-union": that she "did not accept it [membership] so much as undergo it" (pp. 80-1). All Chicago honoured her fine character and splendid work on the day of her funeral.

Adler, Professor Felix, Ph.D. (1851-1933), founder of the Ethical Culture Movement in America. Son of a rabbi, and invited to succeed his father in New York (though he had been born and educated in Germany), he declared himself a Rationalist and secured the position of professor of Oriental languages at Cornell. From 1902 onward he was professor of social and political ethics at Columbia University, and he founded the New York Society for Ethical Culture in 1876. Austere in character and intuitionist in ethics and philosophy, he in his later years professed an impersonal Theism.

Adonis. The Greek form of the Syrian word Adon (Lord), a title given to the ancient Babylonian vegetation-god Tammuz. His cult, which spread westward to Egypt and Greece, was one of the chief sources of the Christian myth of the Resurrection. The legend of his death and annual return to earth and a vivid account of the celebration will be found in the volume of Frazer's *Golden Bough* entitled *Osiris, Attis, Adonis* (1936). *Ezekiel* (viii, 14) describes the women "weeping for Tammuz" at the door of the Temple at Jerusalem, and Jerome says in his *Commentary on Ezekiel* (Migne ed., XXV, 82) that the reference is to an annual celebration in the Babylonian month Tammuz (June-July) "in the course of which his death is mourned by the women, and afterwards his resurrection is chanted and praised." Cyril of Alexandria says the same of the Jews of that city (*Comm. on Isaiah*, II, 3). The substance of the myth was that the handsome divine lover of the mother-earth goddess was slain, but he was permitted by the gods of the underworld (to which he had descended—the "descent into Hell") to return to earth every year for the spring and summer: a very obvious and primitive explanation of the winter, spring, and summer seasons. The slain and resurrected deity was worshipped as Osiris [see] in Egypt and Greece and as Attis [see] in North Syria, Asia Minor, and Rome. Defects in the ancient calendar, from ignorance of astronomy, caused shifts of the date to different months, and the priests found it convenient to celebrate the death and the resurrection within a few days of each other.

Adrenals, The. [See Glands.]

Adultery in Ancient Law. Christian moralists are so prone to represent Babylon and ancient Rome as epitomes of sexual wickedness that it is ironical to find that the law in both these civilizations punished adulterers very severely. A very wide range of lower peoples permitted the injured husband to kill an adulterer, and in several primitive civilizations (Mexico, Yucatan, etc.) the law was severe. The general idea was that adultery was an injury to a man's property (wife). In Babylon and Rome

the ground of the law was moral. In Babylonian law (*The Hammurabi Code*, translation by C. Edwards, 1904) Clause 129 enacted that the erring pair were to be bound together and thrown—doubtless from a tower on the wall—into the river. A qualifying clause suggests that it was an old law that was not strictly applied, but rape (130), incest (154-8), and other sexual offences incurred the death sentence without reserve. Egyptian law of the Middle Kingdom prescribed 1,000 strokes of the lash, but the clause does not seem to have been operative; though the "Tale of Two Brothers" (from which the story of Joseph and Potiphar's wife is adapted) and other literature show that adultery was condemned. In ancient Rome the Lex Julia imposed heavy fines on both parties, and Augustus sentenced his favourite daughter to a painful exile for life for loose conduct. That the Jews would stone "the woman taken in adultery" is one of the many errors of the Gospel writers, but she was sentenced to death in Jewish law. Christendom abolished legal penalties on adultery, yet its apologists have succeeded in persuading the world that it has saved society by imposing a more severe view of adultery than the Romans held.

Advocate, The Devil's. A popular title, even in ecclesiastical circles, of the Vatican official who is in Papal law styled the Promoter of the Faith (established 1587). His function is, in theory, to find objections against the character or the orthodoxy of those whom the Church proposes to declare "Blessed" or "Saint." Since in modern times the motive of the procedure is generally political—to conciliate the country to which the "saint" belongs—or financial (fees to Vatican officials may run to more than £10,000), the office is a mere formality. [See *Canonization*.]

Ægean Religion. The Ægean civilization (about 3000 to 1200 B.C.), which spread across the Ægean Sea from Crete to Asia Minor and in Crete rose to a height comparable with that of Egypt, was particularly interesting from the religious point of view. There is no trace of temples, or at the most there were very small open-air sacred enclo-

tures in the towns; and the chapel in the great palace at Cnossos (which the present writer has visited) is hardly larger than a sentry-box. Until the last phase of the civilization, when a young-man god (the counterpart of Attis and Adonis) was introduced, a goddess alone was worshipped: clearly the Mother-Earth goddess which was for ages the supreme deity from Crete to Mesopotamia, if not India. The claim that the princes were priests of this goddess is disputable. The small coloured statuettes of priestesses, in curiously modern flounced skirts and embroidered bodices, suggest rather a body of female ministers of the goddess corresponding to the Amazons [see] of Asia Minor. Sir John Evans, *The Palace of Minos* (1921), J. Baikie, *The Sea Kings of Crete* (1926) and Prof. G. Glotz, *The Ægean Civilization* (1925).

Æsculapius. He was said by the ancient Greeks to have been a son of Apollo and the nymph Coronis, but there is reason to think that he was originally an historical person with exceptional powers of healing, so that he became the god of medicine. It is important, in view of the claim that the ancient Romans had no hospitals until a Christian lady founded one in A.D. 380, to know that, as every Classical Dictionary shows, the temples of Æsculapius acted as hospitals, and the walls were covered with votive tablets recording cures. It is believed by experts that the more serious patients were kept in the temples or in adjoining houses. The cult was introduced into Rome in the third century B.C., and the great temple of Æsculapius on an island in the Tiber served for medical studies as well as for free treatment. That the Christians should open one small hospital to keep their sick away from the pagan temple—and the temples were closed by Imperial orders shortly afterwards—is scarcely surprising. But this was only part of the pagan provision of free treatment. Greek and Roman cities had municipally-paid physicians and a very large number of domestic physicians (especially to treat slaves of the household). [See *Hospitals and Medicine*.] Æsculapius was believed not only to have gone about among the people

curing the sick, but to have had miraculous powers and raised the dead to life. Jupiter is said in the myth to have slain him for fear he would make men immortal. The myth may have contributed to the Christ-story.

Æsthetics and Theism. It is often said—sometimes even by scientific men who deny that there is a conflict of science and religion—that science deals only with material things, leaving the immaterial or spiritual to religion and philosophy. Æsthetics (the science of beauty or of the feeling for beauty), ethics, psychology, and comparative religion make the distinction meaningless, since the objects of these sciences are not admitted to be material. Æsthetics has, in fact, been used as a basis for theistic argument ever since the days of Plato and his stress on the Good, the True, and the Beautiful. In so far as this refers to beauty in nature, *see* article under this title; but a few apologists, notably Balfour in his *Foundations of Belief* (1895), have contended that the sense of beauty itself points to an intelligent creator of man. These writers generally proceed on the familiar apologetic fallacy that the Rationalist who rejects the supernatural explanation of a phenomenon must work out an adequate explanation of it. In logic and common sense the burden of proof is on the affirmer. But we have here a mystery no longer. Not only do professors of æsthetics never have to invoke supernatural explanations, but modern psychology does not recognize the special “æsthetic faculty” which the apologists postulate, and anthropology describes the entirely gradual evolution, in lower peoples and in prehistoric culture, of our emotional appreciation of beauty. *See* Art, Prehistoric for an account of the very long and slow development of man’s feeling for beauty. The evidence suggests that the primitive feeling for art developed in connection with sexual selection. It is enough that we can trace it in gradual evolution from very elementary to the highest expressions. For a critical analysis of Balfour’s arguments *see* Mr. Balfour’s *Apologetics* (anon., 1902; Watts & Co.).

Ætas, The. [*See* Negritos, Religion of the.]

Affirmation, The Right of. The fine struggle of Charles Bradlaugh against the compulsory oath in the House of Commons ended in the passing of a Bill (51 and 52 Vict., c. 41) in 1888 permitting Rationalists and others to substitute an affirmation for an oath, in courts as well as in Parliament. (*See* Charles Bradlaugh, by H. B. Bonner, 1906, II, 203–365.) This is confirmed in the Oaths Act 1909. The right is so little exercised that court officials sometimes try to exact an oath on the ground that the copy of the formula cannot be found. The Rationalist would do well to take a copy of it to court, and, “having no religion,” insist upon his right: It is: “I, do solemnly, sincerely, and truly declare and affirm that the evidence that I shall give shall be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth.” Officials have no legal right to interpolate a declaration of unbelief in the formula, as they sometimes do: nor are they entitled to question any man’s right to affirm instead of taking the oath.

Agapæ, The. Theologians dispute whether there were in the Church from earliest years two different suppers, one sacred (the Eucharist) and one secular (the Agape or Love Feast). However that may be, from the end of the second century the Fathers (Clement of Alexandria, *Paed.* II, 1, Tertullian, *De Res. Carnis*, I, etc.) complain of drunkenness and other scandals at the Agapæ. When, in the fourth century, these began to be held in the churches in honour of the martyrs, whom the priests multiplied by the thousand [*see* Martyrs], both the licence and the number of feasts increased. Augustine (*Conf.*, VI, 2) tells how Ambrose had to suppress them in the churches of Milan (then the second largest city in Europe) because of the orgies. Augustine later found that he had to suppress them in the African Church, though the Church Council of the year 393 reports that bishops and priests took part in them. Years later he complains that the drunkenness, dancing, and singing still continue in the churches of Carthage (Sermon 311), and that he incurred considerable personal risk by his opposition to the scandal. This general custom throws a broad

light upon the character of the "converts" from paganism and is in accord with all the other evidence. [See Christianity; Damasus; Jerome, etc.]

Age of the Earth, The. In the familiar attempt to attenuate the conflict of science and religion by jibes about "changes in science," a good deal is made of changes in the estimate of the age of the earth. In the last century Lord Kelvin concluded that the globe is about 25 million years old, while the lowest estimate to-day is more than 2,000 million. The fact is ignored that Kelvin's estimate exposed the absurdity of the Biblical estimate [see *Antiquity of Man*], and it was of no further interest to Rationalists whether or no this figure was increased. But it was, in fact, never accepted in the branch of science which is most closely concerned—geology. In his *Force and Matter* (Engl. edition, 1884, p. 160) Prof. Büchner gives a number of geological estimates rising to 6,000 million years. Sir C. Lyell demanded 560 million years. Kelvin's conclusion was based upon a false theory of the source of the sun's heat, which was then thought to be due to contraction. Calculations of the time required for the oceans to reach their present salt-content put the age far higher, but geologists now agree with physicists in accepting a figure, based upon radiological evidence, of between 2,000 and 3,000 million years.

Metals with heavy atomic weight, such as uranium, thorium, and radium, disintegrate at a known rate, and the final product is a special kind of lead which can be distinguished spectroscopically from ordinary lead. Hence the proportion of such lead (checked sometimes by the accompanying helium gas which has been released) discovered in uranium-bearing rocks at various depths of the crust yields the age of the rocks. The oldest rocks thus tested go back about 1,700 million years, and we must allow some hundreds of millions of years before the rocks were formed. The process is delicate, and it has been found that the crystals which are examined are not strictly uniform when taken from rocks of the same age (*Nature*, April 24, 1937), so that it is absurd to seek to discredit the method

because experts differ in their estimates. The age of the earth is now agreed to be somewhere between 2,000 and 3,000 million years, and closer to the former figure. See H. Jeffreys, *The Earth* (2nd ed. 1929). The theory that the earth was formed out of matter disrupted from the sun by a passing star is still generally held, though criticized. All such theories are not "the teaching of science," but merely provisional speculations.

Age of the Stars, The. This question is still in a stage of great uncertainty. Astronomers are divided between a "long scale" (10^{13} years) and a "short scale" (10^{10} years) theory. (The smaller number is that of the ciphers.) There is an admirable survey by Sir J. Jeans in *Nature*, Sept. 14, 1935. In his books Sir J. Jeans's dogmatic manner, which has repeatedly been censured in *Nature*, misleads many into thinking that it is accepted that the source of a star's energy is the annihilation of matter, upon which the longer estimate is based. On the contrary, most of the great American astronomers and many others believe that atoms are built up, not destroyed, in the stars. (See H. N. Russell, *The Composition of the Stars* (1933).) The shorter estimate is based upon a mathematical calculation of the time it has taken for the universe to expand to its present dimensions. (See H. S. Jones, Astronomer Royal, *Worlds Without End*, 1935). For the reply to Jeans's claim that it can be proved that the world had a beginning, see **Beginning of the Universe**. There is nothing in the teaching of astronomy that suggests either a beginning or an end of the material universe as a whole, though individual stars or galaxies are born and die, and many astronomers resent the intrusion into their science of these changeful mathematical speculations. (See Prof. H. H. Plaskett, *The Place of Observation in Astronomy* (1933).)

Age of Faith, The. This phrase is applied to the whole of the Middle Ages, but particularly to the second part (about 1050–1550), because the earlier part, the Dark Age, has a moral, social, and cultural record which by no means commends the faith it professed. But the application of the expression to the later Middle Ages is ironic. Belief had

been immeasurably more uniform and unclouded in the densely ignorant and gross Dark Age. Rebellion against the Church and its creed began as soon as Europe was awakened from its mediæval torpor, and it increased exactly in proportion to the spread of enlightenment, so that in little more than a century the Church retained its authority only by extreme and comprehensive violence. The early school-movement, which is usually represented as a pious extension of episcopal and monastic schools, was to a very large extent a multiplication of free and independent lay schools, sometimes for women, and some of its most brilliant leaders—Abélard [see], Arnold of Brescia [see], Roscelin, Bérenger, Gilbert de la Porée, etc.—were prosecuted for heresy. The early literary movement—that of the troubadours—defied both religion and morals.

Apart from these, moreover, heresy spread rapidly. As early as 1017 thirteen canons and priests of the diocese of Orleans were burned alive for heresy, and such executions in batches occur all over Europe until, at the end of the twelfth century, rebels against the faith—Albigensians [see], Cathari, etc.—populated entire provinces and ran to at least many hundreds of thousands. Massacres [see] and wholesale executions failed to check the rebellion, and the Inquisition was established and the schools and universities rigorously controlled. Yet the literary movement of the Renaissance which followed was steeped in scepticism and immorality, and the increasing corruption of the Church led to the multiplication of rebels by the million. [See *Lollards*; *Hussites*, etc.] On the other hand, the features of mediæval life which are conventionally assigned as the symptoms of a deep general faith—religious art, cathedrals, new orders of monks [see articles on each]—are found on close inspection to have no such significance, while the period was one of a remarkable grossness and licence of life which hardly suggests a deep faith in a creed which sternly enacted eternal torment for sexual indulgence. General familiarity with the vices of the clergy, monks, and nuns, which were derided in popular

songs in all countries, and coarse parodies of the Mass in cathedrals and churches on certain festivals, have the same implication. The various articles in this Encyclopædia covering these points will be summed up in *Dark Age and Middle Ages*.

Agnosticism. The word "Agnostic" was coined by Prof. T. H. Huxley to indicate that, while his contemporaries seemed to have definite knowledge (*gnosis*), positive or negative, about ultimate realities and might be described as Gnostics, he had no such knowledge. In his *Collected Essays* (V, 237) he explains that the idea came to him from the discussions of the Metaphysical Society, to which men of all shades of opinion belonged; though Murray's *New English Dictionary* quotes R. H. Hutton saying that Huxley invented the name some years earlier (in 1869) in his presence. Huxley, following the principles of Hume and Kant, held that the mind cannot attain to any truth beyond the phenomenal universe or the world of experience. Hence the original meaning is that man cannot know the truth about God and immortality, and must leave the issues open. With the progress of psychology and the return of philosophy toward realism this dogmatic philosophical basis of Agnosticism weakened, and Sir L. Stephen, in his *Agnostic's Apology* (1893), vaguely—he confesses—reinterpreted it to mean that after two millennia of discussion the mind seemed to be in fact unable to establish the truth in these matters, and that in any case it was desirable to have an alternative word to Atheism, to which a good deal of odium attached. In frequent conversation with the present writer Stephen acknowledged that his mind was not open or undecided about the value of theistic evidences, which he described as "weaving faith out of moonshine." A. W. Benn, in the chapter on Agnosticism in his *Revaluations* (1909), returns to the Spencerian or Huxleian definition, but he wrongly assumes that the Atheist, being a Materialist, must be prepared to offer an explanation of everything in nature. Sir G. Greenwood is even more Spencerian, insisting on the Unknowable, in his *Faith of an Agnostic* (1919);

though Greenwood had little knowledge of the advance of either philosophy or science. The great majority of Agnostics to-day mean by that term that they have examined the arguments for the existence of God and rejected them. That the Agnostic "leaves the question open," while the Atheist [see] does not, is a myth of the apologists. The article on the subject in the *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics*, which ought to be a standard authority, is inaccurate and prejudiced. Agnostics and Atheists now usually mean the same thing—that they are without belief in God—and the descriptions are used in the biographical notices in this *Encyclopædia* according to the preference, expressed or presumable, of the subject of the notice.

Ahriman (or **Angra Mainyu**). [See **Persian Religion**.]

Ahura Mazda (or **Ormuzd**). [See **Persian Religion**.]

Aikenhead, Thomas (1678–1697), the last Rationalist martyr in Great Britain. He adopted Deistic opinions while he was a student at Edinburgh University, and was arrested and charged with blasphemy. The youth recanted, but the Lord Advocate, impelled by the clergy, "called for blood" (Macaulay, *Hist. of England*, IV, p. 783), and Aikenhead was hanged. He had no counsel at the trial, and the only witnesses were those of the prosecutor. Howell's *State Trials* (1812, XIII, pp. 917–38).

Aim of Life, The. [See **Fate**.]

Airy, Sir George Biddell, K.C.B., D.C.L., LL.D., F.R.S. (1801–92), astronomer. He was Astronomer Royal 1835–81, President of the Royal Society in 1872–3, and one of the most distinguished mathematicians and astronomers of his age. He had Russian, Prussian, Swedish, and Brazilian decorations, and diplomas from many other countries. He nevertheless courageously published a work, *Notes on the Earlier Hebrew Scriptures* (1876), in which he rejected miracles and revelation. In the Preface (p. vii) he says: "I regard the ostensible familiarity of the (Biblical) historian with the counsels of the Omnipotent as mere oriental allegories." He remained a Theist.

Albert the Great, usually quoted as **Albertus Magnus** (1205–80), one of the

most learned of the mediæval schoolmen. Albert, a Dominican monk and for a few years Bishop of Ratisbon, is commonly put forward as a supreme proof (like his contemporary, Roger Bacon) that the Church did not oppose, indeed that it encouraged, science. Though less gifted in this respect than Bacon, he had a good knowledge of the science of the time, and it is claimed that he made personal observation in botany. He was the teacher of Thomas Aquinas, who, however, learned little of his science, and his printed works run to thirty-eight volumes. Any sketch of his life will show that he acquired his knowledge of science entirely from Arab and Greek sources. His early studies were made at the University of Padua—he was a son of the Count of Bollstadt—and the science of the Sicilian Arabs was then well known in the cities of North Italy, which were very independent of Rome. Later he was familiar with Latin translations of the works of Avicenna [see], the greatest Arab-Persian master of science. Latin translations of the works of Aristotle are, however, acknowledged to have been the chief source of his knowledge. He wrote extensive commentaries on Aristotle's works (physics and psychology as well as logic and metaphysics). He was too important a man to be persecuted, as Bacon was persecuted, but he was sourly attacked by his colleagues. The claim that Bacon and he show that the Church had no hostility to science is easily refuted, not only by the imprisonment of Bacon [see], but by the fact that the two monks had no successors or pupils, even of second or third rank, in their respective Orders. The two Orders, Franciscan and Dominican, rapidly degenerated, and they conciliated the corrupt Papacy by checking the study of science and confining their masters to theology.

Albigensians, Massacre of the (1211–15). The extent to which historical truths of great social importance are suppressed in our time is illustrated by the fact that there is not a single work available in the English language on this most shameful chapter of the history of the Middle Ages. It is painfully evaded in English and American historical

literature, and the incredible meanness with which Catholic writers defend it is finding its way into standard works of reference. It occurred in what is held to be the finest period of the Middle Ages, and was ordered and directed by the greatest of the Popes, Innocent III. At least 100,000 men, women, and children, but probably a quarter of a million or more, who defied Rome were brutally slaughtered, and the most prosperous and most enlightened area in Europe was devastated. To speak of them as the Albigensians (people of Albi) is misleading, for Albi and its region were only the central part of the principality of Toulouse, 200 miles in width, with hundreds of towns and cities, which the heretics dominated. The influence of the brilliant civilization of the Spanish Arabs had, through the liberal Christians of Barcelona, who were friendly with them, extended to the south of France in the eleventh century, while the remainder of Europe was still almost entirely squalid and ignorant. The Papal Legates complained that 1,000 cities and towns were lost to Rome. Innocent III declares in one of his letters (Luchaire, p. 146) that his "Crusaders" captured 500 towns and castles, while his 220,000 soldiers took several years to exterminate the heretics, so that the number of victims can be vaguely appreciated. But here we can describe only the nature of the heresy and the behaviour of the Pope.

The modern Catholic plea, which the Protestant historian H. C. Lea (*History of the Inquisition*, 1906, Ch. III) has singularly admitted, is that the doctrines of the Albigensians would, if generally accepted, have ruined the structure of civilization. The *Encyclopædia Britannica* and the new *Encyclopædia Americana*, in paltry notices (probably written by Catholics) of the historic outrage, make the—for works of their standing—scandalous mis-statement that the Albigensian clergy released their followers from all moral obligations. This is, presumably, what would, in their view, have led to social ruin. One might briefly reply that the province, instead of facing social ruin, was admittedly the most prosperous in Christian Europe; that Pope Innocent III said nothing

about moral licence or social interests; and that according to all authorities the Albigensians were the sternest critics of the vices of the Christian clergy. But the most painful aspect of this mean modern apology for a ghastly massacre is that the one authority alleged, P. Alphandéry, does not give it the least support. In the most serious attempt that has been made to understand the ideas and conduct of the heretics (*Les idées morales chez les hétérodoxes Latins au début du XIII siècle*, 1903, in Vol. XVI of the *Bibliothèque des Hautes Études*) he shows that (as all admit) the conduct of the initiated or esoteric members (*perfecti*) of the sect was "ascetic to the point of cruelty," and that they merely permitted the great body of their adherents to live ordinary, but decent, human lives. It is ironic that the code of the initiated heretics which is now assailed was just that which in Christendom made saints of the few monks and nuns who observed it—strict celibacy, fasting, etc.—and in the case of the Albigensians it was logically based upon a belief, borrowed from ancient Persia through the Manichæans [*see*], that the devil had created the body (and all matter). They rejected the Old Testament and the Incarnation, which gave Jesus a material body. They had bishops (some say a Pope), churches, and nuns, and the Pope's legates reported to Rome that the Church was in danger of perishing, so widely had the heresy spread. The hundreds of thousands of ordinary members seem to have known little about the esoteric doctrines of "the perfect" and to have been alienated from the Roman Church by its corruption. No one denounces this comprehensive corruption more strongly than the Pope himself, and the highest authority on contemporary France, Prof. Luchaire, gives us an appalling picture of morals at the time in his *Social France at the Time of Philip Augustus* (Engl. trans. 1912).

The most powerful missionaries having failed to make any impression in Provence, Innocent called for what he described as a Crusade. It is not disputed that greed for loot was the chief impulse of the 20,000 knights and 200,000 footmen who marched south under Simon de Montfort, a poor noble who

coveted, and got, the principality. In an extant letter (XI, 232) the Pope instructed his Legates to disarm the Count of Toulouse by lying, and to the end he treated that prince with the gravest injustice. As the "Crusaders" slew 20,000 (including babes in arms) in the first city they took—it is here that the Monk-Legate is reported to have said, "Slay all, the Lord will know his own," which is at least what they did—and the slaughter continued for three years, its monstrous proportions may be imagined. H. C. Lea's account (*History of the Inquisition*, Chs. III and IV) and the article in the *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics* are the best in English, though a full and accurate study is greatly needed. The third volume of Prof. Luchaire's *Innocent III* (6 vols., 1904–8, not translated) is nearest to an adequate account. The R.P.A. has a work in course of production.

Alcuin (properly **Alhwin**, 735–80). Apologists for the Dark Age confront us with the great learning and educational work for Charlemagne of this British scholar. His learning—he had lessons from Irish monks at York during the short-lived zeal of the Irish and British after their conversion—may be seen in the Migne collection (Vols. C and CI): commentaries on Scripture and a few elementary treatises on grammar, dialectics, and music, a few fragments that had survived the destruction of Latin literature. As to his work, all historians of education record that it was the anti-Papal Lombards who inspired Charlemagne, and that the schools he compelled some of the monks to open were closed after his death. [See *Charlemagne*.]

Alembert, Jean le Rond d' (1717–83), French philosopher. He was the chief colleague of Diderot in compiling the *Encyclopædia* [see] and one of the most brilliant mathematicians in Europe. He was not, as is sometimes said, the son of a priest, but of an officer who had the nickname "Canon" because he was in the artillery. His simple and generous life—he refused invitations to settle at the Courts of Frederic the Great and Catherine of Russia—and high social ideals (best seen in his *Éléments de philosophie*, 1759) are as far removed as possible from clerical caricatures of

"the French philosophers." In his letters to Voltaire he prefers to call himself a Sceptic (Agnostic) rather than Atheist, and he is convinced that the soul or mind is merely a function of the brain.

Alexander VI (1430–1503), Pope. In discussing the causes of the Reformation some recent historians, largely under Catholic influence, allege that the corruption of the Papacy was exaggerated by Rationalists of the last century. In regard to the most corrupt Pope of the period, the Borgia Pope, this is the reverse of the truth. Official documents establishing the birth of six of his children were published from the archives of the Duke of Ossuna, and the Vatican then admitted that it had copies of the same documents (birth-certificates, etc.), so that even Catholic writers have yielded. The documents are published in an appendix to Thuasne's edition of Burchard's *Diarium* [see] and in Vol. V, pp. 363–5, of the *History of the Popes* of L. Pastor (Catholic priest and professor, 29 vols., 1891–1938). Both authorities, and all others, admit that Alexander was completely licentious from youth, got the Papacy by very heavy bribery, and almost certainly had a child by a mistress, Giulia Farnese, while he was Pope. Thuasne gives contemporary evidence in support of Burchard's statement that extraordinary orgies were held in the Vatican during his pontificate. The charge against the Pope of poisoning is probably exaggerated, but seems to be true in at least two cases. It is more important that the authoritative works quoted above show that, while Alexander was exceptional in continuing his licence while on the Papal throne, owing to the longer persistence of his heavy sensuality, the Papal Court was comprehensively corrupt from (with a few short periods of reform) about 1450 to 1650; and it is to be noted that the only great period of Roman art falls in the most degraded section of this time. For a temperate Protestant account see Bishop A. H. Mathew's *Life and Times of Rodrigo Borgia* (1912)—Bishop Creighton's *History of the Papacy* is here inaccurate and too lenient—and McCabe's *Crises in the History of the Papacy* (1916,

Ch. XII). Pastor calls Catholic apologies for Alexander "a perversion of the truth" (II, 542).

Alexandria, Ancient, Science and Scepticism in. Histories of science record how, apart from the speculations of the Ionic philosophers, Greek science, especially in mathematics and astronomy, made its chief progress in Alexandria. The city had been projected by Alexander when he conquered Egypt, and it was built on a splendid scale by the Ptolemies who took over this part of his empire. Isolated alike from Greece and Egypt, the Ptolemies respected the gods of neither, beyond a politic patronage of the temples, and they made the new city the worthy successor of Athens. At the Serapeum, a vast college nominally dedicated to the god Serapis, whom they rather cynically raised from obscurity, and the Museum, they gathered together and maintained for several centuries the most brilliant colony of scientists, historians, and poets the world had ever seen. As far as evidence of the opinions of these survives, nearly all were Materialists, generally of the Atheistic Epicurean school. Mathematics, astronomy, and geography now reached the highest point they attained in the ancient world, and literary and historical studies were just as assiduously cultivated. It was mainly from the works of these Alexandrians that the Arabs and Persians restored science four centuries later, but the complete destruction of the great academy by the monks and people of Alexandria under Archbishop Theophilus in A.D. 389 (Gibbon, Ch. XXVIII), after six centuries of magnificent service, has left only fragments of their work.

Alexandrian Library, The. The Ptolemies collected, at enormous expense, more than 500,000 volumes—some ancient writers say 700,000—for the use of their scholars. The best estimate seems to be that there were 42,000 volumes in a smaller library at the Serapeum, and 490,000 in the vast library attached to the Museum. The latter was destroyed during Cæsar's siege of Alexandria, but Marc Antony gave Cleopatra 200,000 volumes from the library of Pergamus to replace them. Some religious writers deny that

the Christians under Theophilus destroyed this library, and quote the Arab writer Abulpharaj saying that when the Arabs invaded Egypt they found it still so large that they fed the public baths (4,000 in number !) for six months with the books. They omit to state that no contemporary Arab or Christian writer mentions this Arab vandalism, and that Abulpharaj, in whose work the story first appears, lived 600 years later; while we learn of the earlier Christian vandalism from Christian historians of the time. Professor Bury, whose notes to Gibbon (appendix to Vol. III) are here strangely inconsistent, admits these facts, yet rather arbitrarily thinks that a large number of books may have survived to Arab times.

Alfonsine Tables, The. In the record of contributions to science of the mediæval Church we invariably find this work, which contained the best results to date (the thirteenth century) of Greek, Arab, and Persian astronomy. Alfonso X, whose name it bears, was the only Spanish monarch who made any attempt to preserve Arab science in the new Christian civilization. All the others encouraged their people in the most ruthless destruction of art and culture since the days of the Huns. But it is not disputed by any authority that Alfonso employed, to compile the work, the Jewish and Moslem teachers whom he had brought to his University of Salamanca. The editor was the Jew Isaac Ibn Sid, and none of his collaborators were Christians.

Alice, Maud Mary, Princess (1843–78), daughter of Queen Victoria. Princess Alice was from the first the most attractive figure in the royal family. Her father said that she was "the beauty of the family, an extraordinarily good and merry child." The article on her in the *Dictionary of National Biography* says that she became "one of the most accomplished young ladies in England." She married the Grand Duke of Hesse-Darmstadt and was one of the most brilliant women in the Duchy, a sincere and enlightened patroness of art and culture and greatly esteemed for her benevolence. She made a serious study of philanthropic work. Few English writers ever mention that she and her

sister the Empress Frederic [see Victoria] were advanced sceptics. The Grand Duchess was very friendly with D. F. Strauss [see], at that time considered the chief anti-Christian writer in Germany. He read his study of Voltaire to her in manuscript and was permitted to dedicate it to her. Prince von Bülow, who knew her well, says in his *Memoirs* (III, 76, 1931): "The Grand Duchess Alice was as liberal in politics, and especially in religion, as her sister the Crown Princess." The editor of the *Literary Guide* (June 1937) revealed that it was she who translated the article by Haeckel which appeared in the first issue of the *Agnostic Annual*, which he also edited.

Allah. Although Nöldeke holds that the word, which is obscure in its origin, was a common name for "a god" among the early Arabs, most authorities believe that Allah, which has no plural, is the proper name of one of the very numerous deities or spirits worshipped in Arabia in the pre-Islamic period. Muslim writers say that it means "the worshipped," but the meaning is unknown. Why Mohammed singled out this particular name of a god and raised the familiar cry "There is no God but Allah" is equally obscure.

Allbutt, Sir Thomas Clifford, K.C.B., M.A., M.D., B.Sc., LL.D., F.R.S. (1836-1925), physician. He was Regius Professor at Cambridge 1892-1925 and Vice-President of the Royal Society 1914-16. The long list of his honours reflects the very high position he held in his science, and he was on various occasions Lane Lecturer, Goulstonian Lecturer, and Harveian Orator. In his Oration (*Science and Medieval Thought*, 1901) he criticizes the Church severely for opposing and retarding the progress of science, and he repeats these emphatic criticisms in his *Historical Relations of Medicine and Surgery* (1905); yet the leading Catholic apologist in this field, Prof. J. J. Walsh (*The Popes and Science*, 1912), tells his readers that Allbutt rejected the charge against the Church of obstructing science. One could quote a dozen passages like that (p. 51) in which Allbutt says that the bigotry which impeded the progress of surgery "culminated in the reactionary authority of the Church." In his Harveian Oration

he professes Agnosticism: "I wonder if we are glad that the riddle of the origin and issues of being, which tormented their eager hearts, is not solved but proved insoluble." It may not be idle to add that we are unaware that any even of the very numerous sceptics of the Middle Ages were "tormented" by the riddle of life.

Allen, Grant (Charles Grant Blair-findle, 1848-99), author. Canadian by birth and son of an Irish Protestant minister, he taught philosophy for some years at a college in Jamaica before settling in England. His Agnostic views are seen in his *Evolution of the Idea of God* (1897) and *The Hand of God* (post. cheap ed. 1909). He was a remarkably versatile and accomplished writer, and his fine character made him a respected figure in the group of late-Victorian Agnostics.

Allenby, Field-Marshal Edmund Henry Hynman, First Viscount (1861-1936). Allenby served with distinction as cavalry commander in the South African and the European Wars. In 1917 he attained the rank of General and was transferred to the East, where his conquest of Palestine won for him the title of Field-Marshal and Viscount. He was a member of the R.P.A., and his Rectorial Address to Edinburgh University, "World Police for World Peace," in the last year of his life, is one of the noblest appeals for peace and progress ever made by a soldier. He pointedly excludes religion and the Churches from his enumeration of the agencies of betterment. The address is published as *Allenby's Last Message* (1936). See Field-Marshal Lord Wavell, *Allenby, a Study in Greatness* (1940).

Alma-Tadema, Sir Lawrence, Litt.D., D.C.L., R.A., F.S.A. (1836-1912). The distinguished painter was born and educated in Holland, but naturalized in Great Britain. He was elected to the Academy in 1879. His beautiful and sympathetic pictures of ancient Greek and Roman life show an intimate knowledge as well as appreciation of pagan times. He was an Agnostic (information from his personal friends).

Altruism. Concern for others, often to the point of exposing oneself to danger, goes back deep into the animal

world. It begins with certain fishes which nest and guard their eggs—in some cases (stickleback, etc.) the male parent does this—and becomes a condition of survival in the birds and mammals, many of which will fight to the death for their eggs or young. The development of social life among the mammals extends altruistic practices beyond the parental relation. At the human level altruism expands with social life—to the clan, the tribe, etc.—and is the chief basis of moral law, being now an “enlightened egoism” or consciousness of communal interests. Social-moral progress is based upon the expansion of the deep-rooted family sentiment to larger and larger groups, ultimately to the entire race. Westermarck traces altruism in the animal and savage worlds in Ch. XXXIV of his *Origin and Development of the Moral Ideas* (1926). For the superficial claim that Christianity first taught altruism see special articles (*Children* ; *Hospitals* ; *Philanthropy* ; *Slavery*, etc.).

Amazons, The. The old Greek legend of the Amazons of Asia Minor is now generally regarded as a garbled story told by early sailors who had seen bodies of women of masculine appearance and dress. These were probably the celibate priestesses of Ma, the mother-earth goddess of the Hittites [see]. These priestesses, of whom we have discovered carved representations, wore short tunics, armour, axes, and daggers. The Greek geographer Strabo tells us that in certain “holy cities” they formed the majority of the population. In one city there were 6,000 of them, besides eunuch priests like those of Attis. They carry back the story of religious celibacy to the dawn of civilization. See the Rev. Prof. Sayce, *The Hittites* (4th ed., 1925) and, especially, W. Leonhard, *Hittiter und Amazonen* (1911).

Amenhotep IV. [See *Ikhnaton*.]

Americanism. The name first given by the Vatican to the Modernist Movement in the Roman Church. In the later years of the last century many American Catholics, lay and clerical, loudly professed, as part of their attempt to win America, that they were going to modernize their branch of the

Church. In 1899 Pope Leo XIII drastically denounced this “Americanism,” as he called it, in a public letter to Cardinal Gibbons, and the American bishops and cardinals meekly submitted.

Amerindians, The Religion of the. The religion, or religions, of the Amerindians at the time of the Spanish conquest afford the purest example of the development of religion from a very crude level to that of an elaborate mythology and organization. American archaeologists periodically announce discoveries of pre-Columbian cultures, but, though one or two claims are still under discussion, none have yet been substantiated. It is the general conviction that the first immigrants who crossed from extreme north-eastern Asia to Alaska at some date between 5,000 and 10,000 B.C.—the Ice Age precludes an earlier date—entered a virgin continent over which they spread as far as Tierra del Fuego, at one time, it is estimated, numbering about 100,000,000. The lowest religious level, among the Indians of the far North—there has been much degeneration in South America, especially in the case of the Yahgans—and the peoples of north-eastern Asia, suggests the starting-point, a crude nature-religion with shamans, and the cults of the Aztecs, Mayans, and Peruvians exhibit a natural evolution from this stage to that of ethical and sacerdotal religions. The late Sir G. Elliot Smith contended that Egyptian culture had reached America through Southern Asia; but no American archaeologist admits this, and the present writer, who visited the sites from Central Mexico to Southern Yucatan, found the theory unintelligible. We have here, therefore, not only a fine illustration of the natural evolution of civilization by the contact of peoples with different cultures—the civilization began in the bottle-neck of Central America—but of the natural growth of a moral ideal which conquers the priestly demand for human sacrifices and inspires beliefs and practices in many respects like those of Roman Catholicism. The Spanish missionary who accompanied the Spaniards to Mexico, Fr. B. de Sahagun, tells us (*Historia General*, Span. trans., 1829) that he and his colleagues were amazed

to find the Aztec priests practising austerities, hearing the confession of sins, and having a sort of "holy communion" (or eating of the god). [See Aztecs; Communion; Confession.] The religions of the Mayans and Peruvians [see] were still more advanced and in some respects closer to Catholicism.

Amphitheatre, The Roman. The great or Flavian Amphitheatre—in Christian times called the Colosseum or Coliseum (after the Colossus of Rhodes) on account of its colossal size—was built by Vespasian and Titus and opened in A.D. 80. The practice of counting its gladiatorial games and animal combats the chief amusement of the Romans is inaccurate. It seated only 90,000 spectators, while the Circus, with its bloodless games, accommodated about 400,000, and, according to all contemporary Latin writers, the chariot-races in the latter stirred the Romans far more than did the gladiatorial displays. The Stoics protested against the cruelty, but it continued under the pagan and Christian Emperors until the Fall of Rome destroyed the fortunes of the Emperors and rich Senators who had been accustomed to defray the very heavy expenses. For the myth that a monk secured the abolition of the games in A.D. 404 see *Telemachus*; and for proof of the falseness of the tradition that Christians were executed in the Amphitheatre see *Coliseum, Martyrs of the; Gladiators*.

Anabaptists, The. Literally, those Protestants who "baptized again": a sect of Reformation days, organized in 1524, who rejected infant baptism and therefore baptized every adult convert. They were semi-Rationalistic, and many of them rejected the Trinity and developed an advanced social radicalism. At one time the sect sanctioned polygamy. The Anabaptists won power in many cities and destroyed the orthodox churches. It was, broadly, a movement based upon the Bible, yet Lutherans as well as Catholics crushed it by savage persecution.

Anæsthetics, Religious Opposition to the Use of. More or less stupefying mixtures were given to the patient in mediæval surgical operations, but the use of any anæsthetics to allay the pains of childbirth was warmly resisted. As

early as 1591 a Scottish lady was burned alive for asking a physician to give her relief (Dalyell's *Darker Superstitions of Scotland*, 1834, p. 130). The hostility was based upon the text "In sorrow thou shalt bring forth children" (*Gen.* iii, 16). When Sir J. Simpson, in 1847, advocated the obstetrical use of chloroform there was a widespread protest from Scottish pulpits against this attempt to "defeat the Lord's curse." Simpson neatly countered with the text (*Gen.* ii, 21) in which the Lord sends Adam into a deep sleep before removing his rib (Dr. S. Hillier, *Medical and Surgical Science*, 1912, p. 89). Catholic writers sometimes boast that this opposition came entirely from Protestants, but in fact the most violent criticism of Simpson came from the Catholic hospitals of Dublin (J. Duns, *Memoir of Sir J. Y. Simpson*, 1873).

Anahita. One of the chief deities of the ancient Persians, described in the Avesta as "the immaculate one" and "a beautiful woman." She seems to have been particularly associated with water as a purifying and fertilizing element, and, as a goddess of fertility, was analogous to the Babylonian Anat. The Greeks identified her with Aphrodite, the goddess of love, and, when the cult spread from Persia to ancient Armenia and Asia Minor, she in many places displaced the mother-earth goddess Ma [see], and there was sacred prostitution in her temples. The cult is interesting as showing a fertility-goddess stage in Persia before the ascetic development set in, and because Anahita was one of the ancient models taken for the Christian cult of Mary, which began in the East while, in the fifth century, Rome (and Augustine) still resisted it (Conybeare, *Myth, Magic, and Morals*, 1909, p. 229).

Anatomy, Papal Obstruction of. Dr. Hillier (*Medical and Surgical Science*, 1911) says that "by a Papal interdiction of the year 1300 dissection of the human body was prohibited" (p. 37). The leading American Catholic apologist in this field, Dr. J. J. Walsh (*The Popes and Science*, 1912, a tissue of inaccuracies and abuse), ascribes this mis-statement, or ambiguous statement, to A. D. White's *Warfare of Science and Theology* (1896),

but White correctly states that the decretal of Boniface VIII—Catholic writers do not add that this Pope was himself condemned for scepticism and debauchery—which is in question merely forbade the practice of removing the flesh from the bones of Crusaders who had died in the East, and whose bodies were to be brought home (II, Ch. XIII). White then gives Catholic evidence that the decretal was commonly interpreted, since the basis of it was the dogma of the resurrection of the body, as a general prohibition of dissection. As late as the eighteenth century Benedict XIV was asked if the decretal prohibited dissection, and White quotes several councils forbidding monks to practise surgery or medicine. Though the anti-Papal Frederic II ordered dissection in his schools, surgery remained for centuries in a pitiful condition, and Vesalius, the great pioneer of anatomy, was fiercely persecuted for his human dissections. [See Allbutt ; *Medicine and Surgery* ; Vesalius.]

Anaxagoras (500–427 B.C.). A Greek philosopher whose speculations gave rise to the argument for the existence of God from the order and beauty of nature. Born in Ionia and educated in the Ionic philosophy, he migrated to Athens, and he was for thirty years one of the most brilliant and most respected figures in the circle of Pericles. He was, like nearly all the Greek philosophers [see], a dogmatic Materialist, but the very obvious defects of the Ionic theory of evolution (as contrasted with the modern) caused him to imagine a special principle, impersonal and material (as Plato complains), to explain the origin of order and beauty. He does not seem to have laid much stress on this *Nous* (literally, Mind), as he called it, but it gave Socrates and Plato the argument for a spiritual God which is so often attributed to their superior religious genius or insight. Anaxagoras was impeached for Atheism, but Pericles got the sentence of death changed to one of banishment. He held that the stars were white-hot material bodies, a view which gave great offence to the priests and the people.

Ancestor Worship. In the case of very many peoples, from the lowest to the

civilized level, gods were worshipped who are said to have been originally human beings or ancestors. The Bushmen attribute creation to remote ancestors, and the Australian aboriginals ascribe marvellous powers to their Alcheringa. Æsculapius, Osiris, Quetzalcoatl, Krishna, and other deities are believed by some to have been deified men. While this is undoubtedly one of the sources of god-making, Grant Allen's theory that it was the chief or general source (*The Evolution of the Idea of God*, 1897) is an exaggeration, and is due to the author confining his attention too narrowly to African peoples, which are not at the lowest cultural level. [See *Religion*, the Origin of.]

Ancestral Trees. One occasionally meets disdainful references to the genealogical trees of the animal world generally, and of man in particular, which Haeckel used to design for his works. All the illustrated works in which he did this belong to the last century, and the fact that modifications of these are required in view of the vast research and progress of the last forty or fifty years, especially in the science of prehistoric man, is scarcely a ground for suggesting distrust of science. In point of fact, Haeckel's trees, while they were admittedly provisional, were very sound. "We marvel at the accuracy of Haeckel's intuition," says Sir A. Keith in his *Construction of Man's Family Tree* (1934, Forum Series), with express reference to these trees.

Andamanese, The. [See *Negritos*, Religion of the.]

Anderson, George (1824–1913), philanthropist. A self-made man who used his fortune liberally in the support of Rationalism. He was a friend of Bradlaugh, Holyoake, and Watts, and it was he who made possible the issue of the very important series of R.P.A. Reprints by his generous monetary gifts to the Association. He gave with the same generosity, while spending modestly upon himself, to hospitals and charitable institutions.

Angell, Sir Norman (b. 1874), a pen-name of Ralph Norman Angell Lane. From ranching and prospecting in North America he turned to journalism, and on his return to Europe he

became manager of the *Paris Daily Mail* (1905-14). In 1910 he attracted world-wide attention by his criticism of war, *The Great Illusion*, which was translated into fifteen languages. In 1913 he delivered the Conway Memorial Lecture, *War and the Essential Realities*, in which he puts reason above intuition. It ends with the words of Moncure Conway: "Entreat for peace not of deified thunderclouds, but of every man, woman, and child thou shalt meet."

Angels. A Greek word meaning "messengers," but now used to designate supernatural or superhuman beings below the level of deity but distinct from disembodied spirits in monotheistic religions. In pre-Exilic writings of the Old Testament angels are unknown—the meaning of the few apparent references in the Greek translation is disputed—and devils little known. During the Exile the Hebrews became familiar with the Babylonian religion, which abounded in demons, and the Persian religion, which had legions of both devils and angels, and they adopted the superstition. References to cherubim and seraphim in the Old Testament show that they also borrowed the fantastic winged supernatural monsters of the Assyrians and Babylonians. The arrangement of these and the angels in a sort of celestial hierarchy begins in Jewish literature after the Dispersion (or after 200 B.C.), and was borrowed therefrom by Christians.

Anglo-Catholicism. That section of the Church of England, also known as Anglicanism, Ritualism, and the High Church, which holds that the Reformation ought to have confined itself to a rejection of the authority of the Pope, the moral reform of the Church, and the correction of a few abuses such as the sale of indulgences. In its extreme form it retains all the rites, doctrines (except the supremacy and infallibility of the Pope), and sacraments of the Roman Church, and therefore calls itself English Catholicism. Its logic is admirable—if a Holy Ghost was sent to teach the Church all truth for all time it cannot have gone so far astray—and in the sacred name of logic it offers the modern world such monstrosities as transubstantiation, the confessional, and indis-

soluble marriage; and it evades, by denying the historical facts, the question why the Holy Ghost permitted such comprehensive corruption in the mediæval Church. Its real attraction is the ornate ritual which it borrows from Rome, and many of its ministers take doctrine figuratively. English reformers were divided from the start, and the "Catholic" wing had such powerful leaders, like Laud, that it had to be tolerated.

Animals, Cruelty to. The idea that Christianity first inspired a concern for animals has, like so many similar claims, no relation to the historical facts. Without going into earlier civilizations, we have the notorious fact that the Buddhist King Asoka [see] insisted strongly on kindness to animals and forbade his subjects to kill them for food (third century B.C.). He was, in this, influenced by his belief in the transmigration of souls, but from that time Buddhism inculcated kindness to animals everywhere. In the Greek world Plutarch, Seneca, Porphyry, and other pagan writers urged it, and cruelty to animals was often punished by law. For quotations see Lecky's *History of European Morals* (cheap ed. 1911, II, pp. 69-70), in which the strained compliments to Christianity are refuted by the facts given by the author. For the gladiatorial games see article on them. The Church did not condemn cruelty to animals, objecting that they had no souls, and from the earliest Middle Ages to the nineteenth century the most callous cruelty (especially in fights of animals) was permitted everywhere. The Pope refused to sanction the R.S.P.C.A., saying that it was based upon the "theoretical error" that man had duties to animals, and cruelty lingered unchecked in Italy, Spain, and Spanish America. A few clerics and W. Wilberforce [see], who was educated in sceptical and humanitarian ideals, supported the modern movement when it began in the eighteenth century (under the influence of the French philosophers), but, while the great Rationalist leaders—Owen, Bentham, Romilly, Mackintosh, etc.—all supported the movement, the Church was so apathetic that the passing of a Bill was resisted and derided in Par-

liament for twenty years. (See any history of the R.S.P.C.A.). Great Britain founded the first society and passed the first law for the prevention of cruelty.

Animals, Intelligence in. Older claims of intelligence in the sub-human species are generally useless. They are based upon an antithesis of instinct [see] and intelligence which is obsolete in psychology and upon faulty observation and analysis. Many even of Fabre's statements (on the SpheX wasp, for instance) have been disproved, and stories of unusual behaviour of individual animals (of which there are great numbers in Romanes' *Mental Evolution in Animals*, 1888) and accounts of the more complex activities of some groups of animals (bees, ants, birds, beavers, etc.) were, on account of the backward condition of psychology, too superficially appreciated. Some recent observers (Prof. Jennings, *Behaviour of the Lower Organisms*, 1906, Lloyd Morgan, *Life, Mind, and Spirit*, 1926, etc.) are biased by Vitalist or Spiritualist theories. It is now generally agreed in comparative psychology that there is no intelligent action below the level of the higher mammals and no degree of consciousness in the invertebrate world. Sir C. Sherrington says in his important Rede Lecture (*The Brain and its Mechanism*, 1933) that "during vast ages there was nothing in the way of intelligence on the earth" (p. 17) and that it appeared some 80,000 years ago (meaning when man began to make tools, which was probably at least a quarter of a million years ago).

In the higher mammals the automatic response to stimulation of the inherited neuro-muscular structure begins to be modified by that special adaptation of individual behaviour to new conditions which we call intelligence. There is a certain plasticity of behaviour at lower animal levels—the sharp distinction of rigid instinctive from individually adaptive action does not hold—besides that the individual animal (e.g., rat), even without intelligence, can learn by experience. In the higher mammals this plasticity reaches the degree which we call intelligence. Scientific tests now replace the old practice of regarding

every purposive or ingenious action of an animal as intelligent. It is, for instance, enclosed in a box with a simply latched door. A cat will fumble haphazard until it may happen to release the catch, but an ape will soon adapt its behaviour to conditions which it has not encountered before. Köhler found that a chimpanzee would fit one short bamboo rod into another to reach an object lying outside its cage, and even an ordinary monkey may, after a time, use a stick. On these tests intelligence is found to rise, in harmony with evolution, from the lemurs to the monkeys and from these to the anthropoid apes, of which the chimpanzee seems to be the most intelligent. Some observers claim a lower degree of intelligence in dogs, cats, and rats. Professor D. Katz, *Animals and Men* (1937—this work catalogues a long list of papers on experiments); Dr. G. Zuckermann, *Functional Affinities of Man, Monkeys, and Apes* (1933, with list of works on the subject); W. N. and L. A. Kellogg, *The Ape and the Child* (1933); W. Köhler, *The Mentality of Apes* (1927).

Animism. The word was invented in the eighteenth century for the theory of a world-soul, and it had various meanings until Tylor in his *Primitive Culture* (1871) gave it to his theory of the origin of religion. That is, that religion began with a vague belief or feeling that all nature is pervaded or animated by a sort of soul or vital energy, and that in a later stage this was embodied or crystallized in individual spirits or gods. The theory was generally accepted, but during the last quarter of a century experts have come to trace (they say) an earlier phase, Pre-Animism. It is suggested that in its earliest stage religion was an unreasoning emotional attitude (awe, fear, wonder, etc.) toward nature's energies. There are now several rival theories. [See Religion, the Origin of.]

Annet, Peter (1693–1769), Deistic writer. A schoolmaster at Liverpool (which was then little more than a village) who in 1739 published a defiant Rationalist work, *Judging for Ourselves: or, Freethinking the Great Duty of Religion*. He lost his position and came to London, where he greatly helped the spread of Deism. In 1761 he

founded *The Free Inquirer*, and he was, at the age of sixty-eight, condemned to the pillory and to a year of hard labour for blasphemy. C. Twynham, *Peter Annet* (1938), and Robertson's *Short History of Freethought*, II, 169.

Annunzio, Gabriele d'. Prince of Montenevoso (1863–1938), the most brilliant Italian writer of modern times. His poems, novels, and plays won worldwide recognition. He led the Risorgimento (the Rebirth of Italian literature) and defined it as "the worship of man." It was an æsthetic neo-pagan movement with a deep disdain of the Church, which put all his works on the Index, and in 1928 the Pope specially warned the faithful not to read them. D'Annunzio was at first a Socialist and scorned Mussolini's alliance with the Papacy, but he was reconciled politically—Mussolini gave him his title—and his life in his later years was marred by unhappy political adventures and the loss of his literary brilliance.

Anthony, Susan Bromwell (1820–1906), American reformer. A teacher of Quaker extraction, who is regarded by the women of America as the greatest leader they ever had. She worked in the Abolitionist, Temperance, and Feminist movements and was, like many of her associates, an Agnostic. With Mrs. Gage she wrote the standard *History of Woman Suffrage* (3 vols., 1881–7), and in this she often attacks the Churches. Miss Anthony was a woman of strong and balanced intelligence and high character. Ida H. Harper, *Life and Work of S. B. Anthony* (2 vols., 1898–9).

Anthropomorphism. The practice of conceiving or representing gods in human form, whether in graven images, sacred books of the character of the Old Testament, or creeds which attribute human psychological features to a deity—as do all creeds except a few of very restricted acceptance. For the question how far the attribution of "personality" to God may be called anthropomorphic see article under that title.

Antinomianism. A description—meaning, literally, "against the law"—applied to certain Christians of the early Church and others at the time of the Reformation (when Luther coined the

word) who held that the law did not bind the man who had perfect faith. The claim was based upon *Rom. vi*, 14, and did not, in sincere cases, refer to the moral law; but there were groups who interpreted the text to mean that they were released from moral obligations.

Antipodes, Vergilius and the. Apologetic works on science and religion often state that an eighth-century bishop, Vergilius of Salzburg, was so learned in science that he discovered the rotundity of the earth or the existence of antipodes. It is mere conjecture that the man was an Irish monk named Ferghil, who later became Bishop of Salzburg, though this is not unlikely, since the Irish and Saxon monks still had their zeal for such learning as had survived the Fall of Rome, and for missionary work in Europe. But all that we in fact know is that, in a letter to St. Boniface, Pope Zachary (741–52) says that Boniface has reported a certain Vergilius—"I am not clear if he is a priest," the Pope says—for claiming that "there is another world and other men under this," and he is to be excommunicated. That some of the Greeks had held that the earth is a globe could be read in the scrapbooks of knowledge which a few Christian writers compiled after the destruction of the Greek-Roman civilization and its vast literature. The Pope's letter is in Migne (LXXXIX, 946).

Antiquity of Man. Religious writers now set aside with a smile, as a personal eccentricity of Archbishop Usher (*Annals of the World*, 1658), the statement that the Bible puts the creation of the world and man in the year 4004 B.C. Usher was, in fact, the most learned prelate of his age, and any man who cares to take the trouble will find that the Old Testament, by giving the age of each patriarch and the year of the birth of his eldest son, *does* limit the age of the world to a few thousand years. No Christian writer questioned this estimate until in 1825 a French archæologist and advanced Deist, Boucher de Perthes [see], began the study of flint implements and founded prehistoric science (*De la création*, 5 vols., 1839–41). Religious writers unanimously called it a "huge imposture," but with the publication of Lyell's *Antiquity of Man* (1863) the

broad truth was established. A long series of finds of the bones of prehistoric man, from the Neanderthal skeleton (1856) to the remains of the Pithecanthropus of Java (1891), followed, and by the end of the century no scientific authority doubted that man's antiquity ran to hundreds of thousands of years. The pace of discovery has accelerated since 1900, and we now have a collection of skulls and skeletons, from the ape-like Pekin and Java type to the New Stone Age, which would fill a large room; though Catholic writers like McCann still assure their readers that the scientific case rests upon a few disputed bones which one could wrap in a handkerchief. It is impossible to ascertain the exact age of recent geological strata, as the radiological test does not apply to them, and estimates of the age of the earliest remains vary between 500,000 and 1,000,000 years.

This difference of estimates has no more than an academic interest because on other grounds we are compelled to put the appearance of man or his semi-human ancestor tens of millions of years before the beginning of the Ice Age. One or two experts (in some cases influenced by the prejudice against connecting man with the ape) have claimed that man does not come from a family of arboreal apes, but from an earlier type of mammal—apologists who quote this do not realize that it gives an even greater antiquity to man's ancestor—but the authorities are practically agreed that man and the four anthropoid apes had a common ancestor. It follows that the divergence of the human stock from the general animal tree must have been not later than the time of the first appearance of ape-remains in the geological record. We have ample remains—see any recent work on palæontology—of apes which show that the family was perfectly developed and had spread from India to Southern Europe and Africa in the early Miocene, and the accepted geological date for that period is at least 20,000,000 years ago, since Eocene strata can be dated on radiological tests at about 60,000,000 years ago. The actual development of the anthropoid family must be put earlier than the appearance of perfectly

formed apes, and so 25,000,000 years is the minimum we can now assign for the antiquity of man or ape-man. See Prof. W. K. Gregory, *Man's Place Among the Anthropoids* (1934). Sir A. Keith follows the older geological estimate in his *Antiquity of Man* (1915), but in his *Construction of Man's Family Tree* (1934) he accepts the usual estimate. Incidentally, as quoted under **Ancestral Trees**, he expresses admiration of Haeckel's genealogical trees, which are often derided.

Anti-Semitism. The oppression of the Jews throughout the Middle Ages need not be described, but two points must be noted. Very few writers tell how during the same period (about 900–1450) the Jews enjoyed complete liberty in the Arab civilization, and they rose to equal distinction with the Arabs in commerce, art, and science. See Ch. XVII of McCabe's *Splendour of Moorish Spain* (1935). It was their Golden Age. On the other hand, recent Catholic writers maintain that some of the Popes protected them in Christendom. Mgr. Mann claims in his 20-volume *Lives of the Popes* (1910, etc.)—a work of considerable erudition and astonishing sophistry) that “the Popes for the most part protected the Jews” (XIV, 291). Only five Popes out of 270 made any pretence of protecting them, and it was for financial reasons in each case. Alexander III had a Jew as secretary of the Papal treasury and drew large sums from the Jews. Innocent III merely protested against popular massacres and was otherwise very cruel to them, being the first Pope to make them wear ignominious badges. Innocent IV and Martin V were heavily paid for protection in certain regions (Graetz, *History of the Jews*, II, 603). Sixtus V is declared by his Catholic biographer Baron von Hübner to have “protected the Jews in order the better to exploit them” (I, 349).

Modern Anti-Semitism had its rise in the economic conditions of 1870–80 and the increase of prosperous Jews in the cities of Germany and Austria. Germany advanced rapidly after the Franco-German War, and the Jews—who were 0·14 of the population in France, 1·22 in Germany (mostly in Berlin), and 3·85 in

Austria-Hungary (chiefly Vienna)—had a large share of the new wealth and cultural distinction. Most of them were National Liberals and supported Bismarck in his struggle with the Catholics [see *Kulturkampf*]. He sacrificed them, in the Teutonic manner, when he diverted his attack from the Catholics to the Socialists, and from 1874 onward they had to face a mixed opposition of National Liberals (under Lasker), Agrarian Conservatives (jealous of their wealth), Socialists, Catholics, and some Protestants. Prof. Treitschke then put forward (building on Hegel) the theory of the pure Aryan blood which was to be protected from Jewish contagion. William II suppressed Anti-Semitism in Prussia, and it was the Christian (Catholic) Socialists [see] of Bavaria and Austria who created the virulent modern movement. They put into circulation the old blood-charge and the ridiculous *Protocols of Zion*, and Vienna, where Hitler imbibed his ideas, became the chief centre of Anti-Semitism in the world. Although the Jews co-operated very cordially with the Catholics in the struggle against Hitler to the end of 1932, the Catholics made, through Von Papen and the Vatican, a separate peace with the Nazis and abandoned the Jews to the fury which followed Hitler's seizure of power. B. Lazare, *L'Antisemitisme* (enlarged ed., 2 vols., 1934) and H. Valentin, *Anti-Semitism Critically and Historically Examined*, 1936.

Antonine Emperors, The. This term strictly denotes the two Emperors Antoninus Pius (138–161) and Marcus Aurelius Antoninus (161–180), but is often extended to cover the series of Roman Emperors which began with the accession of Trajan (A.D. 98) and ended with the death of Marcus Aurelius (A.D. 180). It is acknowledged by all historians that this was the finest period of ancient history. Gibbon (1890 ed., p. 73) calls it "the period in the whole of history when the condition of the human race"—he means of course the Roman Empire—"was most happy and prosperous." [See *Education*; *Philanthropy*; *Rome*, etc.]. The tribute to paganism which this implies is (by the few apologists who know anything about Roman history) modified by attributing

the reform to the influence of the "Stoic religion" and calling the rulers the Stoic Emperors. Stoicism [see] was not a religion except to a very few of Zeno's Greek followers, and the prevailing creed at this time among the educated classes in Rome was a blend of Epicureanism and Stoicism with the few mystic features of the latter entirely omitted. The finest Emperor of the series, Hadrian, was an Epicurean. The only Stoic was Marcus Aurelius, who, in leaving the Empire to his corrupt son, nearly ruined it. The other two Emperors of the series, Trajan and Antoninus Pius, knew nothing of either philosophy, but were chiefly influenced in their fine work by the Stoic-Epicureans.

Ape, The, and Man. It is usual, though not invariable, to restrict the name "apes" to the chimpanzee, orang, gorilla, and gibbon. Some call them the Great, Anthropoid (Man-like), or Tailless Apes, as distinct from the monkeys. They belong, with man, to the family of Anthropoids. The anatomical, physiological, and psychological features which are common to man and the apes, and peculiar to them, led scientists to turn at once to them for man's ancestry, and it is now agreed—apart from one or two (Osborn, etc.) who would put the origin of man before the ape-stage—that they had a common ape-like ancestor, probably in the Oligocene Period. [See *Antiquity of Man and Evolution*.] The popular phrase that man "comes from an ape" is inaccurate only in the sense that no living or fossil ape is in the line of his descent. If we discovered the remains of man's semi-human ancestor we should certainly class the creature as an ape. The late Sir G. Elliot Smith, one of the highest authorities, repeatedly writes of man's ancestor as an ape. Which of the existing apes is nearest to man is disputed, but the chimpanzee is the more favoured, and this is confirmed by tests of animal intelligence [see]. The earliest remains of man are found in Asia, where the orang and gibbon now are, but the remains of very man-like apes [see *Australopithecus*] and primitive men are found also in Africa, the home of the gorilla and the chimpanzee. The origi-

nal home of the anthropoids is generally believed to have been to the north of India, where fossil ape-remains abound, before the Himalayas rose. The most plausible explanation of the great divergence of the family is that the apes retreated south and led solitary lives in family groups in the tropical trees, with ample food and safety—as we find the orang and the chimpanzee to-day—and this led to degeneration. Ape-skulls of the Miocene Period seem to show a larger brain-capacity than those of to-day. Man's ancestor probably remained in the cooling region, where the forests disappeared as the mountains rose, and faced the struggle on the ground. Sir G. Elliot Smith finely works out in his books (*Evolution of Man*, 1927 ed.) the effect that this would have on the development of the brain. Those who fancy Africa as the cradle of the race postulate similar conditions. [See *Evolution* and, for books, *Animals, Intelligence* in.]

Apocrypha, The. After the Babylonian Captivity, when the Hebrew literature was very drastically "redacted" (and falsified) by the priests, the practice of putting old or forged names (Solomon, David, Daniel, etc.) to new writings spread. The orthodox Jewish leaders, having accomplished all the forging they needed, closed the canon [see], and the sects (Essenes, etc.) had a large number of uncanonical or apocryphal (literally, "hidden") books. The canon was, in fact, not the same for the Palestinian and for the more liberal Alexandrian Jews, and many books (*I and II Esdras*, *Tobit*, *Judith*, the *Wisdom of Solomon*, *Ecclesiasticus*, *Baruch*, and the *Maccabees*) which are not found in the Protestant Old Testament are included in the Catholic version, while some are not admitted by either Church. When the Christian period began, or in the last part of the first century and during the second, many lives of Jesus and apostolic epistles were compiled by pious fictionists, and in the fourth or fifth century [see *Canon*] the Roman Church selected the four Gospels and twenty-one Epistles of the New Testament and condemned the others, many of which are infantile in their absurdity, as apocryphal. An excellent transla-

tion of these is published by the Clarendon Press (*The Apocryphal New Testament*, 2 ed., 1926), and there is a volume of them in the Ante-Nicene Library (1870, Vol. XVI). The best edition of the Old Testament apocrypha is that of R. H. Charles (*The Apocrypha and the Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament*, 2 vols., 1913). The story, reproduced (not seriously) in Haeckel's *Riddle of the Universe*, of the four Gospels leaping on to the altar at the Council of Nicaea is a very late piece of fiction. The Council of Nicaea did not settle the canon.

Apollonius of Tyana, a Cappadocian wandering moralist of the Neo-Pythagorean school who in some respects affords a remarkable parallel to Jesus. He was a contemporary, though the precise years of his birth and death are unknown. He is credited with a very ascetic life and a zeal for missionary work that carried him all over the Roman world and even to India; and he is said to have raised the dead to life and to have preached a very elevated code of morals. Since the life of Apollonius was not written until about A.D. 220, when Philostratus composed it for the Empress Julia, the parallel with the Gospels must not be pressed. The interest is that in the first century there were wandering moralists of ascetic life who attracted considerable attention, and about the memory of whom legends and miracle-stories gathered.

Apostates. In the law of the Roman Church to-day—not in ancient times, but as it is printed in the twentieth century—"heretics" means apostates from the creed, and they are condemned to death. See *Death Sentence* for details. "Good faith" on the part of such seceders is not admitted in the Canon Law or Catholic theology.

Aquinas, Thomas (1227-74), the most famous of the scholastic theologians of the Middle Ages. As a member of the noble family of the Counts of Aquino, in South Italy, he was educated in the University of Naples, which was deeply influenced by Sicilian-Arab culture, and, after becoming a Dominican monk, he studied under Albert the Great [see] at Cologne, later settling as master in Paris. This education explains the knowledge of philosophy, especially that

of Aristotle (with such science as it contains), that makes his work distinctive. His purely theological work would to-day confine knowledge of him to Catholic circles; and very few priests even in that Church ever read his works, although Pope Leo XIII made strenuous efforts to impose him. Since during most of his life Aquinas knew only the very faulty Arab-Syrian versions of Aristotle—the Greek text was not directly translated into Latin until after 1260—his ideas of the Peripatetic philosophy are often erroneous, and the Pope's misguided pressure has given Catholic philosophy the archaic features which make modern philosophers regard it as negligible.

Since Aquinas studied also the political works of Aristotle, he at times expresses an opinion which seems to be in advance of the mediæval mind. But the attempt of modern apologists to represent this regression to ancient Greek ideas as an anticipation of modern thought is saved from absurdity only by selecting a few points out of a thoroughly mediæval socio-political system. Aquinas endorsed every superstition of his age and proved the justice of such crimes as the persecution of Jews and heretics. E. Crahay, a distinguished Catholic lawyer, shows in *La politique de S. Thomas d'Aquin* (1896) that he held that all political power came from God (43-67); that absolute monarchy is the best regime (114); that slavery and serfdom are necessary (he brackets "serfs and animals" together as not members of the civil community in his *De Reg. Principum*, I, 14); that kings are and must be subject to priests (123); and that we must refuse freedom of conscience and execute heretics (129) because faith is an act of will and murderers of the soul are worse than murderers of the body. Successive Popes now present Aquinas as the beneficent guide required by the modern world.

Arabs, Civilization of the. One of the gravest defects of British and American historical literature is the almost universal reluctance to pay adequate attention to the Arab-Persian civilization. Even in our distinguished *Cambridge Mediæval History* only about 100 pages—and

it seems that no British scholar could be found to write these—are devoted to the vast and splendid civilization of the Arabs and Persians, while many thousands of pages are given to the far smaller and much less reputable countries of Christian Europe. Yet during the most degraded period of Christendom (c. 900-1050) the Arab civilization spread from Portugal to the confines of India, and it was in some respects superior to the Greek-Roman. Half of Spain under the Arabs then nourished a population of 30,000,000—it is only 24,000,000 in the entire country to-day—in a condition of high prosperity and enlightenment. Sicily had twice as large a population as England then had, and a wonderful culture, and there were—with periods of reaction, when Moslem fanatics obtained power—equally advanced civilizations in Egypt, Syria, and Persia (which then stretched as far as India). There were hundreds of cities with populations of a quarter of a million to a million (when London, Paris, and Rome had not 30,000), libraries of hundreds of thousands of volumes, a general zeal for education [see *Avicenna*] and beauty, and a standard of life in all classes far higher than that of Christian countries. Science was cultivated in colleges of university rank and free education, to which even Christian scholars were welcomed, and was carried (as any modern history of science shows—see, especially, Dr. G. Sarton's *Introduction to the History of Science* (1937), or Dr. H. S. Williams's *Story of Modern Science* (10 vols., 1923))—far beyond the point at which the Alexandrians had left it. There was an equally voluminous literature of history, philosophy, geography, and poetry. There was very little slavery, while nine-tenths of the people of Christian Europe were in a state of squalid serfdom. In toleration, freedom, social justice, cleanliness, beneficence, and general happiness the Arab-ruled countries were leagues ahead; and the total population of these was many times larger than that of the Christian countries of Europe.

The reluctance of historians to appreciate this remarkable civilization distorts the whole perspective of the history of Europe and protects the myth

that Christianity was at least in large part responsible for its recovery. They continue to pay compliments to the civilizing influence of the Church, allowing only a stimulating contact with the Arabs in the Crusades [see], and they almost ignore the notable spread of Spanish-Arab culture over the south of France before the First Crusade began and the extension of Sicilian culture to the cities of north Italy. Since Draper drew attention to the truth, in his *History of the Intellectual Development of Europe*, in 1862, American literature has had only one substantial work on the subject—S. P. Scott's *Moorish Empire in Europe* (3 vols., 1904)—and, while the works of Muir, Osborn, and Sykes on Moslem Persia are excellent, though outdated, English historical literature has produced only two books in fifty years (S. Lane Poole's *Moors in Spain*, 1897, and McCabe's *Splendour of Moorish Spain*, 1935) on the Arab-Spanish culture which really civilized Europe. See also A. Michi, *La Science arabe* (1938). The Moorish section of L. Bertrand and Sir C. Petrie's *History of Spain* (1934) is a very inaccurate and ill-informed Catholic tract. Meantime the research of a number of liberal Spanish historians and experts on Arabic—Ballesteros, Ribera, Cordera, etc.—has put the truth beyond question. This conspiracy of silence obscures three profoundly important points in the true philosophy of European history: (1) While the barbaric invasions are blamed for the Dark Age, the equally barbaric Arabs created a fine civilization in Syria within half a century of the death of Mohammed, and in less than two centuries they extended it from Spain to Baluchistan. (2) In all the finest periods of this Arab civilization (about A.D. 670 to 1300) scepticism was very widespread, especially in the ruling class, while the occasional triumph of fanatics always led to reaction and destruction. (3) The superiority of the Arab civilization, especially in Spain and Sicily, was the chief agency which awakened Europe after six centuries of barbarism.

Arago, Dominique François Jean (1786–1853), one of the greatest French astronomers and physicists of the nineteenth century. Reared in the days of

the Revolution, Arago, in spite of his rapid progress in academic distinction and the temptations of the clerical royalist reaction after 1814, remained faithful to its best ideals. After the Revolution of 1830 he joined the group of anti-clerical deputies in the Chambre and after the Revolution of 1848 he was Minister of War and Marine. For his epoch-making work in physics and astronomy he was appointed Perpetual Secretary of the Academy and awarded the Copley Medal of the Royal Society. His letters to his intimate friend Humboldt (*Correspondance d'Alexandre de Humboldt avec F. Arago*, 1907) abound in anti-clerical and Agnostic sentiments. His brother Étienne (1802–92), a distinguished dramatist, and his son Victor (1812–96), an eminent lawyer-statesman, had the same Rationalist views and shared his anti-clerical activity.

Aranda, Pedro Pablo Abaraca y Bolea, Count d' (1718–98), the greatest statesman in modern Spanish history. He was President of the Council and First Minister from 1766 to 1773, when the ideas of the French humanitarians, with whom (especially Voltaire) he was in closest touch, and of the anti-Papal statesmen of Italy, began to penetrate Spanish mediævalism. In that capacity he inspired and directed the expulsion of the Jesuits (1767), curbed the Church and the Inquisition, and entered upon a programme of comprehensive social reform. Spain had sunk so low in two centuries of clerical domination that the priests were able to get him deposed. He was recalled in 1792 in the grave circumstances of the country, but the clergy again conspired to destroy him. He was denounced to the Inquisition and imprisoned, as he neared the age of eighty, but his friends rescued him; and the magnificent fight for liberty of Spain in the nineteenth century is in large part his monument. He was, like his friend Voltaire, a Deist.

Archæology and the Bible. Several hundred works of a jubilant character have been published during the last forty years to show that the progress of archæology has vindicated historical statements in the Old Testament. The fact is blandly ignored that the Rational-

ists and Higher Critics of the last century set out merely to meet an orthodox claim that there was not a single historical or other error in the Bible, and, in particular, that the stories told in Genesis were revealed to Moses and constituted a "grand revelation" of the early history of the world and man. It is amusing now to find Bibliolaters rejoicing that some names of monarchs, cities, or battles in the Old Testament are—or are said to be—true, and that, while the early stories in *Genesis* are clearly derived, directly or indirectly, from Babylonia, the Hebrew writers purged them of polytheism or even (after a civilizing contact with Babylonia and Persia) in some respects refined them. One of the earliest and most scholarly—or the only scholarly—of these works, the Rev. Prof. Sayce's *Higher Criticism and the Monuments* (8 ed., 1908), was more acceptable to Rationalists than to Fundamentalists because it discredited more statements of the Bible than it vindicated, established the Mesopotamian origin of the creation and flood stories, and showed the fictional character of the book of *Daniel*. For Sir L. Woolley's recent encouragement of these writers see *Abraham*. Another work in this class by a competent authority is Sir E. Marston's *The Bible Comes Alive* (1937), but it is almost entirely devoted to his and Prof. Garstang's discovery of the ruins of Jericho and Lachish. They do not quote any Rationalist who ever denied that there were such cities, and the fact that Jericho had stout walls which (like the walls of Troy, Babylon, etc.) are in ruins is not, especially as the region is notorious for earthquakes, very startling. S. L. Craiger's *Bible and Spade* (1936) is moderate and well-documented, but apt to strain the evidence at crucial points. Most of the Biblical pæans, like W. K. Beasley's *Jericho and Judgment* (1938) and F. W. Fawthrop's *The Stones Cry Out* (2 ed., 1937), make the discovery of Jericho their strongest point, while Garstang's latest book (*The Story of Jericho*, 1940) suggests no reason whatever why we should not attribute the collapse of the walls to an earthquake, and every reason why we should. For

discoveries, of an earlier date than used to be supposed, of Hebrew written language see article under that title. The entire literature is vitiated by the false assumption that critics did not admit that any older documents or traditions were used in the compilation of the Old Testament [see]. Given such use, many names might be correct.

Archer, William (1856–1924), dramatic critic. Archer had a high reputation for his translations of Ibsen (*Dramas*, 5 vols., 1890, and *Collected Works*, 11 vols., 1906). In 1911 he published a moderate defence of Francisco Ferrer and joined the R.P.A. as an Honorary Associate. His criticisms of Mr. Wells in his theistic phase (*God and Mr. Wells*, 1918) and of Dr. Inge freely express his Agnosticism. In his last years he seems to have been lenient to Spiritualist claims.

Architecture, Christian. [See *Cathedrals*.]

Argenson, Count Marc Pierre de Voyer de Paulmy d' (1696–1764), French statesman. He became Governor of Paris in 1740, and he was later Minister of War to Louis XV. He was an intimate friend of Voltaire and gave him much of the material for his *Siècle de Louis XIV*. D'Alembert and Diderot dedicated to him, in recognition of his services to letters and liberalism, the famous Encyclopædia. His brother, the Marquis d'Argenson, Councillor of State and Minister of Foreign Affairs (1744–7), also was intimate with Voltaire and d'Alembert. Both brothers were Deists (see the latter's *Mémoires*) and anti-clerical, and their protection was of great value to the Encyclopædists. See Robertson's *Short History of Free-thought*, II, 235).

Argentina, Religion in. Catholic publications and annuals (which take their information on such points from Catholics) state that the Argentine Republic is "practically all Catholic." In point of fact the educated middle class—there is a large Indian population whose creed hardly matters—has been fairly equally divided between Rationalists and Catholics since the Revolution of 1816, when the Church supported the Spaniards. In the early part of this century Rationalism gained ground so rapidly

that a Congress of Freethinkers which was held at Buenos Aires was attended by several Ministers, and the Women's Committee included some of the leading women writers of South America. Four years earlier the women of Argentina had agitated so strongly for a law of divorce that the Clericals had defeated it by only two votes. Education is secular and compulsory, and the percentage of illiterates is the lowest in South America. This advance of Rationalism was, after the War of 1914-18, grievously complicated by the spread of Socialism and Communism, accompanied, as usual, by Atheism. American missionaries complained that a Christian worker was apt to be persecuted by his Atheist fellows, who were the great majority. Many Rationalist Liberals now entered into alliance with the Clerical-Conservatives and the large colonies of German Nazis and Italian Fascists, and a period of repression, fostered by Pope Pius XII, who was then on a mission in South America, began in 1935. The statesmen of Argentina did not stoop to the barbarities which were perpetrated in the neighbouring and more Catholic Republic of Brazil, and the pressure was relaxed in 1937; but the remarkable spread of Atheism among the workers has been checked.

Arianism. The first of the great heresies which racked the Christian body after the conversion of Constantine, a denial of the equal divinity of Christ, was led by Arius, a learned and eloquent priest of Alexandria: significantly, the only city where the Christians were in contact with a high culture in the pagan world. Arius won so large a following among bishops, priests, and laity that at one time it seemed possible that the entire Church might reject the new dogma of the identity in substance of Christ and the Father. Constantine, a boorish soldier, told the Athanasian bishops that their difference from the Arians was "insignificant and entirely disproportionate to such a quarrel"—he seems to have anticipated Gibbon's phrase that it was a quarrel over a diphthong (whether Christ was *homo-ousios* or *homoiousios*—that is to say, of the "same substance"

or a "similar substance"—) but he was persuaded to preside at the Council of Nicæa, which condemned Arius (325). His son and successor, Constantius, however, embraced the heresy, and it spread more widely than ever; and the later Emperor Valens also adopted it. The scenes of violence, the bloody combats, and the acts of torture and barbarity into which both sides betrayed themselves in the course of the struggle as to whether Christ was or was not one with the Father may conveniently be read in Gibbon (Ch. XXI). They are part of the very large body of evidence that the establishment of Christianity led to no moral improvement of the Greeks and Romans, but in some respects to degeneration. Thousands lost their lives, and sacred virgins were barbarously and indecently tortured.

Aristippus (435-356 B.C.), founder of the Cyrenaic School [see] of Greek philosophy. He was a pupil of Socrates, but came under the influence of Protagoras, the sceptical leader, who held that man could know nothing beyond the range of his sensations, and in regard to any ulterior problems must be what Huxley called an Agnostic. Aristippus is better known, however, for his ethical views. Philosophers who know how false is the vulgar opinion that Epicurus was the apostle of pleasure transfer that description to Aristippus. The province in which his native city, Cyrene, was situated is substantially modern Libya—stretching from Carthage to Egypt—but it was in those days a most fertile and charming region and encouraged hedonistic views of life. Aristippus, however, maintained strongly that man must not be a slave of bodily pleasure. Virtue—correct social conduct—he held to be a means of promoting pleasure. "A pleasant life" would be a better description of his ideal than "pleasure," as ordinarily understood. Plato, naturally, scorned the new school, but he had far less influence in the Greek world than is commonly supposed, and his followers adopted the sceptical principles of the Cyrenaics. See Eisler's *Dictionary of Philosophers* and A. W. Benn, *History of Ancient Philosophy*, 1912, p. 127.

Aristotle (384-322 B.C.). The familiar

practice of bracketing the names of Plato and Aristotle is as misleading as is the suggestion that they had a widespread and deep influence in the Greek world. Aristotle rejected the idea of spirit, though he equally—in this differing from nine-tenths of the Greek philosophers (Zeller)—rejected Materialism. He invented the middle term, which was widely accepted in the Middle Ages, that the phenomena of life and mind were due to immaterial principles that could nevertheless not exist apart from matter. He thus rejected the idea of personal immortality and of a personal God, the creator and supervisor of the order of nature, which he held to be eternal; and in founding the science of ethics he took the promotion of welfare as the criterion of conduct. He had in his earlier years been an assiduous student of Ionic science [see], which was well represented in his native city, Stagira, and modern investigators find that he made original contributions to biology and embryology; but his prejudice against the Ionic philosophers and his substitution of metaphysical ideas for their atomic and evolutionary theories were fated to have, when the Arabs and Schoolmen at length gave a wide circulation to his system, a very injurious influence on the progress of thought. A. W. Benn (*History of Ancient Philosophy*, 1912) has a long account of his philosophy, the greatest achievement of purely intellectual genius in the ancient world, but rightly points out—and Benn was himself an anti-Materialist—that “for nearly six centuries after his death the Peripatetic School [see] was the least influential in the Greek world” (p. 107). Benn might have said *twelve* centuries, for it was the Arab thinkers who, passing on his philosophy to the mediæval Schoolmen, imposed his authority upon Europe (even Dante calls him “the master of those who know”), to the grave prejudice of science. His commendation of the study, even the empirical study, of nature had more influence on the Arabs and Persians, who may have found his philosophy a convenient cloak for their scepticism from the eyes of fanatics, but the Schoolmen fastened upon his metaphysics (“beyond phy-

sics,” or reasoning on reality from first principles without empirical grounds) and further strained it in the direction of mysticism. From the time of Galileo and Francis Bacon science had for a century or two to fight Aristotelism almost as much as theology.

Armstrong, Prof. Henry Edward, Ph.D., LL.D., F.R.S. (1848–1937), chemist. Emeritus Professor of the City and Guilds College, holder of the Davy Medal, and recognized as one of the most distinguished organic chemists in Europe, Armstrong was also an ardent humanitarian and an outspoken Agnostic. He closes an article in the *Humanist*, Feb. 1918, with Swinburne's defiant line, “Glory to Man in the Highest.” See also the profession of Materialism in his article in the *R.P.A. Annual* for 1919. He was a man of austere and unconventional life and entirely unselfish character, bluntly refusing the present writer (and all others) any material for a short biographical notice.

Arnold of Brescia (about 1100–1155), anti-Papal martyr. He was a pupil of Abélard at Paris, took up the social and political rather than the intellectual revolt of the time and, though a Benedictine monk, incurred the hatred of the Papal authorities. He inspired and led the democratic movement which spread in the twelfth century and struck deep roots in Italy, and he held that bishops and Popes, as well as princes, ought to sacrifice their wealth. The democratic movement which he roused in Italy, on the model of the old Roman Republic, fought the Popes, in what is said to be the most pious and docile part of the Ages of Faith, for more than a century and drove even the strongest of them from the city. The rebellion spread to the cities of North Italy and helped to inaugurate their mediæval republicanism. Adrian IV, the one English Pope, had Arnold, who throughout had remained a strictly religious and ascetic monk, hanged and his body burned and thrown into the river.

Arnold, Sir Edwin, K.C.I.E., M.A. (1832–1904), poet. He was editor of the *Daily Telegraph* from 1873 to 1889, but he had previously taught in a college in India, and in 1879 he won the admiration of Rationalists and incurred con-

siderable rancour from the orthodox by publishing a long poem, *The Light of Asia*, in which Buddha was presented as equal in character to the conventional Jesus. It drew largely upon legend, but it rendered great service by opening the way to a recognition of Buddha in England and brought the author high honours from India, Siam, Persia, and Turkey. In a later work, *Death and Afterwards* (reprint of 14th ed. 1931), Sir Edwin rejects the idea of a future life and the Christian creed or "any extant religion" (p. 10).

Arnold, Matthew (1822–88), critic. He was a son of Arnold of Rugby, and was recognized as the leading literary critic of his time, but his caustic Rationalism finds expression in, indeed pervades, nearly all his works (*Culture and Anarchy*, 1869, *Literature and Dogma*, 1873, etc.); for, in that despised Victorian age, men of letters and of business (Lubbock, Laing, Clodd, etc.), as well as men of science, made a close study of science or history and gave an enlightened lead to the reading public. Arnold rejected belief in a personal God and personal immortality. He defined the only God he recognized as "a Power, not ourselves, which makes for righteousness," and religion as "morality touched with emotion." His brilliant criticisms of Biblical and theological ideas had a deep influence in the world of culture.

Arnoldson, Klas Pontus (1844–1916), Nobel Prize winner. He was a member of the Swedish Parliament and founder of the Society for Peace and Arbitration. Although he was a man of very moderate means, on receiving the Peace Prize, in 1908, he applied the money to pacifist propaganda. He was a militant Rationalist and effective critic of the Swedish Church.

Arrhenius, Prof. Svante August (1859–1927), Swedish chemist and Nobel Prize winner. He was professor of physics at Stockholm University, and later, from 1905, Director of the Nobel Physico-Chemical Institute. The academic world applauded the award of the Chemistry Prize to him in 1903, but besides his discoveries in that branch of science he had a remarkable command of other branches. His *Worlds in the Making* (1908) and

Life of the Universe (1909) appeared in English. Arrhenius was a prominent member of the Monist League—the German R.P.A.—and an Agnostic.

Arriaga, Manoel José d', LL.D. (1839–1917), President of the Republic of Portugal. A distinguished lawyer, writer, and orator who, although he was himself of royal descent, had embraced Republican and Rationalist ideas during his student days at Coimbra University. He was a Republican deputy in the Cortes from 1882 to 1892, and was one of the secret directorate which organized the overthrow of the monarchy and the Church. In 1911 he was elected President of the new Republic. He held the position for the full term of four years, and during that time he helped to draft the series of anti-clerical laws which secularized Portugal and led to a considerable spread of Rationalism.

Art and Religion. The contrast of the mediocrity of art in modern times with its rich efflorescence in the Middle Ages (if one does not accept the Modernist standards) gives many people a superficial impression that religion is the most potent inspiration of art. An obvious reply is found in the painful sterility of Catholic art since the Reformation. Italy retained the mediæval faith, yet from the sixteenth century onward its only notable art-production was in the field of profane opera. Spain's artistic period closed in less than a century, and it fell into the same barrenness as Italy. France was more productive, and it was in exactly the same proportion less Catholic and more distinguished for the spread of scepticism in the world of culture. Latin America and the Greek half of Christendom were still more religious, and from the artistic point of view more debased. The art of music confirms the very plain lesson of these facts. Although the Greeks and the Arabs had given close attention to the study of music, it remained primitive throughout the Middle Ages, and it was long after the Reformation, or the end of the Ages of Faith, when it entered upon its great modern development. This advanced art, moreover, has been far more productive of profane than of religious compositions. Much of the best Church music was composed by

men who were apostates from Christianity (generally Catholicism) to Rationalism. [See Beethoven, Berlioz, Brahms, Cherubini, Mascagni, Mozart, Schumann, etc.], and the general level of hymn-tunes is anything but inspired. Architecture will be considered in a special article (*Cathedrals*); though it may here be recalled that Athens created its noblest religious architecture and sculpture in a period of widespread scepticism, which was shared by its greatest artists. In the Moslem world this is true also of Arab Spain.

In regard to painting and sculpture, the outstanding fact that most of the mediæval artists were equally inspired in profane and religious work—in Venuses and Virgins—rebukes the Catholic claim of special religious inspiration. Indeed, very few of them had, like Fra Angelico, a deep religious feeling. Many who painted beautiful religious pictures—Pinturicchio and Lippi, for instance—were notoriously irreligious and dissipated. Giotto [see], father of mediæval painting, privately wrote violent attacks on the Christian ideas which he depicted with seeming tenderness and reverence. All modern historians of art explain that Christendom produced only "the painting and sculpture of children" until art "emancipated itself from priestly dictation," as Woltmann and Woermann say in their standard *History of Painting*. Sir Frederic Leighton [see], himself a pre-Raphaelite, insists upon this; as does Felix Faure in the most important recent *History of Art* (4 vols., 1921). Roman art in particular attained the highest rank—and few of its artists were Romans—only in one of the most morally depraved and most sceptical periods of Papal history. [See *Renaissance*.] This is even more applicable to poetic art, which ought to be the first to feel religious inspiration. In fifteen centuries Romanism has produced only one poet of the first rank, Dante [see], and he was not strictly orthodox; and Goethe is not the only literary critic who would deny him that distinction. Modern Catholic hymns, on the other hand, are for the most part below the lowest level of art. The decorative arts it is hardly necessary to consider. The

Greeks, Chinese, Persians, and Arabs (who were shut off by the Koran from painting and sculpture) showed at least as rich an inspiration as the artists of the Renaissance, and their finest periods were their most sceptical periods. It will, in fine, be shown in various articles that the depth of religious feeling in the Middle Ages is gravely exaggerated. The broad meaning of the religious art of the Middle Ages is, as few historians of art fail to point out, that the Church was just the richest employer of the numbers of artists who appeared in the new springtime of European life.

Art, Prehistoric. The art of late Palæolithic man, which consists chiefly of frescoes on cave-walls and small sculpture, is sometimes pressed into the service of mystic views. The impression is given that there was a rapid new development of the sense of beauty in prehistoric man, if not a quite sudden appearance of it. One is surprised to find writers like the late Dr. H. F. Osborn giving their readers this impression; but Osborn in his later years—friends said that it was for social reasons—was one of the half-dozen American men of science (Millikan, etc.) who defended religion, though not Christian doctrines. The reason for their mis-statements about Palæolithic art is that a sudden or rapid development of it favours the theory of "emergent evolution" [see]. Many do not clearly realize that none—Christians or Theists—who believe in the spirituality of the mind accept the full doctrine of the evolution of man, no matter how warmly they profess to be reconciled with science. The body, they hold, is a product of animal evolution, but the mind "emerged" from some misty depth, or was created, and was united with the body. The obvious difficulties of this superficial suggestion will be considered elsewhere. The ground for its application here is entirely false. Apart from the slow and steady growth of a primitive æsthetic feeling in the shaping of stone implements, spread over hundreds of thousands of years, the artistic development itself covers the Aurignacian, Solutrean, Magdalenian, and Azilio-Tardenoisian periods, or a stretch of time three or four times as long as the whole of history.

To select a few of the best specimens from the later phase of this development and present them as typical is hardly scientific. The overwhelming majority of the specimens of art which survive are like the drawings of children, and the exaggeration of sex in the carvings and human figures, while not favouring the theory that man had at last acquired a spiritual soul, suggests that sexual selection was a primary cause of the development of his feeling for beauty. But the art-content of late specimens is itself exaggerated in descriptions. *Harmsworth's Universal History* (pp. 201-4) reproduces in colour some of the best prehistoric frescoes and some made by the Bushmen, and those of the savages are not inferior. The carvings in bone and horn are so like those of the Eskimo that some experts believe the Eskimo to be survivors of the prehistoric race of artists. Even a small manual like Prof. M. C. Burkitt's *Our Forerunners* (1923), Home University Library, gives a sufficient account of the facts. One cannot say that the new apologetic, or the attempt of a few scientific and literary men to defend fundamental religious beliefs, is much superior to the old.

Articles, The Thirty-Nine. These clauses of the creed of the Church of England and its American extension were drawn up by a convocation of divines at London in 1562 and finally passed in 1604. Their language is so repugnant to Anglo-Catholics—since Article XIX asserts that the entire Church (under the guidance of the Holy Ghost) erred in matters of faith for more than 1,000 years—and to Modernists, since other Articles insist upon many of its errors (Incarnation, Resurrection, etc.), that at ordination a minister is now required to give only a "general assent" to them. Many in doing so mean that they merely gracefully recognize that this is what divines thought in the sixteenth century. In effect the Church of England has no official creed and does not need to have recourse to the harsh despotism of its Roman rival.

Ascension, The. The story of Christ "ascending into heaven," which is not included among the additions (Resur-

rection, etc.) to the various Gospels, but told by the late and anonymous writer of *Acts*, is so obviously childish that few educated Christians now accept it. To interpret it symbolically is to reject it, for the writer of *Acts* clearly meant it literally; and the very general rejection of his statement, even by Christians who insist upon the soundness of other statements in the book, suggests a lack of a fixed historical standard. It is the kind of story that was not uncommon in the days when all believed in a flat earth and an over-arching heaven. Eusebius (*Praeparatio Evangelica*, IX, 12) says that the late Babylonians believed that Xisuthros, the Babylonian Noah, was taken up into heaven after the Flood. In the Mithraist religion, which was familiar to the early Christians, Mithra ascends into heaven at the close of an earthly life [see *Mithra*.] in the Old Testament Elijah and Enoch are familiar instances. A solemn Church festival is still based upon this old-world legend, and in the Catholic, Anglican, and Nonconformist Churches it is generally accepted.

Asceticism. The idea that denial of one's natural appetites pleases the gods or entitles a person to some degree of veneration from others is very ancient and goes deep into the world of savage religions. The medicine-man, or *angakok*, of even the Eskimo is initiated by ascetic practices in solitude, and we find fasting in many parts of the world (ancient Mexico, etc.) as part of a preparation for a sacred rite. The Greeks seem to have preserved an old practice in fasting during the Eleusinian Mysteries, and in India the very severe monastic sect of the Jains dates from the time of Buddha. A Persian belief that the evil principle created matter (therefore the body), thus explaining its war upon the spirit—a belief which goes back obscurely to the early part of the first millennium B.C.—was a new and vigorous root of ascetic practices, and long before the time of Christ its influence spread over the ancient world. The priests of Serapis and the votaries of Isis in Egypt, and many sects (Pharisees, Essenes, and Therapeuts) [see] among the Jews, adopted asceticism in various, often severe, forms. On the

sexual side we have celibate priestesses in Babylon about 200 B.C. (*The Hammurabi Code*, trans. by C. Edwards, 1904, p. 102), and emasculated priests and celibate priestesses spread everywhere—from the Amazons of Ma to the virgins in the temple of Diana at Ephesus—in the service of the fertility goddess. Pythagoras introduced asceticism into the Greek philosophical world, and, though Plato's extant letters do not suggest that he was ascetic, the Neo-Platonists particularly cultivated the superstition that mortifying the body promotes wisdom as well as virtue. Epictetus and some other Stoics had the same idea. At the time when the Gospel-story, largely borrowing from the Essenes, set up its ideal of asceticism, the regard for it, in one form or other, had spread over the entire civilized world; but the embodiment of it, in the fourth century, in the institution of monasticism [see] was destined to give the religious world one of its most scandalous developments.

Ashtart (plural Ashtaroth; in Greek form Astarte). The fertility goddess of the Canaanites, Phœnicians, and (during long periods) Hebrews: a variant of the fertility or mother-earth goddess which, under different names, was venerated, and generally honoured with orgiastic festivals or (even in the temple at Jerusalem) sacred prostitution. The "standing stones" of which the Old Testament repeatedly speaks were clearly phallic representations, and the *asherim*, which is politely translated "groves" in the English Bible, seems to have been the female counterpart. It is disputed if Ashtart is a Syrian version of the Babylonian Ishtar, but they were in time identified. It seems to have been originally the spirit of vegetation or fertility, but whether male or female is disputed. The picturesque story of the goddess ends in some of her emblems and epithets being transferred to the Virgin Mary. Statues of Mary with a crescent moon and star (Venus) are still seen in Catholic churches.

Asoka (about 300–232 B.C.), a Hindu monarch. In middle life, shocked by the sufferings caused by his wars, he embraced Buddhism, and he is generally described as a monk. It is now univer-

sally admitted that he was one of the most idealistic of monarchs. H. G. Wells says in his *Outline of History*, the first work of general history in English literature to do Asoka justice, that in the list of Kings "the name of Asoka shines, and shines almost alone, a star." The empire which he had inherited from his grandfather, Chandragupta, was as extensive as is the Empire of India to-day, and Asoka maintained it intact, peaceful (after his fortieth year), and very prosperous. Although there is some evidence that he at times wore a royal version of a Buddhist monk's robe, it is not asceticism but social idealism that distinguished his conduct. He had such a passion for right conduct that he employed large numbers of spies to report transgressors, sent ethical missionaries to foreign countries as far as Syria, and set up a large number of stone columns inscribed with his moral counsels or commands. The moral code he so severely inculcated did not include sex clauses, for he left intact the extraordinarily free life of his empire in that respect, and is said to have married a young woman, after the death, late in life, of his first wife. Virtue to him meant peace, which he had a profound social religious toleration, honesty, and brotherhood. This extended it to mysticism, was the custom of his age, that he believed in incarnation, which Buddha himself never clearly accepted, and this led him to impose vegetarianism harshly upon his people. His ethic was "humanely severe practical," and he "is Hindu Supreme Deity," the existence of which, says Mr. Smith, our standard authority in the history, in his *Asoka* (3rd. ed. appeals, 31 and 34). In other words, the other zealous moralists who believed in the other never ignore him in the refined by our Asoka was, like Buddha (theism.) great Asiatic guides, Co. C.), the most magnificent, an Atheist as ancient world. dictionaries. [See As beautiful and Aspasia (fifth century; many Ionian woman of the time, at Miletus—she was one of the most accomplished of the women—she was born in Athens.]

as the *hetairai*. Whatever connotation the word may have had in Roman times, in her day it meant "companions," and it reflects a state of Greek society in which married women and their daughters were secluded and ignorant, so cultivated men enjoyed the society of these alien women. Aspasia lived with Pericles [see], but could not marry him under Athenian law because she was a foreigner. She was one of the most respected figures in the brilliant group of artists and thinkers which gathered round him and were responsible for the Golden Age of Athens, and she attacked the tradition of the subjection of women. Complete scepticism was general in the group, and Aspasia was put on trial for irreligion, but Pericles defended her and secured an acquittal.

Ass, Feast of the. One of the annual festivals, especially in the churches and cathedrals of France, which show the superficial nature of religious belief and the coarseness of character in the Ages of Faith. It was held in the Christmas season, and seems originally to have had its origin in the legend of the ass which was put in the stable at the birth of the ass on which he was taken to the ass on which he entered the world, Balaam's ass, etc. In some places it was called the Feast of the Ass, and it was traced to the ninth century.

(which were generally very coarse) were sung after the Mass, and the people danced round the ass. A stage was erected near the door of the cathedral and gross farces were enacted. For the behaviour of the people on such occasions see **Feast of Fools**, about which we are better informed.

Association of Ideas. Until recent years this was one of the fundamental principles of psychology in explaining the acquisition of knowledge or the operation of the mind. Locke first used the phrase in his *Essay Concerning Human Understanding* (1690), and by the end of the nineteenth century it had become "one of the pillars of psychology," though the word "idea" came to have a more restricted meaning. Pavlov's "conditioned reflexes"—as when a dog learns to associate the "idea" of food with the ringing of a bell—afford a simple instance of the general meaning. The statement, which one reads in some recent manuals of psychology, that the association of ideas is no longer regarded as important or a real process, must be read with reserve. It is largely due to the Gestalt Theory [see], which is an attempt at reaction against the increasing materialism of the science and a return to at least a semi-mystic view of the mind. The question is at present under acute discussion. [See **Psychology**.]

Association Centres. It is sometimes announced as another revolt against "materialistic science" that the localization of intellectual functions in certain areas of the cortex (or covering layer of the brain), which was confidently described some years ago, is now disputed or rejected. That there are definite centres for sensory presentations (sight, hearing, warmth, pain, etc.) and for muscular reaction is admitted (E. B. S. Kaggs, *A Textbook of Experimental and Theoretical Psychology*, 1935, p. 41, and Sir C. Sherrington, *The Brain and its Mechanism*, 1933), but the theory that the areas (especially of the frontal lobe) not thus mapped out must be for the association of the sensory data in higher mental operations is disturbed by recent experiments. Lashley found that rats with these areas removed learned the way out of a maze like normal rats.

Others dispute the value of the maze-test, and it is significant that the frontal lobe develops with intelligence. [See **Brain ; Mind ; Psychology.**]

Astral. A word which means "pertaining to the stars" and is fantastically adopted by Theosophists to designate an imaginary imperceptible fluid which pervades all space and all bodies. The ether of nineteenth-century physics, which Spiritualists still use instead of astral, is the basis of the idea. For the present position of the concept of ether see article under that title; but it never had anything like the meaning which the astral or ether body conveys: something intermediate between the spiritual and the material, which are terms as sharply antithetic as finite and infinite. Theosophists imagine that this impossible idea makes it possible to understand how Mme. Blavatsky, for instance, could visit Tibet while her gross body was in New York.

Astronomy, God in Modern. The fading of God from the astronomical field of nature is as significant as the disappearance of Providence from modern history. Apologetic writers continue to assert that "the order and regularity" of the heavenly bodies supported the old text that "the heavens declare the glory of God," in spite of the sentiment of Laplace, Arago, Airy, etc., that they could "manage without that hypothesis" (a phrase disputably attributed to Laplace in conversation with Napoleon). The origin of stars, planets, and galaxies from nebulous material is, whatever theory of the particular line of development be followed, fully admitted, and the "order" of the heavens, which is constantly disturbed by new stars (which are certainly vast cataclysms and conflagrations of stupendous size), does not suggest guidance to the modern astronomer, even if he could attach any definite meaning to that poetic expression. The infelicitous book in which Dr. Inge suggested that there is a revival of astronomical Theism (*God and the Astronomers*, 1933) was based upon the works of Eddington and Jeans, neither of whom [see articles on them] believed in the existence of a material universe. The scientific reviewer of the book in *Nature* caustically observed that the

title ought to have been "God and Two Astronomers." It was the more infelicitous as Eddington says, in his *Science and the Unseen World* (1929), that "probably most astronomers, if they were to speak frankly, would confess to some chafing when they are reminded of the psalm, 'The Heavens declare the glory of God'" (p. 17). The position to-day is discussed by Woolsey Teller, *The Athelism of Astronomy*, 1938 (Truth Seeker Co.).

Astruc, Prof. Jean, M.D. (1682-1766), founder of Biblical Criticism. Astruc was the first to discover that two documents, Jehovist and Elohist, had been used in the compilation of *Genesis*. He was professor of anatomy at Toulouse and Montpellier, later of medicine at Paris, and he had considerable distinction in the medical world. J. M. Robertson, *Short History of Free-thought*, II, 256.

Asylum, The Right of. In Greek-Roman times it was regarded as an act of impiety to molest criminals or victims of persecution who took refuge in temples. The idea seems to have been ancient in the Oriental world, as the Hebrews were commanded to have six "cities of refuge" for "the manslayer" (*Numbers*, xxv). Although the social evil of this was proved in the old days, the Christian Emperors extended it to the new churches, and the custom survived until modern times. That it was not an original outcome of Christian mercy any classical dictionary shows, but the gross abuses to which it led in the Middle Ages are rarely noticed. Of these the *Memoirs of Scipio de Ricci* (Engl. trans. 1829) afford an extraordinary illustration. Ricci was a strict Catholic bishop who set out to reform Florence and Tuscany in the eighteenth century, and the first piece of corruption he had to suppress was the Right of Asylum. He tells us that the vilest criminals lived in the churches, with prostitutes for mistresses, and sallied forth from them to commit their crimes. The area of refuge (Sanctuary) might be the altar-space, the whole church, or also a part round the church, as we trace round Westminster Abbey to-day.

Ataturk, President Mustapha Kemal

(1881–1938), the creator of modern Turkey. He absorbed liberal ideas from his Turkish father, though his mother was a devout Albanian, and under the Sultan he formed a Freedom Society for young officers, which later merged into the Committee of Union and Progress. Though he opposed Turkey's intervention in the European War, he served with distinction and organized a revolution at the close. In 1923 Turkey became a Republic and Mustapha Kemal its first President, with dictatorial powers, which he used with humanity and remarkable success. As the Moslem authorities raised revolts in the provinces, he broke their power and secularized and modernized the country, paying particular attention to the liberation and education of the women. His genial and paternal despotism won for him the title of Ataturk (the Great Turk) and world-wide recognition. He was a complete sceptic, protesting that his only ideal was the good of his country. G. Grondos, *Ataturk* (Engl. trans. 1939).

Aten. [See *Ikhnatén*.]

Athanatism. A word coined from *thanatos* (death) by Professor Haeckel (who was a good Greek scholar and loved to compose new words) as an alternative to immortality. It was generally felt to be superfluous, and not adopted.

Atheism. The absence of belief in God. The religious writer's usual definition of the Atheist as one who *denies* the existence of God, differently from "the reverent Agnostic," is a controversial device to maintain the odium which often attaches to the word. The highest authority on the English language, Murray's *New English Dictionary* (often quoted as the Oxford Dictionary), defines the Atheist as "one who denies or disbelieves the existence of God"; and disbelief is defined as simply absence of belief. The leading American authorities, Webster's and Funk and Wagnall's Dictionaries, give the same definition, though the latter also distinguishes between positive, negative, and sceptical Atheists. The first is supposed to deny, the second not to believe, the third to doubt the existence of God. In the third case the name is improperly

applied, and it would be difficult to quote more than one or two Atheist writers in all literature who deny such existence. Feuerbach is one of the very few. Murray's definition, besides quoting in support such authors as Gladstone, correctly appreciates the fact that every leading Rationalist who has adopted the name of Atheist—Bradlaugh, Robertson, Foote, Cohen, McCabe, etc.—explains that he means merely that he has in fact no belief in God. See the life of Bradlaugh by his daughter and J. M. Robertson, I, 87, etc. The American theistic philosopher Flint (*Agnosticism*, 1903, p. 53) said that "every man is an Atheist who does not believe in God," and nine people out of ten call a man an Atheist if he returns a negative answer to the question, Do you believe in God? Dr. J. Martineau also defines Atheism as "the rejection or absence" of belief in God in his chief work (*A Study of Religion*, 1898, I, p. 2). Logically, a much stronger case could be made out (from the evil, cruelty, waste, disorder, etc., in nature and history) for a denial than for an affirmation, but the Atheist finds that procedure superfluous.

If we thus take the word in the meaning which is attributed to it by the most authoritative dictionaries, the leading Atheists (and presumably the body of their followers), and their chief opponents (Flint, Martineau, etc.), we see that the jibes of religious literary men about the scarcity and low cultural quality of Atheism are due to ignorance. Not only nine-tenths of the Greek philosophers [see], but a high proportion of the leading moralists and creative statesmen of the ancient world (Buddha, Asoka, Kung-fu-tse, Meng-tse, Pericles, Hadrian, etc.) were Atheists, and a spread of Atheism has occurred in every high phase of civilization. Articles on the subject in our works of reference (the *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics*, etc.) are generally written by clerics, and are fantastic. The historical law that the negative attitude spreads with the growth of knowledge is conspicuously verified in modern times, when, especially since 1918, Atheism has increased far more rapidly than any religion ever did. The

early spread of Islam [see] was not a religious phenomenon, and Atheism made, between 1918 and 1933, fifty times as much progress as Christianity made in its first 250 years. Articles in this work on the state of religion in various countries of America, Europe, and Asia—even in the Union of South Africa, at the last Census, 3,062,669 out of 5,409,092 coloured folk declared that they had “no religion” (*Statesman's Year Book*)—will show that the Churches, especially the Catholic (Roman or Orthodox), lost something like 100,000,000 or more members to Atheism in less than twenty years. Bishop D'Herbigny's *Militant Atheism* (1933) is a comprehensive admission of the facts, though it lacks precise figures. What proportion of the churchless folk in the United States (at least 50,000,000), Great Britain (36,000,000, on Church estimates), France (34,000,000, on Catholic admissions), etc., do not believe in God must be left open, as exact inquiry is discouraged. In a plebiscite taken by the London *Daily News*, in 1925, more than half those who did not attend church said that they also rejected belief in God. Taking the body of Atheists in Russia (more than 100,000,000) as a basis figure and following the correct definition of the word, there are to-day more Atheists than Catholics in Europe and America, to say nothing of China, India, and Africa.

Athens, Scepticism in Ancient. In spite of the modern apologetic plea (since the failure of intellectual evidences) that religion is always associated with a high degree of civilization and the decay of religion with reaction, no informed writer can enfeeble the significance in this connection of the brilliance of ancient Athens. Ill-informed writers endeavour to obscure it by loosely citing the “spiritual” thinkers, Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle (who was not spiritual), men who appeared when the Golden Age was over and even then had little influence, and the supposed indecencies of Aristophanes, which were contemporary with the great achievements and were chiefly enjoyed by the religious body of common citizens. Modern history makes no correction of

the older authorities in this respect. Athens did not, like Athenae, issue fully-formed from the brain of Zeus. It was “the heiress of Miletus” (Gomperz), the chief city of Ionia [see], which had led the advance of the Greeks and inaugurated the first great age of scepticism until the Persians ruined the Ionian cities (about 500 B.C.). Their cosmopolitan trade and culture then passed to Athens, the nearest and most fortunately situated of the Greek cities. Still its artistic and intellectual glamour did not begin until half a century later, when Pericles [see] took the lead of the democracy (444-429). He gathered round him a group of the most brilliant artists and thinkers of Greece—an achievement which depended vitally upon the new wealth of the city—and they co-operated in giving it the cultural distinction and artistic glory which made it the most memorable city in history.

No historian questions, though few now obtrude, the circumstance that it was also an age of scepticism. The religious revival which poets and priests had inspired after the victory over Persia (480-479) had been followed by a remarkable period of general scepticism, as Thucydides records (*History of the Peloponnesian War*, II, 53, and III, 82). That this scepticism was chiefly found in the Periclean group, the constructive men of the time, hardly needs proof. The leading thinkers, Protagoras and Anaxagoras, were expelled for impiety by the bigoted people; Aspasia was saved only by the eloquence of Pericles, who was himself threatened; Pheidias, the supreme artist, was bitterly persecuted by the priests; Euripides is acknowledged by all authorities to have been profoundly sceptical. Grote says that this scepticism of the leaders “disturbed religious belief more or less in the minds of all” (*History of Greece*, 1846, I, 326). Even the Rev. Prof. Mahaffy (*Social Life in Greece*, 1894, p. 361) admits that among historians there is a “general belief in the almost universal scepticism of the Periclean age,” and he opposes it only in the sense that the mass of the people (who expelled philosophers and condemned Socrates to death) did not

share it. No one doubts that, but the coarse and illiterate worker-citizens—it was one of the chief defects of Athens that it provided no general education—were not the men who made the city immortal. That the leading Greek thinkers and artists never called themselves Atheists, which then meant a flat denial of the reality of the Greek deities, is in such circumstances intelligible, but writers like Drachmann, who laboriously attempt to prove that there were few Atheists in Greece, mean men who boldly *denied* that there are gods, and do not use the word in the modern sense. Plato and Aristotle appeared in the period of reaction which followed the Golden Age; and in the later “Silver Age” there was, says Mahaffy, “a new outburst of scepticism” under the influence of Epicurus and Menander.

Atoms and Materialism. The claim, echoed by the entire British and American Press a few years ago, that the discovery of the composite nature of atoms discredited “the materialistic science of the last century,” was based upon an extraordinary ignorance of the real teaching of both the physicists and the alleged Materialists of the Victorian period. The earliest Greek speculators had concluded that while matter seems in practice to be indefinitely divisible, it must ultimately consist of particles which cannot be further divided, and they therefore called these postulated particles *atomoi*. It was one of Aristotle’s many mistakes to reject this theory and say that all bodies consisted of matter (in a new and mystic sense of the word) and form. This piece of obscurantism lasted through the Arab-Christian period, but the French Materialists of the seventeenth century resuscitated the atomic theory, and the chemists (Dalton, etc.) of the early nineteenth century proved that there were such ultimate particles of each chemical element. When in recent years it was shown that these atoms are composed of still smaller particles (electrons, etc.) there was an amazing outburst of rejoicing, Sir A. Eddington and Sir J. Jeans unhappily leading the clerical and journalistic chorus, that Materialism, with its impenetrable and indestructible atoms, was now finally

discredited. The old description of atoms is, in point of fact, true in the sense in which it was meant. Atoms are impenetrable to other atoms and indestructible in the sense that an atom of hydrogen, iron, etc., ceases to be such when it disintegrates.

But a much worse error of Sir A. Eddington [*see*] was to say repeatedly that Materialists had made the “hard” atom (like a marble or a billiard ball, he said) the basis of their theory. As he never names the men he ridicules, and hardly any men of the last century admitted the label Materialist, refutation might seem difficult; but in fact the only physicists of the last century who insisted that atoms are the ultimate and simple units of matter were religious men, like Clerk Maxwell and his clerical followers, who described them as “manufactured articles” or created by God. From the middle of the last century physicists were alive to the possibility of atoms being composed of smaller particles. It is strange that distinguished men of science should not, when they venture into the field of physics, recall that in 1879 Sir W. Crookes attracted world-attention by his experiments on “radiant matter,” which was really an emission of electrons, etc., from disintegrating atoms; and Loeb and Adams say in one of the weightiest recent books on the subject that Crookes had with him “the consensus of opinion” (*The Development of Physical Thought*, 1933, p. 463). But the composition of the atom had been suspected long before, and this idea had been welcomed as a rational alternative to the Clerk Maxwell theory by the very writers who are generally called Materialists. Büchner had declared it “probable” that atoms are composed of smaller units (*Force and Matter*, 1855, English edition 1884, p. 49). Lester Ward gave the idea as one current in physics in an article in *Popular Science Monthly* in 1881 (reprinted in his *Dynamic Sociology*, 1883). Haeckel adopted the theory in his *Riddle of the Universe* (cheap English edition, pp. 79–81). The present writer gave it with confidence in *Haeckel’s Critics Answered* (1903). Every evolutionist was bound to welcome it. The whole

recent experience illustrates again the levity with which caricatures of Rationalist views are pressed upon the public. As to the statement that matter is converted into energy, *see Energy* ; **Materialism** ; **Matter**.

Atonement, The. The only distinctive idea in the Christian synthesis of the first and second centuries is that Jesus was an incarnated God who atoned to "the Father" by a cruel death for the sins of men, especially the sin inherited from Adam. [*See Original Sin.*] Since there is no new ethical sentiment or doctrine about God in the New Testament, this conception, which is emphatic throughout the Epistles (the oldest documents), was characteristic of the new religion, and was so regarded by every Christian until the nineteenth century. Liberals and Modernists, therefore, who now devote much ingenuity to devising patters of words to express it—generally that Christ died to reconcile man with God (At-one-ment: the pun is theirs)—admit in effect that Christianity was based by Paul (and compare *Matt.* xxvi, 28 and *Mark* x, 45) upon a great illusion; that, in the only respect in which the new religion differed from the best religions of the time, it was false; and that all the learned men of the various Churches until recent times applauded as a sublime truth an idea that is now considered barbaric in sentiment and intellectually insipid. So far has the revolt in the Churches gone that the Commission on Christian Doctrine appointed by the archbishops in 1922, and the Joint Conference of the American and British Bishops at Lambeth in 1930, frankly abandon the dogma of atonement (*Doctrine in the Church of England*, 1928, pp. 90–93 for the Commission, and *Report of the Lambeth Conference*, 1930). These, the bishops say, referring chiefly to the ideas of atonement and hell, are "unworthy conceptions of God." "Once for all," says Bishop Masterman, in *The Christianity of To-morrow* (1929, p. 97), "we must banish from our theology all idea of a change effected in the attitude of God by the death of Jesus Christ."

It is now therefore of secondary interest to trace how in the region in

which Christianity developed, in the city of Tarsus (where Paul is said to have lived) in particular, the idea of slain and resurrected gods [*see Adonis* ; **Attis** ; **Osiris**] was familiar. In Judaism the idea of personal atonement for sin, and even of vicarious expiation (the Scapegoat) or of an original curse, was outstanding. In Mithraism [*see*], which was then spreading from Asia to Europe, some experts find traces of a doctrine of divine expiation, though this point is disputed. Instead of the Christian synthesis being superior to other religions which embodied the idea of expiation, which we trace through the savage world, it sank to a lower level by representing the "sin" as a transgression of the arbitrary command of a deity, the guilt as inherited by offspring for all time, the punishment as the most awful ever imagined, and the satisfaction as rendered vicariously. Among savages (African, Amerindian, etc.) a man may expiate his offence against a god, but in most cases he knows he has transgressed social law. The dogma of the Atonement attributed to God the attitude of the most cruel and arbitrary of Oriental despots. From the time of St. Anselm (twelfth century) divines were uneasy about the doctrine and gave it fanciful interpretations, but Aquinas, whose principles are now said to be very appropriate for our age, fastened it upon the Church in all its moral and intellectual crudeness. [*See also Fall* ; **Original Sin** ; **Redemption**.]

Attis. The Phrygian counterpart of the Babylonian Tammuz and the Syrian Adonis as lover of the earth-goddess and principle of fertility. Experts on comparative mythology are loth to admit the obvious interpretation: that we have here a dramatization of the spring-sun caressing the earth and causing the outburst of flowers and vegetation, though, in the myth, Attis is castrated and slain by a boar (winter), but comes to life again. The annual celebration of the birth and resurrection of Attis is especially important as a source of Christian ritual, because the Holy Week services are plainly borrowed from it. The cult was introduced into Rome from Phrygia, in Asia Minor, about 204 B.C. according to most

authorities, and was later recognized as a "licit" religion. Its ceremonies were therefore public, and we are fortunate in having a description of them by St. Augustine (in his *City of God*), who saw them. March 15 (corresponding to Palm Sunday) was the day of the procession of the Reed-bearers. On the 22nd a small pine, hung with violets and having attached to it (the Christian Father Firmicus Maternus adds this, Migne ed., XII, col. 1032) an effigy of the dead Attis as a handsome young man, was carried through the streets to the Temple of Cybele (the mother). Firmicus adds that the effigy was laid on a bier, with mournful chants, then placed in some kind of sepulchre; as is done with the Eucharist in Catholic churches to-day in the corresponding service. Two days later was the Day of Blood (Good Friday), when, to the blare of trumpets, drums, cymbals, and flutes, the emasculated priests gashed themselves with their knives; in Asia Minor this was when they castrated themselves. It was a day of mourning and fasting. In the evening the imitation-tomb in which the image of Attis had been buried was opened by the priests amidst lights and rejoicing; just as on "Holy Saturday" the special receptacle (rock-tomb) in which the Eucharist has been buried is opened. On the 25th (Easter Sunday), the Hilaria or Day of Joy, there was a general and boisterous rejoicing. It is useful to remember that March 24 was then considered the last day of winter, and it should be added that a conspicuous part of these services consisted of processions on the streets, so that all Rome was thoroughly familiar with them. Further details and authorities will be found in the article "Attis" in the *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics*.

Augustine of Hippo (354-430), the ablest of the Latin Fathers of the Church. Since he became the supreme oracle of the Middle Ages and occupies so prominent a position in Catholic literature to-day, it is useful to remember a few points in connection with him which are commonly suppressed. He did not merely reject but scorned the Papal claim of supremacy [see **Popes**]; he denounced the general corruption of

the monks, who first appeared in Europe in his time; and he resented the cult of Mary and of the martyrs which was then introduced. In his later years he shows in his writings a marked intellectual degeneration, and quotations from his earlier works do not represent his mature opinions and are of little value. Thus the allegorical interpretation of *Genesis* which is now often quoted by liberal Church writers, and sometimes in lay works on the history of evolution, was sourly revoked by him in his *Retractions* and his *De Genesi ad litteram*. He positively defends slavery [see] as a divine ordination, and his greatest work, *Of the City of God*, is a dreary and rambling argument, in poor Latin, that the ruin of Rome does not matter because earthly affairs (social welfare and prosperity) are of no moment. He endorsed the crassest superstitions of his age (in one place he represents the fossil bones of prehistoric monsters as remains of the giants of *Genesis*); he painfully labelled the Manichæans, to whose sect he once belonged; he supported the Papal policy of persecuting all non-Christians and schismatics; he developed a very contemptuous attitude toward woman, who, he said, was created only for the purpose of bearing children; and though his study of Plato is now much applauded, he in later years spoke of Plato as "that old fool" and described him as "impious." See McCabe's *St. Augustine and his Age* (1902). Rebecca West's *St. Augustine* (1930) is uncritical and unreliable.

Aulard, Prof. François Victor Alphonse (1849-1928), one of the most learned historians of France in recent years. He was professor of the History of the Revolution at the Sorbonne (Paris University) and the leading authority on that subject. In his *Culte de la Raison* (1892) he exposed for all time the falseness of such legends as that of the Goddess of Reason [see], though the myth still adorns religious (and some other) literature, and he published a valuable small work, *Christianity and the French Revolution* (Engl. trans. 1927), which corrects many other serious errors about the Revolution and the Church. Aulard was a militant anti-clerical and Agnostic. See his preface

to a collection of the speeches of Paul Bert (*Le cléricalisme*, 1900).

Australia, Religion in. In his *History of the Catholic Church in Australia*, Cardinal Moran, head of the Roman Church in Australia, says that there were 700,000 Catholics in the colony in 1888, when the total population was about 3,000,000, and these were approximately the figures returned in the Census papers a few years later. At the last Census (1926), the *Statesman's Year Book* reports, 1,225,550 described themselves as Catholics in a population of 6,600,000. On the published statistics, therefore, the Catholic percentage of the population had sunk from 23 to 19, in spite of a heavy immigration of Irish and Italian Catholics and a full Catholic birth-rate as compared with the considerable general restriction of births in Australian cities. Moreover, census figures of Church membership can be taken only as a maximum, because large numbers who received Catholic baptism, and have seceded, think that they have to describe themselves as Catholics. Figures of church attendance given in the *Australasian Handbook* show that, as we should expect, at least one-third of the alleged Catholics do not attend church; and only seceders habitually neglect that duty in the Roman Church, since it binds under pain of hell for each non-attendance on Sunday. The genuine Catholics are clearly fewer than 1,000,000 in nearly 7,000,000 people, which implies a heavy loss, yet the Church exercises a remarkable power in public and political life. Politicians, as in America and Britain, cover their concessions to it by praise of the social use of the Church, while the *New South Wales State Register* (1925—last issue) records that in that (the most Catholic) State, out of 1,284 men in jail, 474 (more than a third) were Catholics, and, of 46 women prisoners, 31 were Catholics (p. 216). [*See Crime and Religion.*]

Australian Aborigines. They seem to be a branch of the race which migrated from the Asiatic centre in Mousterian (or Neanderthal) days and entered Australia by a land-connection. As the sea then isolated them until the arrival of Europeans in the eighteenth century,

their religious evolution is interesting. They are not, as is often said, the lowest known peoples—the Negritos [*see*] are lower—and Sir J. G. Frazer's theory of the evolution of religion from magic is vitiated by his assuming that they are. The purest native culture (eliminating missionary and other white-man adulterations) is found in the north, and is best described in Spencer and Gillen's *Northern Tribes of Central Australia* (1904). We find a definite belief in spirits and survival—a stage, as we should expect, between the Negritos and the Melanesians—and in *mana* (an impersonal force pervading nature) and magic. Their condition is not inconsistent with the theory that religion began with the belief that man had a double. [*See Religion, Origin of.*] The Australians illustrate the second stage, god-making, by their veneration of certain powerful ancestors, real or imaginary, whom they call the Alcheringa. In some tribes certain spirits—very materially, often coarsely, conceived—stand out above the rest and may be considered embryonic gods, but the belief in a Supreme Being or Creator is traced by the experts to missionary influence (Spencer and Gillen in above work, and Dr. A. W. Howitt, *Native Tribes of South-Eastern Australia*, 1904). Howitt observes that, if religion is taken to mean a worship of gods, they have none. They have strict rules of conduct, but no idea of morality as such.

Australopithecus. The name given to a remarkable genus of anthropoid of which a well-preserved skull was found at Taungs, 80 miles north of Kimberley, South Africa, in 1924. In most respects it resembles the chimpanzee, but it differs in other features, and in these respects it is nearer to man. The skull was found in Pliocene deposits, which means an age of some millions of years. Dr. Broom says, in his final report on the find, that it is "very near to the ape from which man sprang" and may actually be a specimen of that group. The late Sir G. Elliot Smith described it as "the missing link." The discovery encouraged those who believe that Central Africa was the cradle of the race. See chapter by Dr. Broom in

symposium *Early Man* (1937), edited by G. G. MacCurdy.

Austria, Religion in. Reference books still speak of the population of Austria as 90 per cent. Catholic. That ceased to be true half a century or more ago. By 1914 there were several million non-Catholics, besides Jews and Protestants, and after the dissolution of the Empire, in 1919, there was a still more rapid disintegration of the Church. In 1922 the Socialists, who were also Atheists and were strictly banned by the Church, got the great majority of votes in the city of Vienna and held power for ten years, being repeatedly re-elected. At the 1927 elections they polled 830,000 votes outside Vienna and the great majority in the capital. The Christian Socialist (which in this case means clerical-conservative) national Government had its majority in the agricultural provinces and small towns. As "the real battle of Austrian Socialism is directed against the Church," Macartney says in his authoritative *Social Revolution in Austria* (1926), the situation is clear; and all writers acknowledge that in this period Vienna made astonishing social progress. An editorial in the *News Chronicle* (Feb. 12, 1935) pronounced it "as close to the ideal Platonic Republic as the world has ever seen." Dollfuss and the clerical national Government wrecked the power of the Socialists by violence and treachery and prepared the way for the Nazis. "The higher clergy," says Gedye in *Fallen Bastions* (1939, p. 358), "have in the main escaped the persecution which has been the lot of their brethren in the Reich by betraying the cause of the latter and making, to their eternal shame, common cause with the invaders." Cardinal Innitzer urged Catholics to sign the plebiscite for annexation to Germany—he wrote "Heil Hitler" after his own signature—and the Swastika flag was flown on St. Stephen's Cathedral. Hitler at once double-crossed the Vatican (as in the case of Germany). Sixty Austrian priests and monks were in a few weeks' convicted of vice, and the Church was split and demoralized. The Vatican then explained that Cardinal Innitzer had not consulted it! The Church,

of course, recovered no ground under the Nazis.

Auto-da-fe. Portuguese for Act of Faith. It is sometimes given in the Spanish form *Auto-de-fe*, but the Portuguese form is prior in English works. It is the polite description of the burning of a heretic.

Authority in the Roman Church. The mistake is often made of saying that the Catholic takes his entire body of beliefs on faith or authority. The great majority of Catholics, being of a low cultural level, may be said to take their beliefs on the authority of the clergy or in virtue of their environment, but the Catholic system, as presented to the educated, is not so illogical. It recognizes that the authority of the Church must be proved before one is bound or expected to accept it. The existence of God, the immortality of the soul, must be proved by reason, and the divinity of Christ, the establishment of the Church, and the promise to it of divine guidance must be proved by historical evidence (the New Testament and tradition). It is then quite "logical" to accept authority for doctrines.

Avebury, The Right Hon. John Lubbock, Baron, P.C., D.C.L., LL.D., F.R.S. (1834–1913). The most outstanding of the banker-scholars of the nineteenth century, sometimes called "the President-General of the Age" (obituary notice in *Nature*). As Sir John Lubbock he was known to the entire reading public, and he was at one time Vice-Chancellor of London University. His chief works were *Prehistoric Times* (1865) and *The Origin of Civilization* (1870), which, though now outdated, had a notable educative influence. Lord Avebury recognized a "Divine Power," but he was agnostic as to its nature, rejecting all "contradictory assertions under the name of mystery" (close of Ch. VIII of his *Origin of Civilization*).

Averroes (properly Ibn Roshd, 1126–98), one of the two greatest Arab scholars of the Middle Ages. Born at Cordova, he left that city, when the Spaniards captured it, for Seville, and he was, in accordance with the Arab custom of putting learned men in office, appointed Governor, and held the position for

twenty years. He practised medicine, but he was chiefly occupied with philosophy, following Aristotle with material modifications. He had phenomenal industry and a genius probably next to that of Aristotle, but the fanatical Spaniards burned all his works; though Aquinas was much impressed by them, and Dante (Canto IV) hailed him as one of the great figures of his age. Owing to the loss of his works and his need to avoid rousing the Moslem fanatics, who at one time got him degraded and imprisoned, it is difficult to determine his precise position, but experts agree that he substituted a vague Pantheism or World-Soul for Aristotle's (impersonal) God and did not believe in personal immortality. The translation of some of his works into Latin by Michael Scotus for Frederic II gave them a good deal of influence in the cities of North Italy, and was an important factor in the spread of scepticism, particularly as regards immortality, in them. See Renan's *Averroes et l'Averroisme* (1852).

Avesta, The. The oldest part (the Gathas) of the sacred book of the Persians, the Avesta, is translated in Vol. XXXI of the Sacred Books of the East. Though generally archaic and tiresome, it is deeply interesting as the manifest source of some of the most distinctive ideas that were later embodied in Christianity, especially the idea of the coming destruction of the world by fire and of the judgment of men. Ahura Mazda, the creator of light, spirit, and all that is good, will at some date vanquish Angra Mainyu, the creator of matter and evil (who is therefore not infinite, as is often said), and will destroy the earth by fire. The souls of all men will then be summoned to judgment (the Catholic General Judgment), the wicked punished, and the good rewarded. The moral code on which the judgment proceeds is much the same as the Christian, since the devil had created "the flesh." Throughout the book this is called "the coming of the Kingdom," and the pious Persian prays for it almost in the words "Thy Kingdom Come." This expression may have different meanings in some places in the Gospels, but

the chief meaning is clearly the end of the world and the destruction of evil and general judgment of men, which the Persians had held as one of their fundamental dogmas for at least six centuries before Christ.

Avicenna (properly **Ibn Sina**, 980-1037), the second most learned scholar of the Middle Ages and probably the most brilliant. He belonged to the Persian half of the Moslem world, and from the fact that he was born and received his first lessons in a village of Bokhara we gather the wide spread of education in the Arab-Persian world. Except in places or at times when the Moslem fanatics got power, there was, from Spain to India during many centuries, a remarkable zeal for acquiring knowledge. The wandering scholars of mediæval Europe, about whom so much is written, appeared two centuries after such scholars had appeared in Spain, and were tardily inspired by these. In the Moslem countries also the knowledge given in the higher schools was broader and more positive, and a master commonly had a command of four or five branches of learning. Avicenna is said to have practised medicine and read Aristotle forty times before he was eighteen, and he knew the Koran by heart at the age of ten. His works on medicine were standard authorities for centuries, and he wrote also on theology, philology, mathematics, astronomy, geology, physics, and music. To disarm the fanatics he professed the same vague Pantheism as Averroes, but Arab literature ascribes to him the popular saying that "the world is divided into men who have wit and no religion and men who have religion and no wit." It is curious that, while he was the most brilliant and most learned man of his age, he was also very sensual and dissipated, often leading his students in their revels. See S. P. Scott, *The Moorish Empire in Europe*, 3 vols., 1904.

Avignon, The Popes at (1309-77). Historians who repeat the Catholic claim that the thirteenth century is the greatest in history fail to explain why it closed with and was followed by a long period of degradation of the Papacy and ruin of the city of Rome. Boniface VIII (1294-1303), one of the most de-

praved and sceptical of the Popes [see], was soon followed by Clement V, who secured the tiara by a corrupt deal with Philip of France and was obliged to transfer his Court to that country. In order to evade paying the price he had promised—public exposure of the vices of Boniface VIII and of the Knights Templars—he fled to Avignon. The principality of Avignon had until that time belonged to the Queen of Naples, but the Pope bought it from her for the ridiculous sum of £40,000—it contained several towns besides the rich city of Avignon—and, which was the real price, a promise of absolution for her notorious crimes and vices. The sojourn of the Popes in the city for more than sixty years is called by the older Catholic historians “the Babylonian Captivity,” though it was voluntary, and they admit that it was one of the very corrupt periods of Papal history. The famous Italian scholar Petrarch, one of the most respected men of the age, then lived in exile near Avignon, and he has left us a shuddering indictment of its vices, natural and unnatural, in his Latin *Letters Without a Title*. This is one of the hundreds of documents of great interest which tell the true character of the Middle Ages that have never been translated into English. Few pictures in the history of morals are more repellent. Even when fairly respectable Popes were on the throne the Papal Court remained sordid. See also *Les Papes d'Avignon* (1914), by G. Mollat (Catholic), and *La prostitution du XIII au XVII siècle* (1908), by Dr. L. Le Pileur (who reproduces amazing documents from the city archives). It is a Catholic fable that the prayers of St. Catherine of Siena drew the Popes back to Italy. Rome, stung by the progress and prosperity of North Italy while it remained on the level of a village, threatened again to reject their authority if they did not return.

Azana, President Manuel (1880–1940). Son of a Catholic Alcalde, he had a thorough Catholic education at the Instituto del Cardinal Cisneros and the University of Saragossa. He then

discarded his creed and graduated in law at Madrid University. A brilliant student and writer—in 1926 he was awarded the National Prize for Literature—he began to take a keen interest in politics as an anti-clerical Republican, and at the Revolution of 1931 he was appointed Minister of War, and later Premier. He had sworn that Spanish youths should no longer be forced to endure the sour and narrow education he had been compelled to suffer, and with the support at the polls of two-thirds of urban Spain, he carried through the series of laws which secularized the country. He became President in 1936, and, when the Italians and Germans crushed the Republic, fled to England.

Aztecs, The. They were the last branch of the Amerinds [see] to attain the level of civilization, with Mexico City as their capital, before the Spaniards arrived. It is therefore not unnatural that crude relics of their recent barbaric years should have lingered among them, though the worst of these (human sacrifices) were due to the conservatism of the priests and were opposed by some of the princes. On the other hand, the leading Spanish missionary, B. de Sahagun, not only gives the people a fine character in his *Historia General de las Cosas de Nueva Espana* (Spanish trans. 1829), but records with astonishment that in many features the Aztec religion resembled Catholicism. Hymns and prayers which he gives are of a high type, and the people made offerings in the temples of food and flowers and burned aromatic herbs on the altars. They fasted much (one meal a day and no spices), confessed their sins to and received penances from the priests, and on certain festivals used to meet in groups for “holy communion.” They made an image of the god from paste, and the priest blessed it and distributed portions of it to the Indians to eat, with great reverence. Prescott gives many details in his *Conquest of Mexico* (last ed. 1915), and see H. J. Spinden, *Ancient Civilizations of Mexico and Central America* (1922).

B.

Bab, The (1818–50), Persian reformer. In the story of the Bab we have an interesting and instructive parallel to the story of Jesus; so close, indeed, that, although the facts fall in our modern journalistic age, they are very rarely noticed. In 1844 a young Persian named Ali Mohammed, then aged twenty-four, set out to reform the religion of his country in the direction of a pure and undogmatic ethical monotheism without priests. The movement spread rapidly, and in 1850 the priests and the political authorities combined against him, and he and twenty-eight of his chief followers were shot. His life was written two or three years afterwards, and was that of a simple and earnest preacher. Yet a decade or two later biographies of him were full of myths and miracles. His creed, moreover, which did not include belief in personal immortality, inspired many times more martyrs in half a century—10,000 are claimed between 1850 and 1906—than Christianity had inspired in 250 years; and the movement, now called Behaism, from a successor of the Bab, spread over the world and had thousands of adherents in the United States alone. See Myron H. Phelps, *Life and Teaching of Abbas Effendi* (1903), with a strongly supporting introduction by Prof. E. G. Browne (professor of Arabic at Cambridge).

Babel, The Tower of. The story in *Genesis* xi, 1–9, is so childish and clumsy—Babel has no relation to the Hebrew word “to confuse” (*balal*), but is a corruption of the Semitic *bab-ilu* (gate of the gods)—and tinged with polytheism that it raises a psychological question about the beliefs even of great men in the past. The story is not of Babylonian origin, as far as research has gone, but seems to be a reminiscence of an attempt of ignorant tribes to explain the multiplicity of tongues in the city of Babylon. This may have become connected with some old ruined temple-tower. The Hindus had a parallel legend of evil spirits building a lofty fire-altar in order to reach heaven, and Indra destroying it (*Sacred Books of the East*, XLII, 500). Josephus quotes a

closer parallel from the *Song of the Sibyll*, in which the gods confuse tongues as well as destroy the tower (*Antiq. Jud.*, I, 43). (See Sir J. Frazer, *Folk-Lore in the Old Testament*, 1918, I, 362–84).

Babylon, Morals in Ancient. The legend of the particular viciousness of ancient Babylon, which modern research has completely discredited, is based upon libels in the Old Testament (especially the work of fiction with the title *Daniel* [see]) by Jews who naturally hated the city, upon epithets (Scarlet Woman, etc.) drawn from *Revelation*, and upon a story of sacred prostitution given by the Greek historian Herodotus. The first and second of these collections of libels are now negligible, and the story of Herodotus, though strangely accepted by Sir J. G. Frazer, is now regarded by all authorities on the history and life of Babylon as an error, or as at the most (some say) an absurd generalization from a possible survival of an ancient custom in some obscure old temple of the earth-goddess near Babylon. Herodotus, who does not seem to have visited Babylon, as he did Egypt, says that by law every Babylonian woman had to sell her virginity in the temple of Mylitta. There is not only no trace of such a goddess, but we have unearthed large numbers of marriage-tablets, and in these it is commonly stated that the bride is a virgin; which does not merely refute the fable, but testifies to some strictness of sex morals. The story is in itself ridiculous—it represents that some young women had to wait years to find a purchaser (for the smallest silver coin). In other passages Herodotus makes the Babylonians so sensitive about sex that even married folk have to spend the night in prayer after sexual commerce.

In social-moral respects the Babylonian code was more than a thousand years in advance of that of the Hebrew prophets. The late Prof. Breasted, who was an authority on Egypt rather than Babylon, was remarkably far astray when he wrote that the Babylonian religion “never proclaimed the right of

the poor and humble." The social history of Babylonia begins, nearly 4,000 years ago, with a code of law, the Hammurabi Code [see], which insisted more sternly and practically on justice to the workers and women than any code of law in the world until recent times; and this is said by experts to be a collection of much older laws and is expressly stated to be under the guardianship of the gods. The oldest prayers and hymns we have recovered often strike a high ethical note. See Sir E. A. W. Budge's *Babylonian Life and History* (1925 ed.) or any of the works of Jastrow, Pinches, Sayce, Langdon, etc. The archaeological research of the last fifty years has discredited the earlier belief that the Babylonians were less religious and less moral than the Egyptians. They did not believe in rewards and punishments after death—a man's shade passed into a dim, unknown world underground—but, like the Hebrews, they believed emphatically that sin is punished by the gods in this life, which is usually more effective. Hence men and women who suffered any affliction went to the court of the temple to confess to the priests, who read lists of sins to them, and gave a sort of absolution. It is not until the fourth century B.C. that we have serious charges of vice against the Babylonians; and not only are these brought by an embittered officer of Alexander's army, but they refer only to some such degenerate small groups as are found in the days of decay of every civilization.

Babylonian Captivity, The. Historical and archaeological work on the person and the great reign of Nebuchadrezzar on the one hand, and the chronological re-arrangement of the books of the Old Testament on the other, have made the Babylonian Captivity a vital stage in the history of the Hebrews and destroyed the myth of their "genius for morality." Nebuchadrezzar was one of the great kings of antiquity, and he, though possibly himself sharing the widespread scepticism of his age (as reflected in *Job*, which is now believed to be a Babylonian production), restored the old moral and religious culture of Babylon, which was further improved by contact with the Persian religion, and made the city the

richest and most cosmopolitan centre on earth. (See McCabe's *Golden Ages of History*, 1940, Ch. II.) The Hebrews went to school in Babylon, and nearly all the best ethical literature in the Old Testament is now recognized by the critics as Post-Exilic. It is a reasonable inference also that the wealth and power of the Babylonian priesthoods in large part inspired the Hebrew leaders to set about their vigorous organization of the cult of Jahveh and their fraudulent recasting of their literature for the purpose of tracing everything back to Moses. The audacity with which they wrought this, when they found Judæa in a state of appalling ignorance and demoralization, can be judged from their statement that, whereas only about 10,000 (3,320 men and their families) had been deported, 42,360, with a rich treasure, returned; and we read between the lines that most of the sons of the deportees preferred to remain in civilized Babylonia. [See *Ezra School*; *Hebrews*; *Old Testament*.] **Bacchus.** [See *Dionysos*.]

Bacon, Francis, Baron Verulam, Viscount St. Albans (1561–1626). Bacon professed orthodoxy in religion, though against his well-known jibe at Atheism we should put the passage, quoted in Robertson's *Short History of Free-thought* (II, 283), in which he shows its social superiority to "superstition." He points out that "Atheism leaves a man to sense, to philosophy, to natural piety, to laws, to reputation. . . . Therefore Atheism did never perturb States." A more important point is that the recent fashion of putting him after Roger Bacon in the history of thought must be recognized as a superficial contribution to the work of perverting history to suit Catholics. Roger Bacon, with all his earnestness and scientific insight, was silenced by the Church and had no influence. Lord Bacon had a large share in inaugurating the new age and had a much broader ideal than Roger of human service. His *New Atlantis* (1615) reflects to some extent the utopianism which the reviva of Plato had inspired (in More and others), and his *Novum Organon* (1620) and *De Augmentis* (1623) were designed as part of a large new gospel for the regeneration of the race by science.

Bacon, Roger (1214-94). Two points are of considerable interest to Rationalists in connection with the famous scientific friar. First, it is the verdict of modern authorities that not a single item of the science expounded in his works is original, and, in fact, the circumstances of his life leave no room whatever for original work. Modern study of the Arab literature shows us the full sources of his learning (see G. Sarton's *Introduction to the History of Science*, 3 vols., 1927), and we know that, from the twelfth century, English as well as French and German Christian scholars went to the Spanish-Arab schools to study (Prof. C. H. Haskins, *Studies in the History of Mediæval Science*, 1927). Scientific instruments and translations of Arabic treatises circulated in England a century before Bacon studied at Oxford, and at that university Bishop Grosseteste had founded a school of Arab science. But as the zeal for such studies spread, the Church authorities truculently opposed and suppressed it. Albert the Great, the German Dominican monk, was driven into isolation and silence. Possibly it was his noble birth that saved him from active persecution. Roger was imprisoned and prevented from studying for more than twenty years by the authorities of the Franciscan Order, which was already corrupt and eager to conciliate the Popes. The article on him in the *Dictionary of National Biography*, a work which is particularly cautious where the Churches are concerned, gives the authorities. After being "kept in close confinement" in a monastery at Paris for ten years, without books or writing materials, he secretly approached Pope Clement IV for permission to write. Clement, who savagely destroyed the fine work of Frederic II in South Italy and is nowhere stated to have had any interest in science, probably imagined that Bacon was one of the many alchemists who promised bishops and princes to make gold for them. At the Pope's death, in 1268, Bacon "passed into a prolonged confinement" (*Dict. Nat. Biog.*), apparently until 1292, after which he lingered for two further years in complete obscurity. Aquinas had triumphed, to the grave

loss of the race. Prof. L. Thorndike's references to Bacon in various works are, like so much recent American historical literature, biased and unreliable. E. C. Smyth's *Thirteenth-Century Prophet* (1923) is a pamphlet. J. H. Bridges's *Life and Work of R. Bacon* (1914) contains little biography and is not wholly accurate. The article in the *Dictionary of National Biography* is still the best account, but an impartial work on Bacon and the influence of Arab science is very desirable.

Bailey, Samuel (1791-1870), philanthropist. A prosperous industrialist and prominent citizen of Sheffield (he was widely known as "Bailey of Sheffield") who also had some repute in the philosophical world—he wrote *Letters on the Philosophy of the Human Mind* (3 vols., 1855-63)—and was a notable philanthropist. He was for many years a Trustee of the city, and at his death he left it a sum of £80,000, which doubled the income of the Town Trust. His fellow-citizens were then shocked to hear that he had had a profound contempt for their Christian beliefs and was the author of a scathing anonymous work, *Letters from an Egyptian Kafir on a Visit to England in Search of a Religion* (1839). He was a Deist, Determinist, and Utilitarian.

Baillie, George (1784-1873), Scottish philanthropist. He was a member of the Glasgow Faculty of Procurators and gave substantial prizes for the writing of Rationalist works on Deistic lines. In 1863 he offered his entire fortune (£18,000) to the Faculty on condition that they allowed the interest to accumulate for twenty-one years and then with the sum built an institute for the education of the workers. "Baillie's Institution" was opened in 1887, and it still functions in Glasgow; though, as in the case of all such Rationalist charities, the views of the founder are not obtruded.

Bain, Professor Alexander (1818-1903), one of the foremost psychologists and educationists of the last century. In spite of religious hostility he was professor of logic and English at Aberdeen University from 1860 to 1880, and Lord Rector in 1882 and 1884. His chief works on psychology (*Senses and the*

Intellect, 1855, *Emotions and the Will*, 1859, and *Mind and Body*, 1873) were regarded as classics for several decades, and in 1876 he at his own expense established the review *Mind*. Bain was an Agnostic, and is wrongly described sometimes as a Positivist. He merely agreed with Comte in the rejection of theology.

Baldwin, Professor James, M.A., Ph.D., Sc.D., LL.D (1861-1934), American psychologist. Successively on the staff at Toronto, Princeton, Johns Hopkins, and Mexico Universities. He was Herbert Spencer lecturer at Oxford in 1915, and he received the Gold Medal of the Danish Academy of Science. He wrote *The History of Psychology* (2 vols., 1913) for the R.P.A., and for some years edited *The Psychological Review*. His *Dictionary of Psychology and Philosophy* (3 vols., 1901-5) is a standard work. His Agnosticism is expressed in his *Fragments of Philosophy and Science* (1903), in which he disavows the creeds and accepts God only as "a construction of the imagination" or "the ideal self."

Ballance, The Hon. John (1839-93), Prime Minister of New Zealand. Born in North Ireland, he emigrated to New Zealand in 1866 and founded *The Wanganui Herald*. Elected to the House of Representatives, he served in turn as Minister of Education, Minister of Finance, Native Minister, Minister of Defence, and Premier (1891). Few questioned that he was the greatest Premier the Dominion (then colony) ever had. He was one of the outspoken Rationalists who led New Zealand in those days and earned its reputation as the most progressive of the colonies.

Balmaceda, José Manoel (1838-91), President of the Republic of Chile. Educated by the Jesuits, he rejected the Catholic faith in his youth and later founded the anti-clerical Reform Club (1868). In 1876 he entered Parliament and became the leader of the Liberals. As Minister of the Interior he was responsible for the divorce law and other anti-Catholic measures, and he was President of the Republic from 1886 to 1890.

Balzac, Honoré de (1799-1850). The famous novelist was destined for the

law, and when he refused, his parents disowned him, and he spent many years in great privation endeavouring to break into literature. His *Comédie humaine* (47 vols.), which put him in the front rank of European writers, was planned in 1830, and he wrote also twenty-four separate novels. He often worked fifteen or more hours a day. His influence on contemporary letters was such that sometimes he was called "the Christ of Modern Art." His drastic Rationalism pervades all his work.

Baptism. For the innumerable baptismal practices of savages in all parts of the world, especially the sprinkling or dipping of babies at birth, see Prof. Bartlett's article in *The Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics*. The cleansing property of water lent itself everywhere to symbolical and ritual use. Baptism was common in the Brahmanic and the Persian religions, and it was employed in the Egyptian and the Greek mysteries. From these the Jews in their later period adopted the practice of baptizing proselytes, and from both sources, Greek and Hebrew, the early Christians derived the custom. The text which makes it obligatory (*Matt.* xxviii, 19) is part of a later addition to the Gospel, and proves only that in the second century it was a general Christian practice. Absolution by priests being unknown until the time of Pope Callistus (217-22), and baptism being the only detergent for sinners, it was held that serious sin committed after baptism could not be forgiven, and the rite was generally postponed until late in life. Tertullian (*De Cast.* I) and Hippolytus (*Ante-Nicene Libr.*, VI, 346) complained bitterly that Callistus, a wily adventurer, corrupted (and greatly enlarged) the Roman Church by promising absolution for adultery and other grave sins committed after baptism.

Barbarian Invasions, The, and Christianity. In spite of the pretension of a few recent historians, mainly American, to have discovered that the historians of the last century were unjust to the Middle Ages, it is the general verdict of the authorities that civilization in Europe was replaced by semi-barbarism [see *Dark Age*] from about 500 to about 1050 and remained below the Greek-

Roman level for several centuries after the latter date; and in the opinion of many it did not return to the best Roman level until the nineteenth century. For this prolonged degradation, which in its length and squalor has no parallel in history, the invasion of the Roman world by barbarians (Huns, Goths, Vandals, Franks, etc.) is blamed, some apologists going so far as to assert that the consequences would have been worse but for the beneficent action of the Popes and the Church! Against this audacious but very common claim it is enough to set undisputed facts of European history; apart from the fact, which we will not stress, that most of the Teutonic peoples were already Christians when they entered the Empire. First, the barbarians barely encroached upon the eastern or Greek half of the Empire, yet it sank to and remained for centuries in a state of profound moral and intellectual degradation. [See *Byzantine Civilization*.] Secondly, every notable attempt to restore civilization during the Dark Age was made by Teutonic and anti-Papal princes and hampered by the Popes—by the Ostrogoths in the sixth century, the Lombards in the seventh and eighth, the Franks (in far less degree) in the ninth, and the Saxons in the tenth—and it was eventually the Arabs who stimulated Europe to rise. [See articles on each.] Thirdly, Rome itself sank to the deepest degradation of all and had to be purified by the Germans. Fourthly, the Arabs were just as barbaric as the Teutons when Mohammed appeared, yet on a purely secular basis—most of their best princes were sceptics—they created a fine civilization in Syria in a single generation, and within two or three centuries rose to the Greek-Roman level from Portugal to Baluchistan. [See *Arabs, Civilization of the, and Saracens*.]

Bartholomew Massacre, The. The common belief that France remained loyal to the Vatican while the northern nations rebelled against it in the sixteenth century is entirely wrong. In spite of the expulsion of Calvin (a Frenchman), who claimed to have 300,000 followers in France, and the bloody persecution from 1540 to 1550 of

Protestants (or Huguenots) everywhere, the Reform ideas spread rapidly. The heir to the throne and his brother and sons and some of the highest nobles embraced them, and in the second half of the sixteenth century the Huguenots sustained three civil wars against the King's armies. Pope Clement VII had married a girl of his degenerate Medici family to the equally degenerate prince who became Henry II, and after the premature death of that monarch, in 1559, Catherine de Medici reopened France to the Jesuits, and they fabricated a Huguenot plot to sack and burn Paris (1567). This infamous fraud led the Catholic nobles to conspire to destroy the Huguenots, who had come to Paris in large numbers for the marriage of the young King's sister to one of their sect. At midnight of August 23-24 (St. Bartholomew's Day), 1572, the royal troops were discharged upon the Huguenots of Paris, and the Catholic citizens joined in the massacre. The order was sent also to the provinces, and led to days of carnage.

Catholic apologies are here even meaner than in the case of the Albigensian Massacre. The *Catholic Encyclopædia* asserts that "the majority of historians" deny that the massacre was organized; an entirely false statement which is refuted by the writer's later admission that Catherine had long meditated such a crime and had won her son to support it, and that the royal troops had been assembled for the purpose. The article further says that the historians Ranke and Martin admit that only 2,000 were killed at Paris, and that the Pope ordered rejoicing at Rome only because he had received news that the King and Queen had escaped a murderous Huguenot plot. The truth is that Ranke (*The Popes of Rome*, 1866, II, 47) and Martin (*Histoire de France*, 1878, IX, 270-350) and the great majority of non-Catholic historians insist that the massacre was organized. Martin gives one of the most shuddering accounts of what he calls "the orgy of crime." He tells of brutal murders in the royal palace under the eyes of the King and Queen, and describes Queen Catherine and her maids callously making obscene jokes over the dead

bodies of Huguenots they had known, and Catholic boys killing babies in the cradle. Catholic contemporaries say that 10,000 were killed at Paris. The figure of 2,000 which Martin accepts is for one day at Paris. He finds the total number of victims about 20,000. Ranke, a more critical student, says 50,000; which means that the Catholics killed, and more brutally, more than twice as many people in a few days as the French revolutionaries killed (mainly on political grounds) in three years. As to Pope Gregory XIII, the haste with which he ordered bonfires and the singing of the *Te Deum* might plausibly be excused on the ground which Catholic apologists now imagine—the Pope never alleged it—but it is not disputed that he went on, while messengers with a true account continued to arrive, to strike a gold medal with the inscription “Slaughter (*strages*) of the Huguenots,” and for weeks or months he had Vasari painting pictures of “the glorious triumph over a perfidious race.” The French Court, which was sobered by the anger and disgust of Europe and now invented the lie about the danger to the King and Queen, tried in vain to restrain the Pope’s indecent joy. Ranke quotes Cardinal Santorio referring long afterwards to “the famous St. Bartholomew’s Day which was most joyful to Catholics.” Martin’s long account, separately published in Blackie’s French Historical Series (1919), requires little correction, except that his figures are too low. M. Wilkinson’s *Problem of St. Bartholomew’s Massacre* (1925) is a Catholic tract.

Barton, Clara (1822–1912), the American Florence Nightingale. A farmer’s daughter who worked so heroically among the wounded in the Civil War that she was known throughout America as the Angel of the Battlefield. General Miles called her “the greatest humanitarian the world has ever known,” and historians speak of her as the American Florence Nightingale. Like her English predecessor, she was a Rationalist: a Theist, but opposed to Christianity. *The Dictionary of American Biography* admits that “she was brought up in the Universalist Church, but was never a Church member.” She continued

throughout a long life to relieve distress in all parts of the world, even in remote Armenia at the time of the massacres.

Bastian, Professor Adolf (1826–1905), the leading German anthropologist. He was President of the Berlin Geographical Society 1871–3 and professor at the Museum of Anthropology. There are many eloquent Agnostic passages in his chief work, *Der Mensch in der Geschichte* (3 vols., 1860). He says that “we no longer fear when a mighty foe [Science] shakes our protector [God] from his heaven, to sink with him into an abyss of annihilation” (I, 29).

Bastian, Prof. Henry Charlton, M.A., M.D., F.L.S., F.R.S. (1837–1915), physician. He was professor of the Principles and Practice of Medicine at London University 1867–87 and Censor of the Royal College of Physicians. In spite of his position, Bastian was an aggressive Materialist—see especially his valuable *Brain as the Organ of Mind* (1881)—and to the end of his life a champion of spontaneous generation. He defended it against Pasteur and Tyndall in 1871, and he spent the last two decades of his life endeavouring to prove it by experiment (*The Origin of Life*, 1911, etc.).

Bates, Henry Walter, F.R.S., F.L.S. (1825–92), naturalist. He travelled with A. R. Wallace in South America 1848–50, and he then left Wallace and explored the Amazon for nine years. His *Naturalist on the Amazon* (1863) brought him a high reputation, and he was President of the Entomological Society (1869–78) and Chevalier of the Brazilian Order of the Rose. He was an outspoken Agnostic (Clodd’s Memoir prefixed to the 1892 ed. of his book, p. lxxxvi).

Baths in the Middle Ages. How “Cleanliness is next to godliness” ever became a Christian proverb is a rather ironic mystery. While the Greeks and Romans had had a passion for bathing—the public baths at Rome had been immense and palatial establishments—and the Arabs of Spain and Sicily in the Middle Ages had been just as enthusiastic, baths were hardly known even in castles in Christian Europe during the Dark Age. As late as the seventeenth

century the greatest lady of the Court of Louis XIV, Mme de Montespan, never bathed. But the Renaissance had led to a cult of communal bathing, generally in the open air, in South Germany, and the baths which have given their names to various cities (Wiesbaden, etc.) attracted hundreds of thousands of visitors every year. In the summer, life at these centres was so openly licentious that it must be taken into account in estimating the piety of the Middle Ages. The classic document is a letter written from Baden, in 1416, by Poggio Bracciolini, a Papal Secretary who was notorious for his "offensively obscene and coarse writings" (Pastor). A French translation was published by A. Méray in 1868, but it is, as usual, not available in English. He describes "nuns, abbots, friars, and priests," who "often behave less decently than the others," mixing with the crowds of burghers in such a life that "the place seemed chosen by Venus herself to concentrate her pleasures." All authorities agree. See H. Peters, *Der Arzt und die Heilkunst in der deutschen Vergangenheit* (1900), with contemporary illustrations.

Bathybius. Religious apologists occasionally make malicious reference to what they call a spurious discovery of Prof. Haeckel and his claim that it was a link between the living and the non-living. It was not Haeckel, but Huxley, who announced the discovery, in 1868, and who called the object the *Bathybius Haeckelii*. He never claimed that it was a "missing link" or threw any light on evolution, and when it proved to be, not a new species of microscopic life, but a curious chemical precipitate, he publicly confessed his error at the British Association Meeting of 1879 (*Life and Letters of T. H. Huxley*, I, 295 and II, 5). Haeckel, who had discovered hundreds of new species (fully accepted) in the ocean mud from which it came, afterwards acknowledged the mistake in Germany.

Bauer, Prof. Bruno (1809-82), one of the leading German Biblical critics of the last century. It is an advantage to Rationalism that most of the work which revolutionized our knowledge of the Bible was accomplished by theo-

gians, but Bruno Bauer was an exception. He was expelled from his chair of theology at Bonn for Rationalism (1842). His purely naturalistic conception of Christianity, as a blend of the Stoic and Alexandrian philosophies, runs through all his works.

Bayle, Pierre (1647-1706). After vacillating between Catholicism and Protestantism in his youth, he became a Protestant professor of philosophy, and was expelled from France with the other Huguenots. He was persecuted in Holland, to which he had fled, for his liberalism, and he then wrote the brilliant and caustic *Dictionnaire Historique et Critique* (1692), which made him famous. It was translated into English (5 vols., 1734) and other languages, and its witty thrusts at both sects, and its curious information, entertained Rationalists and helped in their work for more than a century. As Bayle prudently refrains from including articles on God and Immortality, the depth of his scepticism is left to conjecture.

Beadnell, Surgeon Rear-Admiral Charles Marsh, C.B., M.R.C.S. (b. 1872). He was educated at Cheltenham School and Guy's Hospital, and he served in the American-Filipino War and in the Naval Brigade in South Africa. From 1914 to 1917 he was Fleet Surgeon on H.M.S. "Shannon," and he retired from the Navy in 1926. Besides writing a number of medical works, he edited Hird's *Picture Book of Evolution*, and he used his very extensive knowledge of science to compile a *Dictionary of Scientific Terms* (1939) and an *Encyclopedic Dictionary of Science and War* (1943). He is an Agnostic and became President of the R.P.A. in 1940.

Beauchamp, Philip. [See Bentham.]

Beauty in Nature. The immense majority of those who believe in God still rely for evidence upon "the beauty and order of nature." For a discussion of the question of order see **Design Argument**. The appeal to beauty requires separate treatment because it is mainly an appeal to the emotions and the imagination. The earlier practice, not yet entirely abandoned, of postulating as a rational principle that whatever is in the effect must have been in

the cause (or "water cannot rise above its own level") was always unsound, since it *assumes* that nature had a cause separate from itself. It is flippant today, when we know how the vast diversity of the world has evolved from something (a diffused and chaotic cloud of matter) which differed from nature as we know it as much as a rose differs from a pinch of dust. Water, it is said, cannot rise above its level; it can and does when it is converted into steam. The argument, moreover, ignores the fact that there is in nature a vast amount of moral and even material ugliness to set against the rarer gleams of beauty. The modern mind will not, like the ancient Persian, entertain the theory that a God created beauty and a Devil ugliness. The unconscious evolution of nature alone explains both features.

The egregious fallacy that the man who does not believe in God must be prepared to give a scientific explanation of every phenomenon runs through the whole of theistic and spiritual argumentation, but in the case of beauty even this fallacy has little application. The larger part of the beauty we admire in nature is inorganic—beautiful scenery, sunsets, ice-crystals, moonlight on lakes, precious stones, etc.—and science explains each of these easily and exhaustively; to say nothing of the fact that the same scene may be ugly and depressing or beautiful, according to light, weather, etc. Even in normal sunlight one man will see beauty in, for instance, the Colorado desert or the ocean, and another ugliness. There is, moreover, a great deal of beauty in nature (crystals, for instance, and Radiolaria) which can be seen only under the microscope. Beautiful bays, fiords, gorges, the Alps, the smaller Canadian lakes, etc., are as easily explained in geology as sandstone rocks. At one time the "beauty of the starry heavens" was a favourite theme of the preacher, and now even a pious astronomer like Sir A. Eddington smiles at his enthusiasm. [See *Astronomy and Theism*.] Even the beauty of the orchid or the rose would not be admitted by any modern botanist to be inexplicable without appealing to God; besides that four-fifths of the story of life was over before flowers appeared in the Mesozoic

Era. Even if it were true, therefore, that at present there is beauty in nature which we cannot explain, we should be bound to see it as part of a comprehensive web the far greater part of which is already explained, and we await the further progress of science. But the claim that we must accept God or at once furnish some other explanation is a crude fallacy, and we usually encounter it in the superficial person who admires the rose and refuses to think of the canker, who forgets that there is a parasite for every pretty flower, and who never reads the science which, he says, "cannot explain these things."

Bebel, August (1840–1913), German Socialist leader. A working man who helped Liebknecht to found the Social Democratic Party in 1869 and became one of its chief leaders. He insisted throughout life on the atheistic character of the Party and wrote works against Christianity—especially *Woman in the Past, Present, and Future* (Engl. trans. 1886)—which contributed very materially to the spread of Rationalism in Germany.

Beccaria-Bonesana, The Marquis Cesare (1738–94), famous Italian reformer. He embraced the Rationalist and humanitarian ideas of the French Encyclopædists and was the leader of a large body of sceptics in Italy. His chief contribution to reform concerned law and crime, and his *Trattato dei delitti e delle pene* (1764) was translated into most European languages and was the classic of criminological literature for more than a century. He opposed capital punishment and trusted to education to extinguish crime. As he was professor of State Law in the Milan Academy, which was then subject to Austria, he was discreet in expressing his Rationalist opinions. He "heard the noise of the chains rattled by superstition and fanaticism," he wrote to the Abbé Morellet; which is a clear enough statement of his position.

Beethoven, Ludwig von (1770–1827). The great composer, whose *Missa Solemnis*—described by Sir G. Macfarren as "perhaps the grandest piece of musical expression which art possesses"—is much used on high festivals in

Catholic churches, was an apostate from their creed and a Pantheist, like Goethe, whom he followed. Felix Moscheles once playfully wrote on one of his manuscripts, "With God's help," and Beethoven altered it to "Man, help thyself." His friend and biographer, Schindler, describes him as "inclined to Deism," and Nohl, in his preface to *Beethoven's Brevier* (1870), shows that he had "no dogma or narrow philosophy of life" (p. lxxxvii). He tells how, at the pressure of friends, Beethoven consented to receive the sacraments of the Roman Church on his deathbed, but said at the close, in the old Latin formula: "Applaud, my friends, the comedy is over." This statement has been disputed, though Nohl was in the best position to know the truth; but even the *Catholic Encyclopædia*, which drags in more than one "freethinker" (as Sir G. Macfarren calls Beethoven in his article in the *Imperial Dictionary of Universal Biography*) who had abandoned Romanism, does not claim the great composer.

Beginning of the Universe. A very common fallacy among the less educated believers in God is to ask the non-believer: Who made the world if there is no God? The fallacy is that the question assumes that the world was made (created) or had at some time a beginning of existence. It will usually be found that they have never heard of an argument that purports to prove this. Even the Catholic rarely knows of the weird verbal gymnastic by which his apologist, arguing on mediæval lines, claims to prove it. (The usual form is: If the world is eternal, the time already elapsed must be infinite, yet we must add to it the infinite time to come.) Sir James Jeans (not in this supported by Sir A. Eddington) endeavoured to substitute a scientific argument for this old play upon words. The statement of religious writers that recent progress in astronomy inspired his argument is erroneous. The theory of Jeans was discussed in the McCabe-Tunzelmann Debate in 1910, and it was based upon a theory of Lord Kelvin which Sir Oliver Lodge refuted in the last century, and this upon a theory of Clausius which goes back to

1850. (See Haeckel's *Riddle of the Universe*, reprint, p. 88.) Sir J. Jeans gave the old and threadbare fallacy a new dress. He said that since the energy of the stars is derived from the conversion of matter into energy, and this process is limited in time by the finite amount of matter in each, it—and therefore the universe—must have begun to exist some millions of millions of years ago [see *Age of the Stars*]. So it was created. The most pleasant aspect of the theory is that Sir J. Jeans professed at the time not to believe in the existence of a material universe. But very many, perhaps most, astronomers deny that matter is being converted into energy in the stars, while almost all reject the argument on the simple ground that the energy radiated into space may be continuously built up afresh into matter in the interstellar stretches. This "wonderful discovery of science," another deathblow to Materialism, was repeated for some years, not only from every pulpit, but in almost every paper in Britain and America.

Behaviourism. In the narrower or proper sense this is a system of psychology originally expounded by Professor J. Watson of America. He proposed to abandon the entire subjective apparatus of the old psychology and all the terminology based upon it (introspection, consciousness, mind, intellect, etc.). Psychology was to recognize only results that were obtained by the objective observation of human behaviour, just as we study animals. The school he founded is purely materialistic, and aroused violent opposition. Its experts have by observation and experiment, especially on young children and their behaviour, rendered considerable service in discrediting mere verbiage and illusions; and, though few psychologists are willing to surrender consciousness—it is a scientific joke that psychology lost its soul in the last century and its mind in this, and seems to be in danger of losing consciousness—the new school may fairly be said to have revolutionized psychology. The statement of C. E. Wager (*Secrets of the Mind*, 1940) that Behaviourism has had little or no influence, or less than

psycho-analysis, betrays a lamentable ignorance of recent psychological literature. In his neutral work *The Definition of Psychology* (1937), Prof. F. S. Keller says that "whether Behaviourism absorbed psychology or was absorbed by psychology is a question of the future," but he goes on to admit that "most psychologists" now define their subject as "behaviour rather than experience" (p. 102). The great majority of the professional psychologists who have published manuals in the last ten years state that their science is a study of man's behaviour. [See *Psychology*.] Since the word "Mind" [see] was generally discarded, it became incongruous to speak of "a study of mental phenomena," and the majority, though not Behaviourists in the narrower sense, have adopted this alternative.

Beit, Alfred (1853–1906), philanthropist. His father was a German Jew who practised the Lutheran religion, but his sons rejected both creeds. Alfred, adopting British nationality and becoming a close associate of Cecil Rhodes, made a large fortune and, though heavily criticized, devoted it to philanthropy, living a very quiet and retiring life. He had "an acute sympathy with every form of suffering and an ardent belief in great causes" (*Dict. Nat. Biog.*). He left £2,000,000 for charitable and educational purposes and the development of South Africa, the papers sadly complaining that he did nothing for religion. His brother, Sir Otto Beit (1865–1930), first Baronet, carried out his benevolent plans and was also a Trustee of the Rhodes Trust.

Belgium, Religion in. Annuals and statistical works, taking their figures from Church authorities, state that "the great majority" of the 9,000,000 inhabitants of Belgium are Catholics. The same works then ingenuously report that the Catholic deputies in the Chamber of Representatives—one deputy to every 40,000 citizens—numbered, at the time of the German invasion, 73 out of a total of 202, or little over one-third. Socialist, Communist, and Liberal deputies, all of whom were under the ban of the Church, numbered about one-half. Even in the Senate the Catholics were only 61 out of 150. The (Catholic)

Revue des Deux Mondes (June 15, 1936), in explaining why the Catholic deputies fell from 79 to 63 at the 1936 election, admits that the Church had been "very guilty," and, "to increase its strength" and enrich some of its members, had "embarked upon sordid speculations." The Rexists (Fascists) had then attacked it, but by a profession of repentance it had partially (63 to 73) recovered. But from the beginning of the century, the electoral returns show, Catholics have been in a minority in the adult male population and have held power occasionally only in virtue of alliances with Socialists against Liberals or with Liberals against Socialists. The majority of these are radical Free-thinkers, as there are comparatively few Protestants. The Rexist (Catholic) party was, after the royal example, so rich in Quislings that the Germans recognized it as the only legitimate party in French-speaking provinces, which were much more advanced than the Flemish provinces.

Belief, The Nature of. The meaning of the word varies almost as much as the mental state or act to which it refers, but in Catholic theology it is precisely defined as accepting a statement on authority (generally the authority of the Church). Much of the ridicule of Tertullian's famous saying, "I believe because it is impossible," is thus misplaced. He uses the word "impossible" in a broad sense—something which is impenetrable to reason—and means that he accepts a doctrine on authority (revelation) because he cannot prove it.

Benavente y Martínez, Jacinto (b. 1866), Spanish dramatist, Nobel Prize winner. Benavente first won attention by his exquisite poetry, and soon became the most distinguished dramatist of Spain. "The theatre as it exists [before 1937] in Spain to-day may be regarded as his creation," says Underhill. Like Galdós, Ibañez, and most of Spain's leading modern writers, he was a thorough sceptic. In his preface to the play *Santa Rusia* (produced in 1932), he, paying enthusiastic tribute to Russia, particularly applauds its rejection of all religion. He describes himself as a Materialist. It should be explained that the Nobel Prize for Literature had

been conferred upon him ten years earlier.

Benevolence and Rationalism. [See *Philanthropy*.]

Benn, Alfred William, B.A. (1843–1915), philosophical writer. Son of an Irish clergyman, he took first-class honours in classics and third in logic and moral philosophy at London University. His chief works are *The Greek Philosophers* (2 vols., 1882), *The History of English Rationalism in the Nineteenth Century* (2 vols., 1906), and *The History of Ancient and Modern Philosophy* (2 vols., 1912). Benn was an Agnostic. He was an Honorary Associate of the R.P.A. and a member of the Society for the Promotion of Hellenic Studies.

Bennett, Enoch Arnold (1867–1931). The distinguished novelist had abandoned a solicitor's office for journalism before he began to write novels. He was an Agnostic and an Honorary Associate of the R.P.A. His views in regard to religion are best seen in his *Human Machine* (1908). He considered that the sole inspiration of the world is found in "the ascertainment of the facts of the universe, the facing of those facts, and the doing of justice according to those facts" (article in the *Agnostic Annual*, 1917).

Bentham, Jeremy (1748–1832), one of the most eminent jurists and reformers of his time. He began to learn Latin at the age of four, and, although he completed his education at Oxford, he heavily condemned "the mendacity and insincerity" of its religious atmosphere. After a legal training he abandoned the Bar for the same reason and, his father having left him a large fortune, devoted himself to education and reform. In 1792 the National Assembly at Paris nominated him a citizen of France for his work. His recognized position in English life enabled him to exercise a very great influence on the progress of reform, especially in regard to law and prisons, and on public enlightenment, and there were few reformers with whom he did not co-operate. A convinced Atheist—in unpublished manuscripts he scornfully calls Christianity "Jug" or Juggernaut (Stephen's *Utilitarians*, II, 339)—he collaborated with Grote [see], the distinguished historian, in writing,

under the pseudonym of "Philip Beauchamp," a very drastic *Analysis of the Influence of Natural Religion on the Temporal Happiness of Mankind* (1822), in which they profess Atheism. He was one of the founders of the Utilitarian school in ethics and one of the most active workers in the establishment of a London University, the distinctive character of which was to be that it should be uncompromisingly secular and independent of clerical influence. In person he was a man of the highest character and beneficence, and Rationalism owes him a heavy debt for his services in a period of deep reaction.

Bequests to Rationalism. Until 1915 bequests to Rationalist or Secularist organizations were frequently, and often successfully, contested by heirs. In 1915 G. W. Foote, President of the National Secular Society, fought a case in which the heir-at-law of Charles Bowman [see] contested a legacy of £10,000 to that Society. Mr. Justice Joyce, while disavowing any sympathy with the aims of the Society, said that he found nothing in theory that was "subversive of morality" or in any other way invalidated the bequest. The Court of Appeal upheld his decision on May 14, 1917, and the House of Lords finally confirmed the verdict. Foote had died in 1915, and Mr. Chapman Cohen pursued the case to its successful conclusion. Since that date bequests for Rationalist purposes are, if made in proper form, safe from attack.

Bergson, Prof. Henri Louis (1859–1940), French philosopher and Nobel Prize winner. In 1907 Bergson published a work *Évolution créatrice* (Engl. trans., *Creative Evolution*, 1911), which, although the author was a Rationalist in the sense in which Bernard Shaw is, was hailed as the latest deathblow to Rationalism. Using a wealth of (largely inaccurate) scientific material, he worked out a theory that a Vital Impulse (*Élan vital*) or soul of the universe has directive controlled evolution, and we must rely upon instinct or sympathy, not reason, to bring us into co-operation with it. He was willing to call this God, in an impersonal sense, but he rejected the personal God of theology—"he is nothing, since he does nothing" (p. 197)

—and the creeds. In spite of this, and although philosophers generally disdained his argument as severely as biologists disowned his “facts,” and psychologists his conception of instinct, religious literature, with the usual echoes in the Press, jubilantly announced the end of Rationalism. The system is now as dead as its author. It is useful to recall these periodical disillusionings when the claim is made every few years—Jean’s end of the world, Eddington’s indeterminism, Garstang’s Jericho, etc.—that science is at last returning to the support of religion. Bergson was awarded the Nobel Prize in 1927 (for Literature).

Berlioz, Hector (1803–69), composer. The distinguished French musician, whose *Te Deum*, *Messe des morts*, *Enfance de Jésus*, and other sacred compositions are so much esteemed in Catholic circles that the *Catholic Encyclopædia* has to include him as one of the faithful, was a complete Agnostic. He repeatedly says this in his letters. In one that was written shortly before his death he says: “I believe nothing” (G. K. Boulton’s *Life of H. Berlioz*, 1903, p. 298).

Bernard, Claude (1813–78), one of the greatest physiologists of the nineteenth century. Because he yielded to pressure and received the sacraments before death, and his funeral procession—he was the first French man of science to be buried at the public expense—started from Notre Dame, Catholics claim him as one of their “great scientists.” He was an Agnostic, and the fact that the sacraments were administered to him has no more significance than in the case of Beethoven, whom the *Catholic Encyclopædia* does not claim. Sir Michael Foster, who knew him well, says that he spoke contemptuously of Catholic services as “opera for servant-girls” (*Claude Bernard*, 1899, p. 205). In his chief work, *Introduction à l’étude de la médecine expérimentale* (1865), Bernard freely expresses his scepticism. He describes philosophy as “the eternal aspiration of human reason toward a knowledge of the unknown” (p. 351, 1898 ed.) and a concern with “questions which torment humanity and which humanity has not yet

solved” (355). He very firmly opposed even the semi-mysticism of Vitalism and was one of the founders of mechanistic biology.

Berthelot, Prof. Marcellin Pierre Eugène (1827–1907), founder of modern organic chemistry. Berthelot was not only one of the greatest of French chemists—his *Chimie organique fondée sur la synthèse* (2 vols., 1860) won him a world reputation and is regarded as the basis of the modern science—professor at the Collège de France, and a member of the Academy of Sciences, but he was, in spite of his high position, a militant Freethinker. He was Minister of Public Instruction (1887) in the Government which defied the Vatican and secularized the schools of France, and an Honorary Associate of the R.P.A. In a letter read to the Congress of Freethinkers at Rome, in 1904, he urged the dissipation of “the poisonous vapours of superstition” (J. B. Wilson, *Trip to Rome*, 1904, 158). His opinions are given in his *Science et morale* (1897) and *Science et la libre pensée* (1905). Few men in the position of Perpetual Secretary to the Academy of Sciences have ever been so outspoken, and he, as is usual, combined a high constructive humanitarianism with his rejection of all religion.

Berthollet, Claude Louis, Count de (1748–1822), famous chemist of Republican and Napoleonic days. He was a member of the company of *savants* whom Napoleon took with him to Egypt, and the Emperor made him Count and Senator for his scientific services. His title was confirmed at the Restoration, but he isolated himself from the new public life and continued to make important discoveries in chemistry. He remained a sceptic, and is not claimed by Catholics in their zealous *Encyclopædia*.

Bertillon, Alphonse (1853–1914), criminologist. Bertillon, whose name is associated with the finger-print test and other means of identifying criminals, as he made the chief contribution to the work, was a well-known French Freethinker. His father, an anthropologist of distinction, had held the same views. “You hope to die a Catholic,” he wrote to Bishop Dupanloup; “I hope to die

a Freethinker" (Wheeler's *Dictionary of Freethinkers*). The son was loyal throughout life to his father's sentiments.

Bethell, Richard, First Baron Westbury (1800–73), Lord Chancellor. Bethell matriculated at the age of fourteen and graduated, with first-class honours in classics and second in mathematics, at nineteen. He won a high reputation in the Equity Courts, and by 1841 was earning £20,000 a year. He entered Parliament in 1851, and was a strong opponent of Church rates, university tests, and the exclusion of Jews from Parliament; and in 1857, when he was Attorney-General, he forced through Parliament the Divorce and Matrimonial Bill and several other legal reforms. He was appointed Lord Chancellor, with the title of Baron Westbury, in 1861. He was a member of the judicial committee of the Privy Council, which dismissed the appeal of the ecclesiastical court in the *Essays and Reviews* case [see]. The *Dictionary of National Biography*, observing that he gave his decision "with keen relish," quotes an epitaph which a wit of the time suggested for him: "He took away from orthodox members of the Church of England their last hope of everlasting damnation." He later, in the House of Lords, threatened the bishops for condemning the book, and he described a pronouncement of a Church synod as "a sentence so oily and saponaceous that no one can grasp it." Jowett (*Letters*, p. 186) says that he "had a great dislike of priests and Churches but not of religion," and in T. A. Nash's *Life of Lord Westbury* (2 vol. 1888) he is quoted as authority for these words of the Lord Chancellor: "You cut off the head of one beast, the Church of Rome, and immediately the head of another beast, the Church of England, makes its appearance" (II, 293). Nash himself says that Lord Westbury held "a rational religion." Whether he was a complete Agnostic we are not told. It may be recalled that Robert Owen, an Atheist, called his system Rational Religion.

Beyle, Marie Henri (1783–1842), the French novelist who wrote under the pseudonym of M. de Stendhal. He abandoned the Catholic creed at an

early age and, while he was studying art at Milan, joined the Carbonari. His painstaking and very finished literary work (*La Chartreuse de Parme*, 1839, etc.) had little recognition for many years, but it was highly appreciated by Flaubert and the finest critics. It was Beyle who said: "Ce qui excuse Dieu c'est qu'il n'existe pas" ("the real excuse for God is that there is no such person").

Bible, The. The word is a plural diminutive of *biblos* (book), and means "the little books," but it is taken as a singular noun, and in this sense the more or less sacred books of other peoples—Egyptians, Persians, Hindus, etc.—are "Bibles." The Chinese King ("books") is an exception, since the Confucians never gave the work a religious significance. The modern critical theory of the Jewish and Christian Bible is too often assumed by Rationalists to be generally accepted, whereas, of the several hundred books on the Bible published even in the last ten years, at least four-fifths defend or assume the literal older conception of it, and the works of more liberal divines invariably endeavour to prove—see, for instance, Prof. S. A. Cook's recent work, *The Truth of the Bible* (1938)—that it has a quite unique moral and spiritual value. Of the 8,000,000 Christians of Great Britain, and 40,000,000 of the United States, more than two-thirds are still in this respect Fundamentalists and, especially in America, the crudest works on those lines have sometimes a circulation of several million copies. Even such works as Paine's *Age of Reason* and Ingersoll's *Mistakes of Moses* are therefore as relevant to-day to the beliefs of the great majority of Church members as they were when they were written. Summaries of the evidence against these beliefs and the names of works to read will be given in sectional articles in this Encyclopædia. Here we may give a few words on the evolution of the Bible, showing how what even liberal theologians call the "progressive revelation" in it is merely a reflection of the higher culture of contemporary nations to whom, at each stage of their history, the Hebrews were decidedly inferior in ethic, sentiment, and knowledge. The

progress is a progress in education of the Hebrews by their neighbours.

At whatever date the Hebrews possessed a written language, it is agreed by the experts—and it impresses the literalists to learn that these are, in regard to the Bible, almost all divines—that the oldest of the actual books of the Old Testament are *Amos*, *Hosea*, *Micah*, and the First (or genuine) *Isaiah*, of the eighth century B.C. [See **Prophets**.] It is acknowledged that the Hebrews already possessed in some form many, if not all, of the stories derived from Babylonia, which fill the first part of *Genesis*, besides tribal traditions, written or unwritten, true or imaginative (or, more probably, mixed), and popular chants like the Song of Deborah. A verification by archaeological research of names which occur in these has no significance, for so many names are so patently fictitious or spurious that we cannot rely upon any of them until they are thus verified. The important point is that the early books (*Amos*, etc.) are so coarse in sentiment and low in moral quality, 2,000 years after a high moral code had been developed in Egypt and Babylonia, that the writer who speaks of the superior morality of the Hebrew prophets misleads his readers. After the eighth century the Hebrews came into closer contact with their superior neighbours, and an advance is to be expected, but the great bulk of the Old Testament was written during or after the Exile, when, in cosmopolitan and highly civilized Babylon, they had a chance to reach the level of their age. It is admitted that the whole literature was then "redacted," or so arranged, altered, and enlarged with fraudulent additions, as to give the Hebrews a very false version of their earlier history and of the organization of their cult and priesthood. [See **Archæology and the Bible**; **Deuteronomy**; **Dispersal**; **Genesis**; **Pentateuch**; **Prophets**, etc.] For the evolution of the New Testament see article under that title and *Acts*, *Epistles*, and *Gospels*. Dr. M. Yearsley's *Story of the Bible* (Thinker's Library, 1933) is an excellent short introduction. See also Archibald Robertson's *The Bible and its Background* (2 vols., Thinker's Library, 1942), and A. D. Howell Smith's *In*

Search of the Real Bible (Thinker's Library, 1943).

It follows that the more specious pleas for the retention of the Bible in education, in spite of the complete discredit of the Word-of-God myth, are invalid. The first is that the Old Testament is a unique account of the development of a religion. That, if it were true, might make it a document of value in the science of comparative religion, which, however, never uses it except as it is radically reconstructed by the Higher Critics. In its actual form it completely falsifies the story of the religious development of the Hebrews. The second plea, that it is unique in its ethical standard, is even more preposterous. Until the seventh century the Hebrews had hardly reached the level of civilization in respect of moral or social ideals. After that date we find them striving to reach the level of Babylonia and Persia, though this phase of their advance is vitiated by a reorganization of their religion on a basis of deliberate literary and historical fraud, the development of a narrow and sour nationalism far below the best ideals of the age, and a reaffirmation of other ancient aberrations (animal sacrifices, the subjection of woman, etc.). It is ironic that when at last many of the Hebrews rise fully to the cultural level of their age—in the Dispersal—the canon of their sacred writings is closed and the new literature is disdainfully excluded. The result is that the "progressive revelation" in the Bible falls silent during the most advancing period of the ancient world (about 400 B.C. to A.D. 100), and it is merely this concealment from Bible-readers of the world's progress in ideals which gives them the impression of a "new revelation" in the Gospels. It will be shown in various articles that these in turn contain no sentiment not familiar in the age, and that they mingle grave ethical aberrations (hell, atonement, etc.) with the sound principles of other sects and moralists.

Bickersteth, Henry, Baron Langdale, P.C. (1783–1851), Master of the Rolls. A lawyer of the highest distinction, he refused the position of Solicitor-General in 1834 and that of Lord Chancellor in

1850. He was admitted to the Privy Council and created Baron Langdale, and in 1850 he gave judgment in the Gorham Case [see] against the ecclesiastical court. Lord Langdale was an intimate friend of such Atheists as Bentham, James Mill, and Sir F. Burdett, and shared their views. His biographer, T. D. Hardy, is not very candid on the point, but in the end admits that he was "destitute of religious feeling" (*Memoirs of the Right Hon. Henry Lord Langdale*, 1852, I, 25).

Binet, Alfred (1857-1911), famous French psychologist. He was Director of the Laboratory of Physiological Psychology at Paris University and author of works which had a considerable influence in bringing psychology on to realistic lines. In *L'âme et le corps* (1905) he rejects the belief in a soul separable from the body, but he was not, as is sometimes said, a dogmatic Materialist. His name is still given to certain types of intelligence-tests.

Biochemistry. The supposed gap between the organic and inorganic worlds began to be bridged more than a century ago when Wöhler synthesized the first organic substance from inorganic matter, and chemistry from that date announced one triumph after another, though religious controversialists continued for decades to declare it impossible. Scientific men of the dying Vitalist school gave them some encouragement. Prof. Reinke wrote in 1909 (in his *Grundzüge der Biologie*) that "it would be waste of time on the part of a chemist to attempt to transform carbonic acid into sugar in the laboratory." Within ten years Moore and Baly had accomplished this. From the synthesis of organic substances, of which thousands are now produced in the laboratory, the chemist had proceeded to attack the chemical processes in the living body, and the immense growth and success of this research had led to the creation of a new science intermediate between chemistry and biology: biochemistry, or the study of chemical processes in the living organism. In his *Biochemistry* Prof. B. Moore was able to record a large number of triumphs of the new science to 1921, and there is now so vast a literature that even a

summary of results would form a book. The discovery or interpretation by biochemists and physiologists of tropisms (the chemo-physical processes which used to be called instincts), enzymes, hormones, vitamins, the electrochemical action of nerves, muscular chemistry, assimilation, etc., has proceeded so far that the Vitalist school is disappearing with the deaths of older men like J. S. Haldane, Lloyd Morgan, Thomson, etc., and the organism is now freely described as a "chemical machine." In a cautious summary of the results, Sir C. Sherrington, as President of the British Association in 1922, said that "we may suppose that in the same sense as we claim to-day that the principles of a gas-engine or an electro-motor are comprehensible, so will the bodily working of such mechanisms be understood by us, and indeed are largely so already" (*Nature*, Vol. 110, p. 351). Since then the further progress has been enormous. [See *Life*, *Nature* of.] It is material to note that this rapid advance, and the corresponding advance in psychology, occurred precisely in the years when, on the strength of confused ideas in physics, the public were being assured every month that science had abandoned "the mechanistic conceptions of the nineteenth century." See Prof. Schmidt and Prof. F. W. Allen, *Fundamentals of Biochemistry* (1938), and Prof. A. T. Cannon's more advanced *Text-Book of Biochemistry* (1938). For the light thrown on tropisms and "instinct" see T. H. Savory, *Mechanistic Biology and Animal Behaviour* (1936). Stanford University publishes an Annual Review of Biochemistry of an advanced character.

Biogenetic Law, The. Haeckel, deepening and expanding the work of earlier embryologists, established, as a proof of evolution, that in the course of its embryonic development the organism passes through a series of forms which, with certain reserves, corresponds to the series of forms of its ancestors in past time. An American writer has put it that "every animal climbs its own genealogical tree." Haeckel called this the Biogenetic Law, and the expression is retained in science. Some embryologists reject it on the ground that in the

case of the higher animals there is nothing like a complete correspondence between the two series of forms, and the argument must therefore not be used as a unanimously agreed proof of evolution, like the anatomical or the geological argument. But it is false to say that Haeckel did not recognize and explain these discrepancies. The evolution of the embryonic structures themselves (the womb and its accessories, the change from oviparous to viviparous, etc.) has entailed material modifications of the development of the embryo and the foetus. The resemblances, however—see the illustrations in Haeckel's *Evolution of Man* (cheap ed., 1912)—are much too striking to be casual and are not limited to external appearance. Controversial writers often say that the law has been abandoned. This is quite false. It is given as proof of the evolution of man in such recent and authoritative works as Dr. Julian Huxley's *Stream of Life* (1926), Prof. J. B. S. Haldane's *Causes of Evolution* (1932), Prof. A. C. Kinsey's *New Introduction to Biology* (1938), Prof. J. Graham Kerr's *Evolution* (1926), Prof. W. K. Gregory's *Our Face from Fish to Man* (1929—a work essentially based upon it), the most important of recent works on Evolution, Prof. A. F. Shull's *Evolution*, 1936, pp. 23–4, Prof. Dendy's *Outlines of Evolutionary Biology*, 4th ed., 1938, pp. 276–92, and even the apologetic symposium *Creative Evolution* (1934).

Birkbeck, George, M.D. (1776–1841), founder of the Mechanics' Institutes and the Birkbeck Institution. After graduating in medicine at Edinburgh University he became professor of philosophy at Glasgow and took a close interest in the education of the workers. He resigned his chair in 1804 and took up medical practice in London, where he founded and largely endowed the Mechanics' Institutes, which is now Birkbeck College and part of London University (of which he was one of the founders). Birkbeck was of a Quaker family, but, while he remained a Theist, he did not identify himself with any sect (L. S. Goddard, *George Birkbeck*, 1884, p. 185).

Birth Control. Disregarding the fantastic suggestions of the Rev. T. R.

Malthus (*Essay on the Principles of Population*, 1798) that marriage ought to be postponed, and the crude practices of ancient civilizations—we have an Egyptian contraceptive prescription of 1850 B.C.—birth-control was first perceived by the Rationalist leaders of the first quarter of the last century to be a necessary complement of the improvements which led to a rapid growth of population. Francis Place, Richard Carlile, and J. S. Mill were the most prominent figures in the movement in the first half of the last century, with Bradlaugh, Mrs. Besant (as long as she was a Secularist), and Dr. Drysdale, taking up the lead. In America R. D. Owen and Dr. C. Knowlton faced the obloquy inspired by the clergy. It is estimated by most authorities that owing to medical progress in lowering the death-rate, especially of infants, a population that does not practise birth control would double in about a third of a century. Some recent investigators claim that a natural decrease of the birth-rate is shown in northern and western Europe, but the official statistics (*Statesman's Year Book*) prove that the birth-rate is still high above the death-rate, and the population increases more rapidly than ever. The insincerity of the opposition in Italy and Germany is now fully revealed, and the only other large opposition, that of the Roman Church, is not more sincere. The teaching in Catholic Moral Theology, taught before the present controversy arose, against restriction. The sole aim of the prohibition (under pain of hell) to Catholic parents is to maintain the Catholic birth-rate while that of non-Catholics shrinks. But no law of the Church is so extensively defied by Catholic women, and in 1930 a body of Catholics in America launched, "with ecclesiastical approbation" a book, *Rhythm of Sterility and Fertility in Women*, telling Catholic married folk how to restrict the number of children by confining intercourse to what is said to be the woman's sterile period of each month. The profit was very high: the loss to the Church was slight, since the great majority of physiologists regard the period recommended for sterility as precisely that of the maximum fertility!

Birth of Saviour Myths. [See Cave-Birth Myths and Christmas.]

Bizet, Alexandre César Léopold (1838–75), composer of *Carmen*. The letters of the distinguished composer (edited by L. Ganderax, 1907) reveal repeatedly that, whatever philosophical religious beliefs he may have had—it is not clear that he had any—he emphatically rejected Christianity. He writes, for instance: “I have always read the ancient pagans with infinite pleasure, while in Christian writers I have found only system, egoism, intolerance, and a complete lack of artistic taste” (p. 238).

Björnson, Björnsterne (1832–1910), Nobel Prize winner and Norway's greatest poet, novelist, and dramatist. Throughout life he was classed with Ibsen as the twin stars of Scandinavian literature, but he was a more militant and outspoken Rationalist than Ibsen, if less great as a dramatist. He was the son of a Lutheran pastor, but in 1875 the study of Spencer extinguished his creed and he became an aggressive Agnostic. He published the first Rationalist book in the Norwegian language, translated Ingersoll, and was an Honorary Associate of the R.P.A. To mention his name in Norway was, says Dr. Brandes, “like running up the national flag.” In its obituary notice the *Athenæum* said that “European literature had sustained no such loss since Victor Hugo.” He was awarded the Nobel Prize for Literature (1903).

Black Mass, The. Catholics are accustomed to call a Mass for the dead a Black Mass on account of the colour of the vestments, but in literature and history the phrase means a Mass, or a more or less close imitation of the Catholic Mass, in honour of the Devil. It was common in Paris in the seventeenth century, and some French writers affirm that it was revived in the first half of the nineteenth century. In the latter case it was, if we accept the stories about it of the neurotic Catholic novelist Huysman, merely a morbid eccentricity of a smart set of idlers. But writers who dismiss the stories of Devil-worship under Louis XIV as idle gossip or as evidence of the credulity of common magistrates or police officials,

or who say that at the most a few apostate priests indulged in this form of blasphemy, have never studied the evidence (as few literary men ever do). A large number of trials for blasphemy and poisoning—the two crimes were closely connected—were held in the Paris Arsenal in 1678 and 1679, and the judges of this special court were the ablest and gravest of the King's Councillors. All the evidence of importance was obtained without torture—this was applied *after* guilt had been established—by examination and confrontation of the accused and the witnesses. The main facts are certain and may be read in the *Archives de la Bastille*, Vols. IV to VI. Catholic writers who say that the culprits were ex-priests falsify the evidence. Not one of the score of priests arrested or denounced was an apostate. Lesage, who is generally named, was never in orders and never attempted to celebrate a Black Mass. The Abbé Guibourg, the vilest and most notorious of them, was in active priestly service until the exposure began, and others were preachers in the fashionable churches of Paris. The ceremony had many forms, but though Guibourg, who descended to incredible depths of obscenity, sacrificed new-born babies (born on his altar) to the Devil, the modern novelist's picture of a virgin being stabbed on the altar is pure fiction. Usually it was a Mass said over the nude body of a woman on the altar, which was lit by black or yellow candles (supposed to be made from the fat of the bodies of criminals or of sacrificed babies). The priest wore fantastic garments and made prayers to “the Spirit” (Devil). The King's mistress (the leading lady of the Court) and many other nobles were so horribly involved that Louis XIV burned the worst pages of the records, but revolting details can be read in the Archives. This morbid development, which shows the real state of morals and religion in a Catholic country less than three centuries ago, arose out of the witch-cult [see] and Satanism, which still lingered in France. See H. C. Lea, *Materials Toward a History of Witchcraft* (1939, Vols. II and III), H. N. Williams, *Madame de Montespan* (1920).

Blasphemy Law, The. The Act of 1697-8, which is commonly called the Blasphemy Law, defined the offence (which had previously been punished by the pillory, boring of the tongue, and branding with a B) as a denial of the Trinity, of the truth of the Christian religion, or of the authority of the Scriptures. By an Act of 1812-13, which relieved the Unitarians, denial of the Trinity was struck out, but otherwise the Statute Law is unchanged. Judges have, however, in spite of the contention of some jurists that there is no Judge-Made law, in effect created a new law. It would clearly have become a dead letter in our time if they had not "interpreted" it. In 1812, in sentencing Eaton to eighteen months for publishing criticisms of the Bible, Lord Ellenborough said that "the Christian religion is the law of the land" and must be respected. In 1841 Moxon was prosecuted for selling Shelley's *Queen Mab*, and in 1868 Holyoake was sentenced to prison for six months for a very mild profession of Atheism, Mr. Justice Erskine saying that it was still against the law to criticize Christianity scoffingly or irreverently. In 1883 Foote was sentenced to twelve months' and Ramsey to nine months' hard labour on the same pretext. The last trial was in 1922, though a ridiculous attempt to enforce the law was made in the Channel Islands in 1939. Religious apologists, who deplore persecution in other lands and who treat the opinions of their own opponents as "scoffingly" as they care, protest that our Blasphemy Law is "in the interest of public order." In no single case of prosecution was public order endangered, nor does the law as it stands envisage this.

Blood Tests of Affinity. It was discovered forty years ago that the serum of one animal's blood mixed with the blood of another animal provoked a reaction directly proportionate to the degree of affinity between the two animals. The process need not be described, but the result, after a large number of experiments, confirmed that man is closely related to the anthropoid apes, less closely to the monkeys (and more closely to those of the Old World than to those of America), and more

remotely to the lemurs. It is often said by opponents of evolution, quite gratuitously, that this is one of the claims of the last generation which science has abandoned. The best recent work on evolution, Prof. A. F. Shull's *Evolution* (1936), includes the evidence as generally accepted and shows that the test has been applied to other families of animals (p. 27). Morf recently Prof. R. Ruggles Gates discovered that blood-group A is found also in the chimpanzee and gorilla and primitive races of men, while the B group is not. He suggests that the B type has developed since man separated from the apes (*Nature*, May 6, 1939).

Blount, Sir Henry (1602-82), one of the founders of Deistic Rationalism in England. He was a prominent figure in public life and served on several Royal Commissions. In *The Oracles of Reason*, a collection of letters and essays chiefly written by his son and published in 1693, there is a Latin poem by Sir Henry in which he professes Pantheism (the world being God's body) and rejects personal immortality. His eldest son, Sir Thomas Pope Blount, Commissioner of Accounts in the House of Commons, is openly Deistic in his *Essays on Several Subjects* (1692). The second son, Charles Blount, professed to be a Christian, but was regarded as one of the chief leaders of the early Deists, especially on account of his *Oracles of Reason*. He wrote also a Deistic *Anima Mundi* and translated the Life of Apollonius of Tyana as an offset to the Gospels. The *Dictionary of National Biography* says that his father "probably shared or inspired his opinions."

Bodichon, Barbara Leigh Smith (1827-91), foundress of Girton College and George Eliot's model for Romola. A prominent figure in Liberal political circles, Mme Bodichon worked devotedly for the education and emancipation of women. She was a close friend of G. J. Holyoake and shared his views. He published several pamphlets for her and suggested the *Englishwoman's Journal*, which she founded (*Life and Letters of G. J. Holyoake*, I, 287). She planned Girton College and spent £11,000 on it, so that "she may justly

be regarded as its foundress" (*Dictionary of National Biography*).

Boileau-Despréaux, Nicol (1636-1711), one of France's greatest poets. He studied for the Church, but abandoned his creed and turned to law and later to letters, attaining equal rank with Corneille, Racine, and Molière. The clergy and the Jesuits persecuted him all his life, and in his later years he was tempted to write an insincere essay *On the Love of God*, on the strength of which Catholics now claim him. Brunetière (Catholic and leading French critic) shows, however, that the contemporary Jesuits who denounced him as an apostate from Christianity were right, and that he agreed in scepticism with Molière (biographical notice in the *Grande Encyclopédie*). Lanson confirms this by many quotations from Boileau's poetry in his *Histoire de la littérature française* (pp. 495-7).

Boissier, Marie Louis Gaston (1823-1908), French historian. Boissier, Perpetual Secretary of the Academy from 1876 onward, was the chief French authority on ancient Rome and a very elegant and learned writer. His chief works are *La religion romaine* (2 vols., 1878) and *La fin du paganisme* (2 vols., 1891): two of the most important works yet written on the true condition of the world in which Christianity was born and the real nature of its triumph. His Rationalist views are freely expressed in the latter work—not translated into English, though some of his less important works are—and he is denounced as a sceptic in the Abbé Delfour's *Religion des contemporains* (1895).

Boito, Arrigo (1842-1918), Italian poet and composer. He fought the Papal troops in Garibaldi's expedition in 1866, and his opera *Mefistofele* was violently attacked by the clergy for ridiculing Christian doctrines. He was considered one of Italy's leading composers and was a Chevalier of the Legion of Honour and a Commendatore.

Bolingbroke, Viscount. [See St. John, Henry.]

Bolívar, Simon (1783-1830), President of Bolivia. Bolívar, who had at the completion of his studies, travelled in

the United States and Europe and adopted democratic and anti-clerical ideas, was the first great leader of the South American rebellion against Spain. In 1819 he became President of the Republic of Colombia. Four years later he was chosen Dictator of Peru, after its liberation, and part of it was organized as the separate Republic of Bolivia, of which he was President. His life ended in tragedy, as the clericals united with republicans, who resented the sternness of his methods.

Bonaparte, Prince Jerome (1784-1860), youngest brother of Napoleon I. For a discussion of the Emperor's views on religion see *Napoleon*. All members of the Bonaparte family were probably sceptics, but Jerome, who was King of Westphalia (1807-12), and his son were the most outspoken. Jerome "cherished a systematic hostility to every religious creed in general and to the Catholic religion in particular" (P. de la Garce, *Histoire du second empire*, 1894, I, 119). He had considerable ability, and his rule in Westphalia was enlightened. After Waterloo he fled to Switzerland, but he returned after the democratic revolution of 1848 and became President of the Senate. He guided the counsels of his nephew Napoleon III in most matters, but tried in vain to break his tactical alliance with the Church. His son, Prince Napoleon Joseph Charles Paul Bonaparte (1822-91), who has been described by French historians as "by far the ablest of the Bonapartes after the founder of the family," was as outspokenly anti-clerical as his father. After the Revolution of 1848 he sat with the Republicans and anti-clericals in the Constituent Assembly, and, though he altered his political views, he remained a thorough sceptic. After the fall of the Third Empire he retired for some years to England, and was very friendly with Bradlaugh (see many references in Mrs. Bradlaugh-Bonner's life of her father), but with the collapse of clerical influence he returned to France and again sat with the anti-clerical deputies in the Chambre. Catholics boast that he received the sacraments before death, but he was unconscious when they smeared him with the sacred oils.

Bonheur, Marie Rosalie (1822–99), famous (as “Rosa Bonheur”) French animal-painter. Her friend Louis Passy describes her as an Agnostic, but she was rather a vague sort of Pantheist. Before death she consented to have a religious funeral, but this was only in order that she might be buried near a friend, and she said: “Though I make this concession as to my body, my philosophical belief remains unaltered” (T. Stanton’s *Reminiscences of Rosa Bonheur*, 1910, 78–82). It will be noted that she does not say “my religion.” Her pictures won many gold medals and the Cross of the Legion of Honour.

Boniface VIII (1235–1303), Pope. Historians and literary men who now repeat fraudulent Catholic claims about “the glorious thirteenth century” shrink from noticing that it was crowned by the pontificate (1294–1303) of one of the most scandalous in the long gallery of “bad Popes.” Apart from a very serious but unprovable charge that he had his predecessor murdered—he certainly took the Papacy from him by fraud and imprisoned him—his successor Clement V had, as part of his own corrupt bargain for the Papal chair, to convene a Council of the French Church in 1312 to try the dead Boniface, and, at this, voluntary Roman witnesses, chiefly priests and lawyers, accused Boniface of blasphemy, cynical scepticism, denial of immortality, defence of adultery (“no more harm in it than rubbing your hands together,” he had said), and mockery of all religion and morals. The statement of the *Catholic Encyclopædia* that the prelates acquitted him of the charges is false. They were afraid to make any pronouncement on the evidence, which was endorsed by the greatest lawyers in France. Gregorovius, the Papal historian, tries to relieve him of the charge of vice on the ground that he was eighty years old, but even the *Catholic Encyclopædia* makes him only sixty-eight years old when he died, or less than sixty at his accession. The severe strictures on him in Prof. Rockwell’s article in the *Encyclopædia Britannica* have been cut out of the article in the last edition, but the *Cambridge Mediæval History*, which reflects the general opinion of historians, says that “the

evidence seems conclusive that he was doctrinally a sceptic” and “it is probable that for him, as later for Alexander VI, the moral code had little meaning” (VII, 5). Dante voices contemporary opinion in Italy when he puts the Pope deep in hell (Canto XIX, 52–7).

Boniface, St., of the eighth century. The numerous letters of Boniface, an English monk who spent forty years in missionary and reform work in England, France, and Germany, and held a high position in the Church, are among the many important documents of the Dark Age which are never translated and scarcely ever mentioned. Historians and religious writers freely quote and translate the pious assurances about the state of the English Church of the contemporary monk Bede—a dreamy, purblind recluse—but ignore the appalling letters of the far better informed and much travelled Boniface. None knew more about the state of the Church in three countries (more than half of Christendom at that time), and he describes it as one of general and at times incredible corruption. See letters 12 and 44 particularly for the complete licentiousness of the French bishops and clergy, and 57 for the state of the English nunneries. The Anglo-Saxon kings and nobles made brothels of the nunneries, and the nuns, Boniface writes the Pope, “for the most part kill the children who are born to them.” Neither Rabelais nor Boccaccio ever imagined a conventual life such as England and France witnessed in “the century of saints.” The letters (never translated) are in the Migne collection of the Latin Fathers, Vol. LXXXIX.

Book of the Dead, The. A popular title of the collection of ritual and sacred writings of ancient Egypt, the correct title of which is “The Coming Forth by Day.” The book is on the whole a dreary mixture of magic and superstition, particularly in regard to the passing of the soul of the dead man, and it stands apart from the large popular literature, from which the Hebrew sacred book adopted the “Story of the Two Brothers” (modified as the story of Joseph and Potiphar’s Wife). Of special interest is the part called the Book of

Confessions (or Protestations), which gives the pleading of the soul in the judgment hall. The moral code upon which this is based is far higher than that of the Hebrews in the days of the early prophets, and, though the Book of the Dead, as we have it, was redacted and enlarged in the seventh century B.C., texts inscribed in the tombs, which were later gathered together in the Book, show that the code is 3,000 years older than the oldest Hebrew writings. It is translated by Sir E. A. W. Budge, *The Book of the Dead* (1920).

Borgia Family, The. The impression is often given that corruption was introduced into the Papal Court in the fifteenth century by the Spanish Borgia family and was eliminated after the death of Alexander VI. The Spanish Church was certainly corrupt, but the first Borgia (properly Borja) to settle in Rome, Pope Calixtus III, was, apart from his fatal nepotism, not a vicious man, and the corruption of the nephews he summoned to Rome reflects the general condition of Italy. The Papal Court itself was deeply infected before their arrival and, apart from a few short periods of compulsory reform, remained corrupt for a century after the death of Alexander [see]. It is, however, clear that Pope Calixtus knew that his nephews had at once embarked upon careers of vice. Stories of the Borgia poison are in their extreme forms greatly exaggerated, and Lucrezia, though she enjoyed the full freedom of Roman society in her youth, was not at all the monster of vice she is represented. The morbidity of her brother Cesare can hardly be exaggerated. He had, as his father was fully aware, a cold contempt for all moral and religious restraints. But he had little influence in Italy after his father's death, in 1503, while the corruption of the Papal Court continued for more than a century—J. Fyvie, *Story of the Borgias* (1912), and J. L. Garner, *Cæsar Borgia* (1912).

Borrow, George (1803–81), author of *The Bible in Spain* (3 vols., 1843). In all references to Borrow it is assumed that he was a devout Protestant, whereas he notoriously rejected all Christian beliefs and cannot properly be described even as a Theist or Deist. The solicitor

to whom he was articled in youth was a Pantheist and made a convert of George to his creed. When it became known that, as he could not at first earn a living by writing, he had taken up the work of an agent of the Bible Society in Spain, there was, says Harriet Martineau, "a burst of laughter." He was reticent for a time, but in later years, when the success of *Lavengro* (1851) and *Romany Rye* (2 vols., 1857) gave him a reputation, he was again an outspoken sceptic. He rejected all Christian beliefs and admitted only the existence of "a Spirit," which he refused to call God (Knapp's *Life, Writings, and Correspondence of George Borrow*, 2 vols., 1899).

Bougainville, Count Louis Antoine de, F.R.S. (1729–1811), traveller. Although he was a brilliant student of mathematics and was trained in law, he was the first Frenchman to travel round the world, and was admitted to the English Royal Society for his distinguished services to science. In revolutionary days he was a Vice-Admiral of the Fleet, and Napoleon made him Count and Senator. He was a Deist, like Voltaire.

Boulaq Hymn. [See *Bulak Hymn*.]

Bowen, Charles Synge Christopher, Baron Bowen, M.A., D.C.L. (1835–94), Law Lord. After a brilliant scholastic career he studied for the Bar and also worked as a journalist. In 1861 he left the staff of the *Saturday Review* as a protest against its orthodox attacks on Jowett and Stanley. He was junior counsel in the Tichborne Case (1871–4) and was in 1879 made a judge of the Queen's Bench Division, and in 1893 a Lord of Appeal and a Peer. Lord Bowen was an Agnostic, as he often shows in his letters in Sir H. G. Cunningham's *Lord Bowen* (1897). In a poem "To Hermione" in the same work he speaks of

the illimitable sigh
Breathed upward to the throne of the
dead skies.

. . . the shore,
The brighter shore we reach, I only know
That it is night, Hermione, mere night—
Unbroken, unilluminated, unexplored.

Bowen, Marjorie. [See *Long, Gabrielle*.]

Bowman, Charles (died 1908), testator

of the Bowman Bequest [*see* **Bequests**]. A member of the National Secular Society who left his estate (about £10,000) to his wife with reversion to the Society. Mrs. Bowman, who also was a Secularist, died six years later, and relatives contested the will, pleading that anti-religious bequests were illegal. G. W. Foote won the case in the first court and the Court of Appeal (1915), and Mr. Cohen, who succeeded him in that year as President of the N.S.S., successfully fought it in the House of Lords (1917) and secured the future safety of Rationalist bequests.

Brabrook, Sir Edward William, C.B. (1839–1930), anthropologist. He was Chief Registrar of Friendly Societies (1891–1904), President of the Anthropological Institute (1895–7) and of the Folk-Lore Society (1901–2), and Director of the Society of Antiquaries. He was an Agnostic and an Honorary Associate of the R.P.A.

Bradlaugh, Charles (1833–91). A self-educated man, his schooling having ceased at the age of eleven, he entered the Army, left it to become a solicitor's clerk, and then devoted his life to the propaganda of Freethought. He founded the *National Reformer* in 1860, and by his vigorous defence of it won a repeal of the Security Laws and safeguarded heterodox publications. In 1866 he founded the National Secular Society, and his powerful and impressive speaking attracted large crowds and rendered inestimable service in the advance of the country. Elected M.P. for Northampton in 1880, he declined at first to take the oath and did not sit in Parliament until 1886. His great fight against the oath culminated in his forcing through the House a Bill yielding the right of Affirmation [*see*]. He also introduced a Bill to abolish the Blasphemy Law, and he was prominent in many reform movements, notably Malthusianism and Indian reform. In 1876 he was unsuccessfully prosecuted, with Mrs. Besant, for a Malthusian publication. Bradlaugh described himself as an Atheist in the correct meaning of the word, but was willing to deny the reality of the God of the Bible. *See Charles Bradlaugh*, by his daughter, with chapters by J. M. Robertson (2

vols., 1894). His daughter, Hypatia Bradlaugh Bonner (1858–1935), worthily sustained his work by pen and public speaking, and by a rare fortune in advanced movements the grandson, Charles Bradlaugh Bonner, continues the work to-day. He is particularly active in connection with the biennial International Congress of Freethinkers.

Bradley, Francis Herbert (1846–1924), philosopher. His chief work, *Appearance and Reality* (1893), is considered one of the most brilliant and most important philosophical works published in England in half a century. Consistently with his philosophy—that we have a direct knowledge of appearances (phenomena) only—he was an Agnostic in the Huxleian sense. “There is but one reality,” he says in the above work, and, although it is spiritual, it is inscrutable and “not the God of religion” (p. 447). He denies personal immortality (p. 523). In his *Essays on Truth and Reality* (1914) he defines God as “The Supreme Will for good which is experienced within finite minds” (p. 435) and condemns all “self-seeking after death” (p. 459).

Braga, Theophilo (1843–1924), President of the Republic of Portugal. The most prolific and most distinguished of modern Portuguese writers—his epic *Vision of the Ages* (1864) and *History of Portuguese Literature* in 32 vols. gave him a continental reputation—Braga was very active in the Republican and the Rationalist movements. He was President of the Provisional Government after the Revolution (1910) and second President of the Republic (1915–19). An Atheist (professing Positivism), pacifist, and humanitarian, he warmly supported the annual Congress of Freethinkers.

Brahms, Johannes (1833–97). Like many other composers of sacred music of the highest order—chiefly his *German Requiem* (1868)—Brahms was an apostate from Christianity. His letters, published by his friend (and fellow-Rationalist) Hertzogenberg (*Letters of J. Brahms*, Engl. trans., 1909), show that he was an Agnostic. In the year before his death he wrote and composed *Vier Ernste Gesänge* (Four Serious Songs), which are considered his “supreme

achievement in dignified utterance of noble thoughts" (*Encyclopædia Britannica*). In point of fact, as Brahms himself says, in a letter to Hertzogenberg (June, 1896), the words to the first song plainly express his disbelief in immortality.

Brain and Mind. There are few more ironic chapters in the history of religious controversy than that which describes the struggle over the question of brain and mind. Although the Greek philosophers [see] had almost all disdained the conception of Spirit, the idea of a mind that was separable from the body was so deeply lodged by Christianity in the thought of Europe that religious writers, and some philosophers, quote as a supreme example of materialistic nonsense the supposed saying of Cabanis that "the brain secretes thought as the liver secretes bile." Cabanis [see], who was not an amateur, but one of the chief medical authorities of eighteenth-century France, had really made the more scientific statement that "we must regard the brain as a special organ, specially destined to produce thought, just as the stomach and intestines are destined to effect digestion." So great has been the change in one hundred years that we now have so high an authority as Sir P. Chalmers Mitchell describing himself as "one who does not shrink from the implications even of the phrase that thought is a secretion of the brain as bile is a secretion of the liver" (*Evolution and the War*, 1915, p. 107). Such special authorities on the brain as Prof. Maudsley and Prof. J. Loeb were equally materialistic; and even Sir C. Sherrington, in his Rede Lecture (*The Brain and its Mechanism*, 1933), goes very far in that direction, declaring that we have every hope that in time science will explain "how the brain does its thinking" (p. 34). Yet all through the nineteenth century psychology passed from one absurd theory to another under the pressure of the spiritual view of mind, and the physiological and anatomical study of the brain was seriously retarded by the confusion about its function which this view caused. See the complaints of Prof. R. J. A. Berry (*Brain and Mind*, 1928, p. 2) and Prof. Lovatt Evans (*Recent*

Advances in Physiology, 1930 ed., p. 373).

Now we find authorities like Prof. F. X. Dercum declaring that "psychology can only be regarded as a department of brain-physiology," and that "mental phenomena are in their essence physical" (*An Essay on the Physiology of Mind*, 1922, p. 115). Prof. Howells observes, in his standard *Text-Book of Physiology* (13 ed., 1936, p. 190), that "it is *perhaps* still an open question as to the existence of a psychic factor," and Winter and Bayliss wonder, in their *Human Physiology* (1930, p. 437), "if such terms as mind have any meaning apart from the behaviour of the whole organism." Recent physiological literature generally ignores the mind, and it is still more significant that in steadily increasing numbers psychologists agree with them, quite apart from representatives of the Behaviourist School. In an impartial survey of the science Dr. Heidbreder reports that the authorities increasingly "regard man as an animal reacting to his environment as other animals do" (*Seven Psychologies*, 1933, p. 417), and in a similarly impartial survey (*The Definition of Psychology*, 1937, p. 102) Prof. Keller says that "most of to-day's text-book definitions emphasize behaviour rather than experience." Prof. Boring (of Harvard) goes so far in a recent symposium by thirty American authorities (*Introduction to Psychology*, 1939) as to say that "a man is a mass of protoplasm moving about on the face of the earth" (p. 6). Prof. Skaggs (*A Textbook of Experimental and Theoretical Psychology*, 1935) says, in his Preface, that "mind or consciousness is assumed to be . . . a by-product of physiological processes" (p. 9); and Prof. Heisington (*Psychology*, 1935) says that it is "nothing over and above bodily responses."

Further evidence of this revolt against mysticism in recent psychology will be given in the articles **Mind** and **Psychology**. Since psychology ceased to be a branch of "mental philosophy" and claimed to be a science, it could no longer ignore the data of other branches of science and was compelled to move in this direction. The establishment of the evolution of man on the solid basis of

prehistoric remains, especially skulls and artefacts, put the gradual evolution of "mind" beyond dispute; and Sir G. Elliot Smith has brilliantly shown in his works (*Evolution of Man*, 1927, etc.) how changes in the mammal brain, in correlation with changes in other organs and in the environment, fully account for the advance of mind to the simian and the human level. Recent discoveries of the action of some of the ductless glands on mental activity, research on the nerves (especially the brain), study of the action of anaesthetics and drugs, aberrations of sex and sex-psychology, are, in spite of the obscurities which remain, compelling a mutual approach of physiology and psychology as a study of behaviour. The higher "mental" operations are traced to a particular layer of cells in the cortex of the brain, and the other brain-structures are found to be arranged in a hierarchy which corresponds to the graduation from simple sense-impacts (presentations) to the highest operations of what a decreasing number of psychologists still call the psychic life. The division of opinion will be dealt with under **Psychology**. Prof. J. G. Taylor is perhaps a little over-emphatic when he says (*Popular Psychological Fallacies*, 1938, p. 24) that "modern psychology has abandoned the Cartesian distinction between body and mind" (p. 24), but the above quotations, to which many will be added, show how much truth there is in his claim. Since, however, the cells of the most important layer of the cortex [see] cannot be studied during life, and brain-structure is the most complex in the world, we have to expect a good deal of obscurity.

Bramwell, George William Wilshire, Baron Bramwell (1808-92), judge. "One of the strongest judges that ever sat on the bench," the *Dictionary of National Biography* says. He was created a Lord Justice of Appeal and a Peer in 1882. Lord Bramwell was a thorough Benthamite, in full sympathy with "that band of enlightened and advanced Liberals who used to make joyous demonstrations of kid-gloved Agnosticism at the annual British Association Meetings" (C. Fairfield, *Some Account of G. W. Wilshire*, 1898, p. 102). His

Agnosticism is expressed in the correspondence with Lord Coleridge [see] and the Duke of Argyll which Fairfield includes.

Brandes, Georg, LL.D. (1842-1927), Danish critic. He lived at one time or other in almost every capital in Europe and had an incomparable mastery of European life and literature, as we see in his chief work, *Main Currents of the Literature of the Nineteenth Century* (Engl. trans., 6 vols., 1901-5). An outspoken Agnostic and Honorary Associate of the R.P.A., he translated J. S. Mill into Danish and wrote a vindication of Ferrer (a translation of McCabe's *Martyrdom of Ferrer*). He was a member of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences and of the English Royal Society of Literature. His brother, Carl Edvard Brandes (1847-1913), was a more militant Atheist. He refused to take the oath when he was elected to the Danish Folketing in 1880, and won the right of affirmation.

Brazil, Religion in. The annuals report that of the 41,500,000—some say 45,000,000—inhabitants of Brazil "all but 100,000 are Catholics." Thus is the Catholic grand world-total compiled. The books do not stress that more than 30,000,000 of the inhabitants are Indians, living, for the most part, in the last degree of squalor and illiteracy, and that an extraordinarily corrupt body of priests and monks exploit them when they are not too scattered to be profitable. Prof. T. Braga [see] and K. G. Grubb describe the beautiful country as "an immense hospital" and say that in the poorest and most scattered districts there is only one priest to 100,000 Indians (*The Republic of Brazil*, 1932). Of the white population, more than a million are Italian, Spanish, or Japanese immigrants. Yet the Atheist movement which swept South America after 1918 had the same success in Brazil as elsewhere. The majority of the city-workers, American missionaries reported, were caught in it, and they enacted a good deal of advanced legislation. A large proportion of the middle class, by long tradition anti-clerical—many took the lead in the new movement—then joined the Clerical-Conservatives, and there was the worst

reaction in South America. In 1935 the Communists organized a futile rebellion, and by the end of the year there were, the *Annual Register* says, 10,000 political prisoners in the jails, and "amongst these were university professors and many other distinguished Brazilians belonging to the best society" (p. 312). In 1936 the police clumsily arrested Viscountess Hastings and Lady Cameron, and in the *News Chronicle*, July 14, 1936, Viscount Hastings told how they had seen that the prisoners were brutally tortured in the jails. The present Pope (XII) had recently visited South America. The Church which moans about persecution in Russia and Germany, where it was not persecuted, fully approved this wholesale imprisonment and torture of its opponents in Brazil.

Breasted, Prof. James Henry, A.M., Ph.D., B.D. (1865-1935), American historian. He graduated in divinity at the Chicago Theological Seminary, but left the Church and became professor of Egyptology at the Oriental Museum. He spent many years in research in Egypt, and received honours from learned societies in many countries. His *Conquest of Civilization* (1926, a rewrite of his *Ancient Times*) is a standard work on ancient history to the Fall of Rome, but his personal views are best seen in his *Victorious Man* (1926) and *The Dawn of Conscience* (1933). He was an Agnostic and an Honorary Associate of the R.P.A. (J. A. Wilson, *Biographical Memoir of J. H. Breasted*, 1935.)

Briand, Aristide, D^r ès L. (1862-1932), French statesman. One of the anti-clerical statesmen who, in the early years of the present century, completed the secularization of France. He became Minister of Public Instruction and Cults, 1906, President of the Council, 1909, Minister of Justice and Cults, 1914, and Premier, 1915. The law of the separation of Church and State was based upon a report by Briand, who had previously practised at the Bar. Briand was one of the most widely respected of French statesmen, an idealist and Agnostic, and one of the most vigorous and most eloquent opponents of the Church.

Brieux, Eugène (1858-1938), French dramatist. Brieux, who was often called "the French Bernard Shaw," was considered the leading French dramatist of his time and had a world-wide repute. His militant scepticism is seen in his play *La foi* (1912). The title means "Faith," but is in the English version characteristically called *False Gods*. It is a vigorous attack on priesthood in the guise of a story of ancient Egypt. Brieux was a member of the Academy and an officer of the Legion of Honour.

Brinton, Prof. Daniel Garrison, M.D. (1837-99), American historian and ethnologist. He was professor of ethnology at Pennsylvania Academy, professor of American linguistics at the University of Pennsylvania, and President of the American Association for the Advancement of Science. His many and important works on ethnology, comparative religion, and history made him an outstanding authority on the Amerindians and the history of America. Brinton was a Theist, but he rejected personal immortality and all "crumbling theologies" (*The Religious Sentiment*, 1876).

Brisson, Eugène Henri (1835-1912), French statesman. A lawyer who entered politics, on the anti-clerical side, and attained every position short of the Presidency of the Republic, for which he was a candidate. He was twice President of the Chambre (1881-5 and 1895-8) and twice Premier (1885 and 1898), and he took a very active part in secularizing the schools and destroying the power of the Church. Brisson was a man of high ideals and recognized character. He was zealous in the exposure of the Panama scandal.

Broca, Pierre Paul (1824-80), noted French anthropologist. He was a member of the Academy of Medicine and founder of the Société d'Anthropologie, the École d'Anthropologie, and the *Revue d'Anthropologie* (1872), and one of the greatest anthropologists of his age. In the years before 1870 the Catholics bitterly opposed him and his work, but the Third Republic, which triumphed over the Church, honoured and encouraged his work and made him Senator.

Brodie, Sir Benjamin Collins, B.A., D.C.L. (1817–80), chemist. He was professor of chemistry at Oxford University and President of the Chemical Society (1859–60). At Oxford he had refused to subscribe to the Thirty-nine Articles. He is quoted in the *Life of Lord Sherbrook* (LL, 530) as saying that “it is as hard for a dog to run with thirty-nine stones round its neck,” and Dr. Jowett complained to him in a letter in 1844 (*Letters of B. Jowett*, 1899): “You do not leave any place for religion at all.” He seems to have held at the most a vague Theism.

Brooke, Rupert (1887–1915), poet. He served in the First World War and died of sunstroke while he was a unit in the Mediterranean Expeditionary Force. His high promise in the field of poetry was universally recognized, and in his *1914 and Other Poems* (1915) he lightly satirizes Christian beliefs (see, especially, “Heaven”) and shows that he is not convinced of immortality. Occasionally he speaks of God.

Brosses, President Charles de (1709–77), French historian. He reached the office of Counsellor to the Dijon Parliament at the age of twenty-one and was later its President. He was distinguished also as a literary man and historian, and he collaborated with the Encyclopædists, writing several articles for them. His letters from Italy (*Lettres familières*, 1868, I, 250, II, 439, etc.) throw a curious light upon the character of the learned Pope Benedict XIV (who loved indecent stories) and the state of the Church.

Brotherhood of Man. No Christian claim is more firmly lodged in our literature, secular as well as clerical, than that Christianity, in declaring the Fatherhood of God, introduced into the world the doctrine of the brotherhood of man. A father who is supposed to doom the majority of the race to eternal torment is quaint enough, nor do men seem to have been any nearer brotherhood in the Christian Era than in Roman days, but few ought to be ignorant that divine fatherhood or motherhood was a commonplace of pre-Christian religions. Even Egyptian and Babylonian deities were frequently hailed as the benevolent fathers or

mothers (Ishtar, etc.) of all men, while the chief god of the Greeks and Romans was actually named the “Father in Heaven” (as the word Jupiter means). It was emphatically taught by the Brahmins of India, in the seventh and sixth centuries B.C., that men are “all children of one Father” (Prof. Hopkins, *Ethics of India*, 1924, p. 150), and to the Jews from an early age Jahveh was the father of his people.

More important as a source of the doctrine of brotherhood was the Mother-Earth goddess of Asia Minor (the Ma of the Hittites, the Great Mother of the Phrygians, etc.). From Phrygia the cult passed to Lydia [see], where we find the brotherhood or friendliness of all men first emphatically taught, and realized, better than in any later age, by the seventh century B.C. From there the doctrine, one of the practical applications of which was the formation of Guilds [see] of the Workers, passed to the neighbouring Ionian cities, gave a high quality to the ethic of the Ionian thinkers [see], and reached Greece and Rome. Zeno and Epicurus, the first philosophers to make the brotherhood of man a cardinal doctrine, came from Asia Minor or the islands off its coast, and the Stoic and Epicurean schools which spread over the Greek-Roman world inspired benevolence everywhere, condemned torture, and in some cases attacked war and slavery. Cicero urged the *caritas humani generis* (“universal friendship” or brotherhood) in a fine chapter of his *De Officiis* (I, 14), and there was a remarkable development of philanthropy [see] under the so-called Stoic emperors. All these consequences of a genuine and practical doctrine of brotherhood were abandoned when Europe was compelled to embrace the new religion; yet the literature of our enlightened age abounds in assurances that Christianity introduced and enforced the idea of brotherhood. (For books see the articles to which reference is made.)

Brown, Ford Madox (1821–93), painter. Although he painted a large number of religious pictures, he had no religious belief. His grandson and biographer, Ford Madox Ford, says: “In his early days he was a conventional

member of the Church of England; in later years he was an absolute Agnostic with a great dislike of anything in the nature of priestcraft" (*Ford Madox Brown*, 1896, p. 401).

Brown, Bishop William Montgomery, D.D. (1855-1937). Lifted from poverty and trained for the ministry of the Protestant Episcopal Church by a wealthy lady, who eventually left him a fortune, he became Bishop of Arkansas in 1900. After his resignation, in 1912, he had time to study, and he developed the radical heresies for which he was deposed in 1924; the real reason being that he had adopted Communism. He then became a bishop of the Old Catholic Church. Brown was a dogmatic Materialist and disbeliever in immortality and the historicity of Jesus. By "God"—the word does not occur in his later works—he meant whatever is good in man. He had a sentimental attachment to the Church and thought that its doctrines might be held as symbols of human truths. The seven volumes of his *Bankruptcy of Christian Supernaturalism*, and most of his works except *Communism and Christianity*, were written by McCabe. He had a very high character, lived very simply, and spent more than half his fortune in the propaganda of Rationalism and in benevolence.

Browne, Sir George Buckston, LL.D., F.R.C.S. (1850-1945), surgeon. After some time as demonstrator of anatomy at University College Medical School he joined Sir H. Thompson in surgical practice. He was Honorary Gold Medallist of the Royal College of Surgeons, Life President of the Harveian Medical Society, and Trustee of the Hunterian Collection. Sir Buckston was an Honorary Associate of the R.P.A. and was the Donor of Down House (Darwin's home) and of the Royal College of Surgeons Research Farm, Kent.

Browne, Sir Thomas, M.D. (1605-82), author of *Religio Medici*. His famous work, which had a large circulation all over Europe and is still read, is often described as a fine piece of religious literature, though it was put on the Roman Index. But in his *Discourse on Sepulchral Urns* (1648)

Browne, a Norwich physician of distinction, is a sceptic as regards immortality, and a Deist. "A dialogue between two infants in the womb concerning the state of this world might handsomely illustrate our ignorance of the next," he says (1886 ed., p. 158); and he observes that "the wisest heads are almost all skeptics" (Section VIII).

Browning, Robert (1812-89), poet. Benn (*The History of English Rationalism in the Nineteenth Century*, 1906) traces the poet's gradual emancipation from Christian belief after 1830 in his works. See, especially, his "Christmas Eve" and "Easter Day" (1850). He remained a Theist. "Soul and God stand sure," he says in "La Saisiaz" (1875). Exceptionally intellectual in his poetry, Browning was very sentimental in his thinking about religion, but to describe him as "a great Christian poet" is nonsense.

Bruno, Giordano (1548-1600), martyr of Rationalism. Born near Naples and educated in that city, where he became a Dominican monk, Bruno absorbed the Greek-Arab culture which lingered in South Italy from the days of the Saracens and Frederic II. He threw off the monastic robe and fled to Switzerland, then to France, England (where he published his chief works and was friendly with the leading Deists), and Germany. Except in England, he found Protestants as intolerant of his heresies as Catholics. Lured back to Italy by false promises, he was arrested by the Inquisition at Venice. To say that he there recanted his heresies is false, but he certainly strained his professions of faith to meet the wishes of the Venetians, who did not want to execute him. However, the Papacy took advantage of the political conditions to demand that he should be transferred to the jurisdiction of the Roman Inquisition: which Catholics now say never put any man to death. He remained in its dungeons, steadfastly refusing to recant, for six years, and on February 17, 1600, he was burned alive. Bruno held that the world is infinite and is informed by a World Soul, but his Pantheism is of a more scientific type than that of the Arab philosophers, and his works reveal an ability which in happier circumstances

would have won a very high repute. (See W. Boulting, *Giordano Bruno*, 1916.)

Buchmanism. [See Oxford Movement.]

Büchner, Prof. Friedrich Karl Christian Ludwig, M.D. (1824-99), author of *Force and Matter* (1855). He was deprived of his medical professorship at Tübingen University for writing his famous book, which sold hundreds of thousands of copies in various languages and rendered incalculable service to Rationalism. In the second half of the nineteenth century it occupied the position which Haeckel's *Riddle of the Universe* would later fill. Büchner was a Monist, like Haeckel, not a Materialist, as is usually said, though both were Atheists in the proper meaning of the word. He was a man of very poetical and idealist character—he published a volume of verse—as is described in the Preface to the English translation (4th ed., 1884) of the 15th German edition of *Force and Matter*, and by his brother in the Preface to his *Last Words on Materialism* (Engl. trans. 1901). The brother, Prof. Alexander Büchner, shared his views.

Buckle, Henry Thomas (1821-62), historian. Buckle took fourteen years to collect the material for his great work, *Introduction to the History of Civilization* (2 vols., 1856 and 1861), reading books in nineteen different languages. Immensely valuable as the *History* and its criticisms of Christianity were to Rationalists, the author was a Theist and believed in immortality (J. M. Robertson, *Buckle and his Critics*, 1896.)

Buddha (about 560-480 B.C.). All references to the Hindu moralist Gautama, who came to be called Buddha (Enlightened), as the founder of a religion or sect or as a "great spiritual seer," are directly opposed to the conclusions of the leading authorities. There was in the sixth century B.C., in Asia, a remarkable challenge of religious traditions comparable with that of the nineteenth century in the West. The Ionian thinkers [see] of Asia Minor, and Lao-Tse and Confucius [see] in China, led a revolt against all religious belief, and there was a simultaneous revolt against the cult of Brahma in India. The chief centre of the latter revolt was

the Atheistic Sankhya philosophy [see], by which Buddha and the contemporary founder of Jainism were inspired; but while there was also a hedonistic school, as in all such ages, which taught that pleasure was the highest good, Mahavira [see] and Buddha regarded pleasure as one of the evils of life from which men were to be delivered. Mahavira advocated ascetic monasticism as the remedy; Buddha relied upon knowledge. His counsels to the people were the plain social rules of conduct, but there was a mystic tinge in his teaching to the elect. To rhetoric about his spiritual insight we have to oppose the fact that there was no pretence of originality in his successful exhortations of the people; whereas his personal contribution, or what was peculiar to him in his teaching, was responsible for its degeneration into the spurious religion called Buddhism. It was commonly held in India that the idea of transmigration (which gave a man a second or third chance) best reconciled folk to the evils of life, and it is generally agreed that Buddha passively accepted the theory, without—he was far from being an exact thinker—attempting to adjust it to his general theory of life.

It is stated by all the leading experts that he had no belief in God, soul, or any spiritual realities. The chief authority, Prof. T. Rhys Davids, proves at length in his *Buddhism* (22nd ed., 1910)—a book published by the S.P.C.K.—that Buddha "denied the existence of any soul" (p. 99), and that a belief in soul was rank heresy to the early Buddhists. In his *Buddhism, its Teaching and Literature* (lectures delivered at Cornell University) Prof. Davids says that neither Stoics nor Confucians were "quite so frankly and entirely independent as Buddhism of the two theories of God and the soul" (1926 ed., p. 140). Prof. E. W. Hopkins, another standard authority, explains in his *Religions of India* (1895) how the revolt against Brahmanism "led to Atheism" (p. 298), and says that Buddha "cast off not only gods but soul" (p. 314), and "no man ever lived so godless yet so godlike" (p. 325); and in his *Ethics of India* (1924) he says that "there was no God [in Buddhism] till Buddha himself

in the eyes of the ordinary worshipper took God's place" (p. 142). Prof. Vincent Smith, our chief authority on Hindu history, insists that Buddha had no idea of founding a religion, and "without denying the existence of a Supreme Deity he ignored it" (*The Oxford Student's History of India*, 12th ed., 1929, p. 45.)

Thus all the leading authorities; yet the *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics* entrusted its article on Buddha to a Methodist professor and Bible Society writer, the Rev. Dr. Geden, who does not even notice this important issue. The same prejudiced writer, however, in his article on "God: Buddhist," while admitting that Buddha never mentioned God or gods or souls, claims nevertheless that he *must* have believed in them because he was a man of such profound spiritual insight! In the article "Indian Buddhism," in the same encyclopædia, Prof. MacDonell (professor of Sanscrit at Oxford University) says that Buddha "denied the existence of a world-soul and of the individual soul." In short, every expert who disentangles the teaching of Buddha from adulterations in the earliest Buddhist literature (which was written long after his death) admits that he never appealed to God or a soul, and that he urged people to waste no time on such matters or on priests or temples. The single argument of those who are reluctant to grant that the greatest of ethical teachers was an Atheist (in the legitimate sense) is that he thought it better not to introduce his belief in God and the soul into his teaching. To this the obvious and decisive answer is that in the whole of history there is no instance of a moralist, particularly one who devoted his whole life to moral preaching to people who *did* believe in God, having such a belief and rigorously declining to strengthen his appeal with it. The same argument can, we shall see, be used in regard to the Atheism of Confucius.

Buddhism. The Asiatic religion which has assumed that name is an accretion of myths, superstitions, and rites which grew round the teaching of Buddha as it spread over Asia. The ethic was still pure in the days of Asoka [see], though that king laid far more stress upon

transmigration than Buddha had laid, and his munificent endowment of Buddhism, with the best of intentions, accelerated its degeneration. The life of leisure in the great endowed monasteries bred futile discussion and dissension, and decay set in. Modern authorities question the truth of the tradition that the religion, as it had now become, was suppressed in the greater part of India, though its deterioration had enabled the Brahmins to recover ground against it, and sober monarchs, as in China, frowned upon its vast sterile communities. In some of these the same vices were bred as in the monasteries of Europe, though there was never anything like the same widespread corruption. There is in modern times a revival of pure Buddhism, in India and elsewhere—there is a small Buddhist Society in London—but the Buddhist religion, which counts its followers by the hundred million, has no more resemblance to the teaching of Buddha than Roman or English Catholicism has to the teaching attributed to Jesus in the Gospels. Its one distinction is, as Rhys Davids says, that its annals are nowhere stained by persecution of other religions. Of the 150,000,000 followers that it claims, the majority are not Buddhists in the sense in which men are Christians. They lightly profess it or enjoy its services as well as, at the same time, other religions, like Taoism or Shintoism. [See China.]

Buffon, Count Georges Louis Leclerc de (1707–88), the leading French naturalist of the eighteenth century. He took thirty-five years to write his famous *Natural History* (36 vols., 1749–85), in which he incorporated the evolutionary theory of the origin of the sun and planets which Descartes had crudely outlined and Laplace later put in scientific form. Buffon had been educated by the Jesuits, but he adopted the sceptical views of the learned world of his time, and the clergy compelled him to alter certain passages of his work, the greatest scientific work yet published at that time. His friend, Hérault de Séchelles, tells us that Buffon said to him: "I have everywhere mentioned the Creator, but you have only to omit the word and put in

its place the power of Nature" (*Voyage à Montbard*, p. 36). He adds that the great naturalist did not believe in a life after death.

Buisson, Professor Ferdinand Edouard (1841-1932), French statesman and educationist. As Minister of Public Instruction from 1879 to 1896, Buisson was the chief creator of the secular school system of France. He had been professor of the science of education at the Sorbonne, and he was a Commander of the Legion of Honour. His Agnostic views are best found in his book *La religion, la morale, et la science* (1900), and a few years before his death he assured the present writer that his opinions were unchanged.

Bulak Hymn, The. A hymn to the Sun God composed in the days of the Heretic King of Egypt, Amenhotep IV, the manuscript of which (found at Bulak, or Boulacq) is in the Cairo Museum. Breasted has a translation of it in his *History of Egypt* (1909, p. 371), and this is put side by side with Psalm CIV in McCabe's *Twilight of the Gods* (1923, pp. 3-4). That the Hebrew psalm is a modified version of the Bulak Hymn will be questioned only by those who deny, for instance, that the story of the Flood in *Genesis* is taken from the Babylonian Epic. Since the Egyptian hymn preceded the Hebrew (which commentators describe as one of the most inspired of the psalms) by many centuries, we have here an ironic commentary on the claim that the Hebrews taught the world monotheism and on the "inspiration" of their writers. There is another translation in Steindorff's *Religion of the Ancient Egyptians* (1905, pp. 66-7).

Bulas. This is the Spanish name for the "Bulls of Indulgence," shortly called Indulgences, which were sold in bookshops in Spain and Spanish America until a recent date. All Catholic writers protest that it is a calumny to say that the Church sold indulgences even in the days of Luther. They were still being sold by the million every year in Spain in the first quarter of the present century. The complete set of four which lie before the writer are dated 1911, and were in that year bought for him over the counter in

Madrid by an American Atheist in the ordinary way of trade. In the following year the writer caused a very serious agitation among English and American Catholics, who were outraged to hear of the traffic, by describing them in an article in the *Contemporary Review*. The Jesuit Fr. S. Smith was compelled to publish an evasive booklet regretting the difficulty of suppressing certain ancient irregularities in Spain, but he attempted the excuse that there was no "sale" because you simply gave an "alms" to the Church (over a book-seller's counter), and he gave you the *bula* (and your change) for the Church. The traffic was shortly afterwards withdrawn from the bookshops and confined to the priests. Until about 1920 the Vatican, which took a percentage of the year's sales—some writers say 10 per cent.—issued a new authorization every year, and a gaudy procession, headed by a drummer and buglers in military uniform, announced the fact in the streets of Madrid. The Press—see, for instance, *El Imparcial*, Dec. 4, 1889—described the procession (with "all the parish priests of Madrid and high ecclesiastical and civic dignitaries") next day, and the Catholic shopkeepers put the sign "Bulas" in their windows.

There are four different *Bulas*, each bearing the signature of the head of the Spanish Church and the fixed price. For 50 *centimos* (about 4d.) the Spaniard bought permission to eat meat on nearly all the days of the year on which British Catholics fast. For 75 *centimos* (about 7d.) he got a "plenary indulgence" [see *Indulgences*] for himself or (a different *bula*) for a deceased person. For 1.15 *pesetas* (about 10d.) he bought what Spaniards familiarly called the Thieves' Bula. The Archbishop of Toledo gravely explains in it that if you have any ill-gotten property and do not know the name and address of the owner (as the pickpocket usually does not), the purchase of a *bula* makes it yours, legally and morally; but if the object is worth more than 11s. you must buy a *bula* for each additional 11s. up to about £28. If the value of the object is higher than that, you must go to the priest and make a *composicion* ("deal"). Photographs of the procession and the *bulas*,

with English translations, were published in *Romish Indulgences of Today*, by "Fulano," an anonymous professor of Edinburgh University, in 1902, but Catholics secured the suppression of the book. Reference to the *bulas* was also cut out of Guides to Spain. Catholic writers again say that the Church *never* sold indulgences.

Bullett, Gerald, M.A. (b. 1893), novelist. Mr. Bullett has written in the *Rationalist Annual* (1938) and edited Montaigne's *Book of Good Faith* and Butler's *Fair Haven* for the R.P.A. In his article in the *Annual* he says that "Rationalism must be part of the mental make-up of every man who claims to think for himself" (p. 16), though he accepts an impersonal immanent divinity. In his more recent book, *Problems of Religion* (1938), he agrees rather with Bergson [see] in preferring instinct or intuition to reason.

Burbank, Luther (1849-1926), horticulturist. From the position of a farm-worker Burbank raised himself by industry and genius to that of the greatest creator in the world of new types of flowers, fruit, and trees. He reared more than a million plants a year, destroying most of them—neighbours used to speak of his "million dollar bonfires"—in order to select the best. He added incalculable wealth to American productiveness and remained a comparatively poor man. He pleaded earnestly for the application of the same scientific methods to the improvement of man, and toward the close of his life he caused a sensation by declaring from a local pulpit that this should be done without priests, churches, or belief in immortality. He "believed neither in heaven nor hell," says Wilbur Hall in an introduction to Burbank's posthumous work *An Architect of Nature* (1939). The present writer visited him in Santa Rosa a few weeks before he died, and found him in a mood of militant Rationalism. He had, he said, abandoned the vague Emersonian Theism which had appeared in his earlier works.

Burchard, Johann (about 1440-1516), diarist. A German priest who became Master of Ceremonies (or Majordomo) in the Vatican Palace during the period of its deepest demoralization and served

under Popes Sixtus IV, Innocent VIII, Alexander VI, and Julius II (1483-1516). He was therefore the best-informed man of his time on Papal affairs, and the large diary which he left at his death, though for the most part a tedious description of routine, contains material of the greatest value, especially as it was not written with the least idea of publication. Some of the details of life in the "Sacred Palace" are quite Neronian in their depravity. The diary (*Diarium*, 3 vols., 1883-5) was published in Latin by L. Thuasne, who adds notes and documents which show that it is one of the most reliable documents of the time. There is, of course, no English translation of any part of it.

Burckhardt, Professor Jakob (1818-97), historian. He was professor of the history of art at Basle University 1845-93, and his chief works, *Die Kultur der Renaissance in Italien* (1860: Engl. trans. *The Civilization of the Renaissance in Italy*) and *Die Geschichte der Renaissance in Italien* (1867) are classics on the Italian Renaissance. In his posthumously published *Weltgeschichtliche Betrachtungen* (1905) he reveals that, as we should expect from the candour with which he describes the viler features of the Renaissance, he rejected the Christian and all other creeds.

Burdett, Sir Francis, Bart. (1770-1844), reformer. Although he was a wealthy banker—he married Miss Coutts and founded the house of Burdett-Coutts—and lived in a period when, on account of the French Revolution, a bitter war was conducted against Radical ideas, he took a splendid part in the reform movements of his time. He was once imprisoned in the Tower, and on another occasion fined £2,000 for resisting the corrupt political authorities. In the closest co-operation with Bentham and Place—Atheists like himself—he fought for the freedom of the Press, Catholic Emancipation, the education of the workers, the reform of law and prisons, etc., whereas the Lord Shaftesbury [see], who now occupies the place in reform-history which Burdett ought to occupy, had to barricade his house against the London workers. He materially helped Birkbeck to found the Institution which is

now part of the London University. Mrs. de Morgan, who knew him, says that he was "what in these days would be called an Agnostic" (*Threescore Years and Ten*, 1895, p. 12).

Burgers, Thomas Francis (1834-81), President of the Transvaal Republic. Educated at Utrecht University, he became a minister of the Dutch Reformed Church on his return to South Africa, and in 1864 he was suspended for heresy. Theal, the historian of the Republic, says that in 1872 the Boers had to overlook his heresies and make him President on account of his outstanding ability, and in a posthumously published volume of stories (*Toncelen uit ons Dorp*, 1882) he shows himself an Agnostic.

Burnett, James, Lord Monboddó (1714-90), Scottish judge and early evolutionist. He was appointed a Lord of Session, taking his title from his birthplace, in 1767. The impression is given in later literature that he was an eccentric and superficial writer who made fantastic guesses at the origin of man. He was, on the contrary, not only a distinguished judge, but an erudite Greek scholar who perceived the soundness of the evolutionary ideas of the Ionian School and worked out, with the crudeness which was inevitable in his age, a theory of the evolution of man (*Of the Origin and Progress of Language*, 6 vols., 1773-92).

Burns, The Right Hon. John (1858-1943), statesman. His elementary education ended, and he began work, at the age of ten. In his youth he fell under the influence of Paine and R. Owen and joined the Secularists (Belfort Bax, *Reminiscences*, p. 104). He became a Labour leader and was President of the Local Government Board 1905-14, and President of the Board of Trade in 1914, resigning as a protest against the declaration of war. Stead describes him (*Our New Rulers*, 1906, p. 40) as an Agnostic and "an austere moralist who neither drinks nor smokes nor bets nor swears."

Burns, Robert (1759-96), Scottish poet. Among his early poetry such pieces as "Holy Willie's Prayer" and "Holy Fair" and letters which he wrote at the time attested his scepticism.

Religious writers boast that he read the Bible much in his later years, but such lines as

O Thou Great Being! What Thou art
Surpasses me to know

show that he was nearer to Agnosticism than to Theism (A. Webster, *Burns and the Kirk*, 1889).

Burroughs, John, Litt.D. (1837-1921), famous American naturalist. His works won a place for him in the American Academy of Art and Letters. In his later books, *The Light of Day* (1900) and *Time and Change* (1912), he rejects Christianity and the belief in God and immortality. He speaks of "the God we have made ourselves out of our dreams and fears and aspirations" (*Time and Change*, p. 179). In the *Light of Day* (p. 164) he makes a bold profession of Atheism: "When I look up into the starry heavens at night and reflect upon what it is that I really see there, I am constrained to say, 'There is no God.'"

Burt, The Right Hon. Thomas, D.C.L. (1837-1922), statesman. Son of a miner, he had only two years schooling, yet he became Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Trade (1892-5), a Governor of the Imperial Institute (1891), and a member of the Privy Council (1906). He was a friend and staunch supporter of Bradlaugh, and was described by Earl Grey as "the finest gentleman I ever knew." Speaking at the funeral of H. Boyle, in 1907, he did not conceal his scepticism about a future life. "We have but faith; we cannot know," he quoted from Tennyson; and he honestly added, "and some of us have little enough faith." (Aaron Watson, *A Great Labour Leader*, 1908, p. 309.)

Burton, Sir Richard Francis (1821-90), explorer and Orientalist. His translation of *The Arabian Nights* (10 vols., 1885-6) was a masterpiece. His niece, Georgiana Sisted, scathingly describes (*True Life of Sir R. F. Burton*, 1896) how his Catholic wife had the sacraments administered to him while he was dying and helpless, and burned some of his manuscripts. She describes him as "a sturdy Deist," but as his God was "unknown and impersonal," and he did not believe in a

future life, Agnostic is a better description.

Bury, Prof. John Bagnell, M.A., LL.D., Lit.D. (1861–1927), historian. He was professor of modern history at Dublin University 1893–1902, Regius Professor of Greek 1898, and Regius Professor of Modern History at Cambridge from 1902 onward. His edition of Gibbon superseded all others, and his works on the Roman and Byzantine Empires won honours from learned societies in all parts of the world. No English historian of recent times was more distinguished. Professor Bury was an Honorary Associate of the R.P.A., and his Rationalism is voiced in his *History of Freedom of Thought* (1913) and in the Preface to *The Idea of Progress* (1920).

Bushido. The Chinese name for the Japanese work *The Way of the Warrior*, a very ancient manual of conduct for the Samurai. In the early days of the century, when Japan's aggressive ambition, which was already developed in Japanese literature, had to be concealed from British and Americans, writers like Professor Nitobe (*Bushido*, 10th ed., 1905) were employed to represent that the Bushido was a collection of lofty moral precepts from all sources and that the Samurai (then disbanded) had been model warriors. Although their military manual does include some counsels of perfection, we now know that they were no more idealistic than mediæval soldiers in Europe, and their entry into civil life and the regular army had much to do with the growth of the spirit which has debased the real virtues of Old Japan.

Butler, Samuel (1835–1902), writer. He began to study for the Church, but abandoned his creed and emigrated to New Zealand, where he became a sheep-farmer. Returning to London in 1864, he wrote a series of pungent and attractive works (*The Fair Haven*, 1873, *The Way of All Flesh*, 1903, etc.) in which he mixed shrewd criticisms of the Churches with a stubborn and violent opposition to Darwinism and science. He held that there was an impersonal mind or purpose directing the universe. Bernard Shaw embraced his ideas and lingers in that ancient atmosphere.

The progress of evolutionary science since Butler's time has made his criticisms hopelessly outdated.

Byron, George Gordon, Lord (1788–1824). In his youth Byron accepted the Deistic, and to some extent the social, ideas of the French writers. He was at first scornful of Christian doctrines, but he in time altered his feeling, though he was "to the last a sceptic," Moore says in the chief biography of him. In quotation the dates of his poems must be carefully considered, but even in maturity—if he may be said to have ever matured—he, though remaining a Deist, did not believe in a future life (letter of June 18, 1813). He contracted a fatal illness while helping the Greeks to win independence.

Byzantine Civilization, The. When the Emperor Constantine [see] was driven from Rome for the murder of his wife and son and had to found a capital city in the East, he chose the site of ancient Byzantium, and thus the Eastern or Greek half of the Roman Empire came to be called Byzantine; though Prof. Bury, one of the highest authorities on it, disliked the word and preferred to speak of "the Later Roman Empire." Its story is very important from the Rationalist point of view because it affords a decisive test of the claim that the semi-barbarism into which Europe sank after the Fall of Rome, and in which it remained for a period longer than that of any other historical reaction, is consistent with the supposed moral and social effectiveness of Christianity. The degradation [see *Dark Age*] is attributed to the invasion of South Europe by the Goths, Vandals, Huns, etc., and it is represented that civilization would have been eclipsed for an even longer period had it not been for the Church.

Since the Byzantine half of the Empire was not seriously disturbed by barbarians, who merely harassed its fringe for a short time, and it had from the start a Christian Emperor and capital and was Christianized earlier than Italy, its social-moral history is interesting. Protected from the marauding peoples, it naturally retained its wealth, and the concentration of this in the Church and

the Court just as naturally maintained a comparatively high level of art, though it was uninspired and unprogressive. Hence the fallacy of such defences of the Byzantine Empire (or Kingdom) as R. Byron's *Byzantine Achievement* (1929), in which the broad facts of life are ignored and the art (mainly decorative) is glorified. The facts—even Prof. Bury's history practically ignores these and concentrates on military and political history—are that the Church became as corrupt and intolerant as the Roman Church; the history of the Royal Court is far more deeply stained with vice and murder (often savagery) than the history of the pagan Roman Emperors (see McCabe's *Empresses of*

Constantinople, 1913); the people of Constantinople and other cities fell into the wildest licence [see *Justinian*]; and the mass of the people of the kingdom became as illiterate and debased as those of Europe. Lecky, who usually strains the facts to support his facile compliments to Christianity, here breaks down completely and confesses that the degradation of the Eastern Empire ("one of the least noble forms that civilization has yet assumed" and "one of the most contemptible in history") under the despotic control of the Christian Church does yield the social conclusion suggested above (*History of European Morals*, cheap ed., 1911, II, 6-8).

C.

Cabala (or Kabbala), The. A body of esoteric Jewish literature concerning spirits and demons and the supposed art of invoking or controlling them. The word is thought to be connected with the Hebrew for "received," and denotes a secret tradition or wisdom. In its origin it is, like Gnosticism [see], to which it is in many respects related, an outcome of the mystic section of the great intellectual ferment which followed the cosmopolitan developments of the second half of the first millennium B.C. In a sense it was a reversal of Frazer's theory of the primitive evolution of religion out of magic: the discredit of the old religions weakened faith in prayer and led to a re-development of magic, now supported by a riot of weird speculation about spirits between God and the human soul. The rich demonology of the religions of Egypt, Babylon, and Persia provided the starting-point, and the Jews of the Dispersion, resenting the narrow and fictitious nationalism of the cult of Jahveh, indulged in a freedom of speculation which engendered a large number of new schools (Neo-Pythagoreans, Serapeans, Essenes, Therapists, Neo-Platonists, Gnostics, etc.), apart from the practical moralists and the scientific Epicureans. The works of Philo Judæus show that the speculations were widely accepted among the Jews before the ancient era ended. In

the murky atmosphere of the world from A.D. 500 to 1000 there was among the Jews a remarkable elaboration of these fantastic speculations and magical practices. The First Part of *Faust* gives some idea of the Cabala, and modern Theosophy and Spiritualism are partial continuations of the aberration. (See C. D. Ginsburg, *The Kabbalah*, 1865.)

Cabanis, Pierre Jean Georges (1757-1808), French physician. Cabanis is commonly quoted as a shallow Materialist and Atheist writer of Revolutionary days who said that thought was a secretion of the brain as bile is a secretion of the liver. He was neither a Materialist nor an Atheist, for he admitted the existence of an intelligent First Cause; and he was one of the most distinguished and most influential medical writers of his time. Instead of comparing thought to a liquid like bile, he (in his *Rapports du physique et du moral de l'homme*, 1802) said that thought is a function of the brain in the same sense as digestion is a function of the stomach, and it is in this sense that he said that "the brain digests impressions and organically secretes thought." Allowing for the cruder language of 150 years ago, modern psychology may be said [see *Brain and Mind*] to approach his position. He was a moderate Republican, and detested the excesses of some of the Revolutionaries.

Campbell, Thomas (1774-1844), Scottish poet. He abandoned training for the ministry, after a brilliant course at Glasgow University, and in 1799 attracted wide attention by his *Pleasures of Hope*. He settled in London, and many of his poems ("Ye Mariners of England," "Lochiel's Warning," etc.) were so generally esteemed that he was described at death as "an established English classic." He was buried in Westminster Abbey (with Dean Milman and Macaulay among the pallbearers), though he had in his poems resented "superstition's rod" (in the poem "Hallowed Ground") and notoriously did not believe in a future life (Mrs. de Morgan *Threescore Years and Ten*, 1895, p. 118). He wavered, as poets do, between Theism and Agnosticism.

Canada, Religion in. Statistics are here, as usual, loose and unreliable. The religious figures are in any case swollen by the solid Catholicism of the province of Quebec, which is due not merely to the fact that it is the original French Colony in North America and its farmers are more backward than those of France, but also to the extraordinary powers of the clergy. When the territory was taken from the French the ecclesiastical authorities were bribed to secure the docility of the people by the grant of these powers. They can, for instance, compel all the inhabitants of any district, whether Catholics or not, to pay for the building of a new church. Nowhere else are priests, monks, and nuns more prosperous. In spite of this, Rationalism made considerable progress in Montreal, which had so fine a body of Freethinkers before the close of the last century that they "gave donations of over a million dollars to McGill College" (S. P. Putnam's *Four Hundred Years of Freethought*, 1894, p. 585), and thus virtually founded the leading university of Canada. Today the city and province are ruled on Fascist lines as regards freedom of thought and discussion. Taking advantage of the world-cry of Bolshevism, the clerical authorities, working with the corrupt political authorities, use their old powers mercilessly. "Church and State are combining in an effort to suppress freedom and to create a

Fascist State on the Italian model" (*News Chronicle*, special article, August 18, 1938).

Canney, Professor Maurice Arthur, M.A. (1872-1941). He was Pusey and Ellerton Hebrew Scholar 1892, Houghton Syriac Prizeman 1896, studied at Berlin University 1906-7, and was Professor of Semitic Languages and Literatures at Manchester University 1912-34. He was also a member of the editorial staff of the *Encyclopædia Biblica* 1897-1903, and from 1912 onward he edited the *Journal of the Manchester Egyptian and Oriental Society*. Chief works *An Encyclopædia of Religions* (1921) and *Givers of Life* (1923).

Cannibalism and Communion. Cannibalism is not found at the lowest level of human life, where the social group is very small, the climate genial, and the pressure of hunger rare, as all these lowest peoples are (or were) in the tropics or sub-tropics. Among savages above this level it has been common on all four continents (Westermarck's *Origin and Development of the Moral Ideas*, 2 vols., 1926, Ch. XLVI). Scarcity of food is the most usual explanation, but it is often due to a superstitious belief that the eater will absorb the courage (especially if the victim is a war-captive), the magical powers, or the soul of the eaten. From this root at the higher level of barbarism was derived the practice of "eating the god" (as it was called in Mexico) or food and drink in which the god was believed to be incarnated. Westermarck gives a large number of instances of sacrificial cannibalism (II, 563-5). [See **Communion**.]

Canon of Scripture, The. The Greek word "canon" means a rod or pole for keeping things straight, and came to be used in the ecclesiastical world for "rules" as distinct from "laws" of the civil community. Hence the "canons" (rulings) of Councils, which were in time codified as Canon Law, and the "canonical" (in accordance with ruling) books of Scripture as opposed to the apocryphal. After the Dispersal, when large numbers of Jews settled in Alexandria, there was a division of authority between that city and Jerusalem, and the canon of the Old

Testament was more liberal in cultivated Alexandria. [See *Apocrypha*.] The early Christian Fathers naturally took the canon of the Old Testament from the Alexandrian Jews, and the Catholic Bible follows them, and contains many books which are to the Protestant apocryphal. Until the second half of the second century the Church leaders did not consider Christian literature sacred or inspired, but the familiar four Gospels then began to be regarded as specially or alone authoritative and were connected with names of the Apostles. There was, however, considerable difference of opinion, especially in regard to alleged Gospels and Epistles, until the latter part of the fourth century, when the "Decree of Gelasius" shows that Roman Christians were still indiscriminately reading all sorts of gospels, epistles, and other documents. Catholic scholars, eager for the prestige of the Papacy, claim that Pope Damasus (366-84), guided by Jerome, drew up the first list of canonical books, but it is generally agreed that this was done in Councils of the African Church in 393 and 397, and the Roman list is ascribed to Pope Gelasius (492-6). In any case, the story of the four Gospels leaping on to the altar at the Council of Nicæa, which Haeckel gives (not as serious history) in the *Riddle of the Universe*, is a late fabrication. The Council of Nicæa did not discuss the canon.

Canon Law. The "rulings" (canons) of Popes and Councils were first collected in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, and the various collections were later blended or codified in the Book of Canon Law (*Corpus Juris Canonici*). This work contained, and still contains, a mass of forgeries, especially about the powers of the Pope, as even Catholic scholars are now forced to admit. [See *Decretals*, *The Forged*, for an account of these.] It is more important to understand a distinction which Catholic authorities draw between Public and Private Canon Law. In 1918 the Vatican issued a revised *Code of Canon Law*, and it was intended that this should be translated into the language of each country. In America an English trans-

lation was published, though the text was almost smothered under a tactful running commentary, but the English authorities did not produce a translation. The Code is so violently opposed to civil law (particularly in regard to marriage) and to the modern spirit (especially as regards toleration and freedom of inquiry) that the less it was obtruded the better for the Catholic propagandist. This revised Code, moreover, does not contain the death-sentence on heretics [see] and other monstrosities of Church Law, and the impression is given that they have been abandoned. Few but experts will notice that the 1918 Code is only the Private (domestic) part of the Canon Law, leaving the Public Law, with its arrogant claims, in the Latin. These claims are so far from being abandoned that the Public Law has several times been re-issued, for the training of priests, in the present century. See Father Marianus de Luca (Professor at the Roman University, and writing with the special approbation of Leo XIII), *Institutiones Juris Ecclesiastici Publici* (1901), and Cardinal Lépicier, *De Stabilitate et Progressu Dogmatis* (1910). For both Codes, exoteric and esoteric, see McCabe's *Papacy in Modern Politics* (1937, pp. 32-42).

Canonization. Whenever the Vatican in modern times resorts to this mediæval process of making saints the Press is supplied with entirely misleading information about it. When the Roman Church rose to power in the fourth century there was such zeal to adorn its earlier history with sanctity and heroism that the titles Saint and Martyr were awarded, and men and women were invented for the titles, with wild licence. Martyrs [see] were created, generally out of nothing, by the thousand, and all sorts of persons, often either disreputable or wholly mythical, were declared Saints. The practice continued throughout the Dark Age, each locality making its own Saints (in some cases even canonizing old phallic deities). In the twelfth century, when Rome intensified its power over the Church, the Popes claimed the sole right to canonize. Local resentment was assuaged by creating a lower degree or decoration

called Beatification. The man thus declared Blessed (by Rome) could be honoured locally, whereas the Saint is imposed upon the entire Church. After local inquiries a series of conferences (consistories) are held at Rome at which a champion of the candidate defends, and a "Devil's Advocate" [see] is supposed to question (if there is occasion) the holiness and orthodoxy of the subject.

In modern times the power is used mainly for political purposes and for profit. France is flattered by the elevation of Joan of Arc, who was probably a witch [see], and England by the apotheosis of Thomas More, whose anti-clerical *Utopia* is no longer mentioned; and the Press and cinema are then enlisted in a campaign to advertise the Church. This is in large part fraudulent. The procedure is described as a simple and impressive declaration by the Church that More, for instance, was a man of holy life. The fact that the process requires even in our day absolute proof that the Saint or Blessed (or his body) wrought at least two miracles, in the most literal sense, is concealed, and the profiteering of the Roman officials is never mentioned. After the canonization of More (1935) English Catholics were outraged at receiving a bill for £13,000, besides £4,000 for a souvenir (a solid gold chalice) for the Pope. Every Italian prelate—the English were carefully excluded—who took part had his price. This information came to the present writer from a priest through only one intermediary, and the scale of costs of the canonization given in the *Catholic Encyclopædia* is illusory.

Canossa. The phrase "back to Canossa" is used in modern literature in describing the submission of an opponent to the Papacy, as when Bismarck abandoned the *Kulturkampf* in Germany. The event to which it refers is more mythical than historical. The bitter feud of Pope Gregory VII with the Emperor Henry IV is said to have ended (1076) in the young monarch doing penance in the snow, in bare feet and woollen robe, outside the gates of the castle at Canossa, where the Pope resided at the time. But these picturesque

details are found only in the loose and inaccurate *Chronicle* of the monk Lambert of Hersfeld. There are modern historians (A. Dammann, *Der Sieg Heinrichs IV in Canossa*, 1907) who contend that in fact Henry besieged the castle and compelled the Pope to absolve him, but we may infer from the Pope's letters (especially IV, 12) that Henry went through some form of penance to get absolution. The comment of historians that this was a triumph of the spiritual power is, however, wholly misplaced. Henry was hard pressed in a civil war fomented by the Pope, as well as by war in Italy, and the sentence of excommunication (which released his subjects from allegiance) was politically dangerous. It is equally undisputed that the Emperor resumed his defiance of the Pope as soon as he left Canossa, and fought him, victoriously, to the end of his life.—C. Mirbt, *Die Absetzung Heinrichs IV* (1888); *Cambridge Mediæval History* (V, 69–71).

Carbon Theory, The. Popular apologetists, few of whom have ever read the book, still refer disdainfully to some Carbon Theory of the origin and nature of life advanced by Prof. Haeckel in his *Riddle of the Universe*. This is supposed to be "completely discredited in science." It will be found that, instead of proposing a new theory, Haeckel spoke of the Carbon Theory as already thirty-three years old in 1899 (cheap ed. of the *Riddle*, p. 91), and the principles of it which he recommends are now commonplaces of biochemistry. Organic chemistry is, in fact, often called Carbon Chemistry, so preponderant do we find the role of carbon in living matter.

Cardinals. The Pope's counsellors or Sacred Court. Originally the word (from *cardo* = hinge) was taken as equivalent to "important" or "principal" and was applied to the chief churches and the priests who served them. In the sixth century it was restricted in Rome to the heads of the parishes, and in the eleventh century the election of the Pope (hitherto made openly by priests and people) was confined to these "cardinals." The name was still given to the clergy of a cathedral or mother-church elsewhere until 1585.

Carducci, Professor Giosue (1836-1907), Italian poet and Nobel Prize winner. He was professor of literature at Bologna University and for many years leader of the realistic school of Italian letters. During this period he wrote a *Hymn to Satan* which was defiantly Rationalistic. He later moderated his tone, but did not alter his convictions. "I know neither Truce of God nor any peace with the Vatican," Professor Corelle quotes him saying (*Naturalismo Italiano*, 1911). His prose and poetry fill twenty volumes, and he was awarded the Nobel Prize for Literature in 1906.

Carlyle, Richard (1790-1843), rebel publisher. A working man who was so fired by reading the works of Paine that he took up the sale of them when the Government suspended the Habeas Corpus Act in 1817, and he became one of the bravest fighters for freedom of speech. He went on to print and publish them, as well as *The Republican*, *The Deist*, and other periodicals. In all he spent nine years and four months in jail and continued to direct the work from jail while his wife and assistants sold the banned publications. He "did more than any other Englishman of his day for the freedom of the Press," says the *Dictionary of National Biography*. Like Paine, he was a Deist (G. A. Aldred, *Life of Richard Carlyle*, 3rd ed., 1941).

Carlyle, Thomas (1795-1881). He discarded Christian belief, under the influence of Gibbon, while he was a student of divinity, and the study of Goethe later led him to abandon belief in a personal God and immortality. The vague Pantheism which he then adopted is seen in his *Sartor Resartus* (1834). His fame as an historian (*French Revolution*, 1836-7) and essayist rose so high that in 1874 he was offered, and refused, the Grand Cross of the Order of the Bath. His disdain of Christianity breaks out repeatedly in his works—in his essay on Voltaire he praises him for having given "the death-stab to superstition," and he is very outspoken in his *Frederick the Great* and his *Life of Sterling*—but his own creed remained vague, especially as he was temperamentally opposed to

science. He detested equally the Churches, Positivism, Evolution, and (though he wrote with deep sympathy of the cruel condition of the workers) Democracy. In conversation he, while strongly opposed to Spencer, professed Agnosticism. To the poet Allingham, who tells us this in his *Diary* (1907), he said: "I have for many years strictly avoided going to church and having anything to do with Mumbo-Jumbo" (p. 217), and in reply to a question about a future life he said: "We know nothing: all is, and must be, utterly incomprehensible" (p. 269). He said much the same to Tennyson (Hallam Tennyson's *Alfred Lord Tennyson*, 1897, II, 410). The best biography is that of D. A. Wilson, *Carlyle* (6 vols., 1923-34).

Carnegie, Andrew, LL.D. (1835-1919), philanthropist. Beginning life as a weaver in the United States, to which he had been taken at the age of eleven, Carnegie became one of the richest men of the country, and no other rich man ever made so altruistic a use of his fortune. He himself repudiated the title of philanthropist and said that he was simply "a distributor of wealth for the improvement of mankind." His latest biographer, B. J. Kendrick, says that he gave away £70,000,000 or nine-tenths of the fortune he had accumulated. Showing that he was a sceptic from boyhood, Kendrick tells us that one sabbath his mother said to him: "You would have enjoyed the sermon to-day, Andrew; there wasn't a word of religion in it." In the books he wrote (*The Gospel of Wealth*, 1900, and *The Life of James Watt*, 1905) he was generally reticent about religion, but there are Agnostic observations in the latter. He speaks of "the mysterious realm which envelops man" (p. 33) and says that "we are but young in all this mystery business" (p. 54). Dr. M. D. Conway, who knew him well, says that he always described himself as an Agnostic, and in 1912 he made a sort of confession of faith (reproduced in the *Truthseeker*, August 23, 1919) in which he abjured "all creeds" and said that he was "a disciple of Confucius and Franklin." A Catholic weekly stated that when he was once challenged about

his many gifts of church organs he humorously replied that he did this "in the hope that the organ music would distract the congregation's attention from the rest of the service."

Carnot, Count Lazare Nicolas Marguerite (1753–1823), French statesman. A distinguished military engineer under the Revolution, then a member of the Directorate, and finally Minister of War and of the Interior under Napoleon (who gave him his title), he proved one of "the irreconcilables," or refused to bend the knee to Baal, under the restored monarchy. Arago says, in his *Biographie de Carnot* (1850), that he left the Roman Church early in life and remained a Freethinker until death. His eldest son, **Sadi Nicolas Leonard Carnot** (1796–1832), was one of the most brilliant physicists of his age. "Carnot's Principle" is considered one of the foundations of the science of thermodynamics. His second son, **Lazare Hippolyte Carnot** (1801–88), was a lawyer and statesman of distinction. He was Minister of Public Instruction after the Revolution of 1848 and anticlerical democratic deputy in the Chambre under the Third Republic. The grandson, **Marie François Sadi Carnot** (1837–94), entered political life under the Third Republic and became in succession Minister of Public Works, Minister of Finance, and, in 1887, President of the Republic. He was assassinated by a fanatic after having directed the secularization of France for seven years.

Caroline, Queen of England (1683–1737), wife of George II. Daughter of the Margrave of Brandenburg-Ansbach and exceptionally studious for one of her rank, she put herself under the tuition of the philosopher Leibnitz and continued to correspond with him and study philosophy after she became Princess of Wales and began to live in England (1714). Deism was then widespread in cultivated circles, and her house at Richmond was regarded as one of the chief centres of the heresy. When, on several occasions, she had to act as Regent in the King's absence from England, Parliament had to pass a special Act excusing her from taking the oath. The *Dictionary of National*

Biography admits this, but professes to regard as mere gossip the statement that she remained a Deist to the end of her life and refused to take the sacrament although the Archbishop of Canterbury and the leading Minister, Sir R. Walpole (himself a sceptic), begged her to do so. But the fact is beyond question. The Queen's closest friend, Lord Hervey, describes the death-bed scene in his *Memoirs* (1847, II, p. 518). The Earl of Bristol says that her heterodoxy was notorious (*Letter-Books of John Hervey*, III, p. 196), and Lord Chesterfield describes her as "a Deist, believing in a future state" (*Characters*, p. 1406).

Carpenter, Edward (1844–1929), author. He was a priest of the Church of England and Fellow of Trinity (Cambridge) until 1874, when, under the influence of Walt Whitman, he became a Rationalist. The prose-poems (in the style of Whitman) and essays which he published made him known throughout the country, and his austere character (though combined with ethical heterodoxy) and high idealism were deeply respected. His Rationalist views are particularly seen in *My Days and Dreams* (1916), but find expression in all his works.

Carpenter, Prof. William Benjamin, C.B., M.D., LL.D., F.R.S. (1813–1885), naturalist. A man of exceptionally wide erudition and rare public spirit, Carpenter was especially distinguished in medicine—he was Fullerian Professor of Physiology at the Royal Institution and Professor of Forensic Medicine at University College—and geology (Swiney Lecturer at the British Museum and Lyell Medallist of the Geological Society). He received also the medal of the Royal Society. He was an enthusiast for popular education and was President of the London Sunday Lecture Society, which frequently gave Rationalist lectures at that time, from 1869 until he died, and of the Newcastle Sunday Society. In his *Nature and Man* (1888) he professes a broad Theism, but he was not a Unitarian.

Carus, Paul, Ph.D. (1852–1919), philosopher. A German-American who settled in Chicago and, with the aid of generous funds supplied by his father-in-law, attempted to propagate Monism

(on more philosophic lines than Haeckel's system) in America. He founded *The Monist* and *The Open Court* and published valuable contributions to comparative religion as well as philosophy.

Casimir-Périer, Jean Paul Pierre (1847-1907), President of the French Republic. After serving two terms (1890 and 1893) as President of the Chambre in the heat of the conflict with the Church he was elected President of the Republic (1894). He was very moderate in speech, but he gave valuable evidence for the accused at the trial of Dreyfus, and throughout the whole period of his higher political activity (1877-1895) he co-operated in the secularization of France and the destruction of the power of the Church.

Cassels, Walter Richard (1826-1907), author of *Supernatural Religion*. He had a prosperous business in India and was a member of the Syndicate of Bombay University and of the Legislative Council of Bombay. He retired from trade in 1865 and devoted himself to the preparation of his work. It was published anonymously in two volumes in 1874 (a third appeared in 1876) and was one of the most widely discussed books of the time on the scholarly criticism of the Bible. In it (I, 73) he confesses a belief in an impersonal God, but he later rejected this and professed Agnosticism.

Catacombs, The. These galleries, partly water-worn and partly excavated, in the soft rocks below the Roman district, with their thousands of graves, are often cited as proof of the large number of the martyrs of the early Roman Church; but it is recognized to-day that the greater part of the graves belong to the fourth century, when there were no martyrs. The Christians of the second and third centuries protected their dead by digging private cemeteries (the first catacombs) under fields outside the city which belonged to members of the Church. These were greatly extended when the Church, on account of the long peace and the relaxation of moral discipline, grew in numbers in the third century. They were deserted and neg-

lected when Constantine gave the Church freedom and wealth; but in the second half of the century Pope "St." Damasus, a man of few scruples [see], opened them up and fabricated martyr-titles for a very large number of the graves. Since it is not now disputed by the leading Catholic experts, like Father Delahaye, Mgr. Duchesne, and Prof. Ehrhard [see *Martyrs*], that there were very few Roman martyrs in three centuries, or that Damasus forged his epitaphs, it is clear that all but a few of those buried in the Catacombs had died in their beds; and the descriptions in Catholic literature of the faithful gathering for "mass" at the tombs while scouts watched for Roman soldiers are taken from "lives of the martyrs," which are dismissed by every expert as forgeries. See R. Lanciani, *Pagan and Christian Rome* (1892), and A. Jerovsek, *Die römischen Katakomben* (1902).

Catastrophic Theory, The. We find a belief that earlier ages ended in cataclysms or world-wide catastrophes spread over a considerable range, from the Amerinds to the Babylonians, but the phrase now refers particularly to an attempt to reconcile *Genesis* and geology. While geological research was still very incomplete, it seemed that there were certain remarkable "discontinuities" or gaps in the series of the stratified rocks. The "days" of creation were then held to be long geological periods ending in the "nights" of great catastrophes. Modern geology has no difficulty whatever with these disturbances in the succession of strata. The constant change of land and water-surface and the occurrence of Ice Ages, when the mountain ranges reached a great height, obviously explain why the deposition of sediment and formation of rocks were suspended over large areas (which rose above the water) during long ages. Some of the Ice Ages destroyed whole populations of living things over millions of square miles.

Categorical Imperative, The. A phrase invented by Kant to express what he believed to be the character of the moral sentiment: that its imperious commands are independent of considerations of consequences or expediency. Kant was a man of very isolated and

eccentric life who had been reared in a strict puritanical environment, and he never attempted to study the moral consciousness of others, so that his ethical philosophy is rather an analysis of one highly sophisticated individual conscience. His critics said that as he had destroyed the foundations of the ordinary arguments for God and immortality in his *Critique of Pure Reason*, he felt compelled to appeal to "practical reason." Neither psychology nor the modern science of ethics countenances his idea. [See *Conscience*; *Ethics*; *Intuition*.]

Cathari, The. One large body in the revolt against Rome which spread over North Italy, France, and Germany in the twelfth century, after the re-awakening of the mind of Europe, consisted of Evangelical Christians of strict life who were known as the Cathari (the Greek for "pure"). The name is wrongly extended to the Albigensians, only the select minority or inner circle of whom were ascetic, and other rebels. It properly means Christians who abhorred the corruption of the Church and its perversion of the teaching of the Gospels. They were for the most part annihilated in the truculent persecutions inaugurated by Innocent III. [See also *Waldensians*.]

Cathedrals, The Mediæval. Catholic apologists take advantage of our appreciation of these superb memorials of one of the world's great art-periods to draw from them quite illegitimate arguments in favour of their Church. They claim that the Roman Church alone could inspire such art, and that the noble buildings bear witness to the deep religious feeling and docility of the people of the Middle Ages. The general public is not sufficiently instructed to reflect that no great artistic efflorescence ever occurred in a period of undisturbed faith or of puritanism, and the literary men who endorse the Catholic argument never read authoritative modern historians on the real character of the Middle Ages or dream of consulting architectural experts. These experts, as is shown in the article *Art and Religion*, resent the superficial inferences of the apologist and point out that the only religious significance

of mediæval art is that the Church was then the wealthiest patron of artists. A few points on the cathedrals in particular are to be noted.

1. The argument of the apologist leaves wholly unexplained the fact that the Catholic Church itself lost all its supposed architectural inspiration in just the same proportion as the rest of the world when the Middle Ages ended. Spain had its Renaissance later than other countries, but it ended within a century, and the entire Catholic world passed into a condition of inglorious artistic sterility. The reduction of its wealth was not the cause, for the building of the great cathedrals did not demand great wealth; and on the other hand the Roman Church in the United States or in Germany has more wealth than the whole of Europe had in the thirteenth century, yet remains artistically insipid. The one notable emulation of mediæval art in modern times was the rebuilding of Rheims Cathedral, and this was achieved in the most sceptical country in Europe. On artistic grounds alone it would be possible to raise such buildings in any country to-day if it were desired.

2. The cathedral-development was a natural outcome of the economic recovery of Europe and the concentration of the new wealth in the hands of the clergy and monks, as all modern historians of art point out. It began in the eleventh century with the erection of Romanesque churches in the part of Germany which had been awakened by contact with North Italy, where Lombard art lingered, and Constantinople (through marriage with a Greek princess). Some experts (see Leader Scott, *The Cathedral Builders*, 1899) hold that the art of the ancient Roman sculptors and builders, which was finely employed by the Ostrogoths in the sixth century and by the Lombards—both peoples were anti-Papal—in the seventh and eighth, still sheltered under the protection of the Italian Alps, and that the builders as well as the style (Romanesque) came from there. Whatever the beginning, the rich bishops and abbots of Germany soon vied with each other in employing the new art; and in no part of Europe were prelates more

dissolute. The Gothic style [see] was developed from the Romanesque in north-central France, chiefly in and round Paris, at a time when the bishoprics and abbays were generally corrupt. It was developed very slowly during two centuries, and by technical advances which the modern authorities trace on purely secular, and in the main utilitarian, lines.

3. If the beauty of the buildings reflects deep piety, this can be only the piety of the architects; yet few of the names of these are known, and where a name is preserved it is apt to be that of a man who was anything but pious or puritanical. The architect of the beautiful Speyer Cathedral, for instance, was the Bishop of Osnabruck, a sensual and worldly man who was religious only in title and revenues, and lived in one of the most depraved periods (eleventh century) of German civilization; as the Protestant historian Prof. Hauck shows in his *Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands* (5 vols., 1912). A few of the later Gothic cathedrals, or part of them—some took centuries to build—were erected in a time of religious revival, but in far more cases the reluctant people complained bitterly of the sacrifices which the clergy imposed upon them, or the civic authorities candidly boasted (as did those of Florence in 1294) that they just wanted to outshine other cities. Recent authorities insist that this mediæval art was “civic art” or “the art of the new communes.”

4. But the decisive reply is found in the genuine moral and social history of the Middle Ages. The Cathedral Age coincides with the legendary Age of Chivalry [see also Middle Ages], and was one of the most openly licentious in history. The cathedrals themselves were not only used on certain days during the whole period for blasphemous and indecent parodies of the Mass [see *Feast of Fools, of the Ass*, etc.], but were very profanely abused every day for frivolity, assignations, soliciting—in Germany the prostitutes were called Cathedral Girls—and huckstering. The indecent gargoyles on the façades of many cathedrals reflect the temper of the age as faithfully as do the statues of the

saints. There were many pious folk, but the general level of morals, particularly in regard to sex, was at least as low as in any period of history. On the artistic side see E. Fauré, *History of Art* (Engl. trans., 4 vols., 1921), Moore's *Gothic Architecture* (1899), and Leader Scott's *Cathedral Builders* (1899). A score of articles in this Encyclopædia describe the corruption of the age, as every expert on each country of Europe—Traill's *Social England* (1902, Vol. II), Luchaire's historical works for France, Fisher's *Mediæval Empire* for Germany, etc.—describes it.

Catherine of Aragon. The Catholic writers boast of Pope Clement VII's heroic spiritual firmness in refusing to grant Henry VIII a divorce from Catherine and ascribe the English Reformation to this frustration of the King's “lust.” The Catholic historian Lord Acton showed long ago, in his *Historical Essays and Studies* (1907, Ch. I), that this is a gross misrepresentation. The Pope privately assured Henry of his willingness to annul the marriage, but he was restrained by fear of his nephew, the Emperor. Rome had for centuries found pretexts to annul royal and noble (wealthy) marriages almost whenever it was asked or paid to do so [see *Divorce*], and the refusal in this and a few other cases was purely political. The same Pope Clement had already (1525) granted a scandalous divorce to Henry's licentious sister Margaret. See also Froude's *History of England* (I, 139-47).

Catherine II (1729-96), Empress of Russia. The demoralization of Catherine's later years must not obscure the fact that in her prime she was a sceptic of high humanitarian ideals. It was the excesses of the French revolutionaries, as represented by fugitive nobles and prelates, that led to her change of views. Until that time she had been in complete sympathy and constant correspondence with Voltaire and other anti-Christian French humanitarians. She had materially helped Diderot and invited him to settle in Russia. In her letters to Paris she scorned the “mummies” of the Russian Church and made a quaint profession of Deism: “I am one of the imbeciles who believe in

God." Under French influence she founded many schools for the people, for the first time in Russia, and ordered a reform of the laws and of the administration of justice. "The people are not created for us, but we for the people," she wrote in an instruction of the year 1767. For many years she devoted herself to reform and philanthropy, but the corruption of the age defeated her good resolutions, and the outbreak of the Revolution drove her into the arms of the reactionaries. (See McCabe's *Romance of the Romanoffs*, 1917, Ch. XI.)

Catholic. The word is used occasionally in ancient Greek writers and the early Greek Fathers in the sense of "universal" or "general." It began to be applied to the Church when heretical sects appeared in the second century, but it was chiefly the struggle against the Donatist schism in the fourth and fifth centuries that fixed the title. The doctrine of the "whole" Church was to rebuke sects and schisms. Since the Greek Church was never united with Rome it is hardly appropriate, and the eagerness of those who call themselves Anglo-Catholics to protest that they belong to the "Universal Church," while repudiating one of its chief dogmas (Papal Supremacy), is not impressive. The entire complex of ideas and sentiments associated with the word "Catholic" is a flat defiance of the modern spirit of progress and of free discussion and challenge.

Catholic Encyclopædia, The. A very pretentious work in fifteen large and sumptuous volumes (1907-12), which was financed by the wealthy Catholics of the United States. In the Introduction it promises "the whole truth without prejudice" and says that in ascertaining the truth "the most recent and acknowledged scientific methods are employed." In reality it often employs the worst tricks and vices of Catholic propaganda, so that it can safely be consulted only for illustrations of these and for details of undisputed Catholic teaching, ritual, and administration. In Biblical matters—one need not read farther than "Adam"—it is almost always Fundamentalist; in biography (of saints, Popes, etc.) it is

childishly credulous; in history, particularly the history of the Papacy and of the crimes and vices of the Middle Ages, it is monstrosously untruthful; in quoting authorities it is gravely deceitful; and in scientific articles (evolution, etc.) it is little above the level of the American Baptists. An exposure of its historical methods will be found in McCabe's *Popes and their Church* (4th ed., 1904, pp. 97-109), but specimens occur in many articles of this work. Another feature of interest is that the writers are almost entirely priests or professional propagandists, which reveals the extraordinary poverty of the Church in distinguished lay scholars. Hilaire Belloc is entrusted with only one short article ("Land Tenure"), and that on a "safe" subject. The peculiarities of Catholic Truth exhibited in the work are so singular that, in order to confuse the non-Catholic who might compare the articles with those of ordinary encyclopædias, the American and English Catholics went on to secure an important influence in the writing of the latest edition of the *Encyclopædia Britannica* and the new *Encyclopædia Americana*. [See *Encyclopædias*.]

Causality, The Law of. The exact nature of the relation of what we call cause and effect has been the subject of much controversy. Hume rejected the idea of cause, and Kant declared it to be a subjective form of thought. Men of science sought to avoid any mystic implication by substituting "antecedent and consequent" for cause and effect, but it is obvious that of several events which are immediately antecedent to another event, one (the true cause) has a special relation to it which the others have not. In practice the philosophical difficulty is ignored, and the Law of Causality—the empirical fact that in nature occurrences always have causes—was retained and was said to be one of the bases of science. In recent years certain obscure movements of electrons were declared by Sir A. Eddington and a very few other physicists to be uncaused. [See *Indeterminism*.] Apart from the fact that Sir A. Eddington does not believe in the existence of a material world, it was pointed out by the majority of experts that to claim

that an event has no cause because—in a very obscure field of research—we do not at once discover the determining cause is neither logical nor scientific. In spite of these protests Press and pulpit announced once more that “the foundations of science were crumbling” and we were returning to spiritual views.

Cave Man. A popular expression for the various races of prehistoric men who during the last phase of the Quaternary Ice Age lived in rock-shelters or caves. Most authorities estimate that the phase lasted more than 100,000 years, covering the Mousterian, Aurignacian, Solutrean, Magdalenian, and Azilian periods, so that communal life during these ages led to considerable progress. The advance in art is discussed in *Art, Prehistoric*. The fact that at one stage we find skulls of a large cerebral capacity has been used by emergent evolutionists to suggest the sudden appearance in man of a “soul.” This loose and purely verbal interpretation leaves in obscurity the question of the evolution of the brain itself and ignores the fact that just such large skulls are commonly found, as a normal feature of a tall and powerful body, in mountaineering peoples of no great intelligence. The vulgar idea of the Cave Man seems to be founded on a discredited theory of certain sociologists, that the strong man of the group monopolized the women until younger men could defeat him. Cave Man at the height of the Ice Age was nearest to the Eskimos, who are remarkably peaceful and very ready to lend a wife to a friend or traveller.

Cave-Birth Myths. The popular Christian belief, which is dramatically represented in Catholic churches at Christmas, that Jesus was born in a cave has not even a basis in the Gospel legends. Mark and John say nothing about the birth at Bethlehem. Matthew speaks of a “house” at Bethlehem, and Luke of a “manger” because there was “no room in the inn.” Luke’s narrative is so obviously synthetic that even Biblical theologians who are considered orthodox reject this story as a late accretion. When the bishops of the American Episcopal Church tried in

1922 to insist upon orthodoxy, the staff of their own professors in the Theological School at Cambridge (Mass.) issued a scathing reply, contending, among other matters, that the story of the miraculous birth of Jesus was so demonstrably a fiction which the Greeks added to the Gospels that it must be rejected (*Creeds and Loyalties*, 1923, p. 87, etc.). The story is, however, interesting as an illustration of the way in which the legend of Jesus was compiled from contemporary mythologies. St. Jerome ingenuously lets us see, in his *Commentary on Ezekiel* (Migne ed., XXV, 82), how the compilers came to speak of a cave at Bethlehem. There was, he says—and he lived many years in Palestine—a cave in a grove at Bethlehem which was a temple of Tammuz or Adonis: the Babylonian and Syrian version of the young god associated with the mother-earth goddess. The Mithraists notoriously celebrated, and on December 25, the birth of their saviour in an underground temple which was known as a cave; and the Egyptians, according to the *Paschal Chronicle* (Migne, XCII, 385), which is confirmed by Macrobius (*Saturnalia*, I, 18), celebrated the birth of Horus on “the shortest day,” exhibiting an image of him as a babe in a manger with his virgin-mother (the *Chronicle* says). For the birth of other gods (Dionysos, etc.), or the worship of the new-born god in a basket or cradle, see Robertson’s *Christianity and Mythology* (1900, pp. 197–215). The “cave” first appears in the Christian story in an apocryphal gospel of Matthew. However widely we recognize a vegetation-myth in legends of slain and resurrected gods, the birth in a cave in midwinter seems to refer to the sun, as Macrobius suggested, emerging from the darkness of winter. [See also Christmas.]

Cavendish, The Honourable Henry, F.R.S. (1731–1810), famous chemist. Son of Lord Charles Cavendish and nephew of the Duke of Devonshire, he devoted himself and a large fortune to so intense a study of science that it formed almost the only interest in his life. He made important discoveries in chemistry (the composition of water, etc.), and his success in physics is commemorated by the Cavendish Society

and the Cavendish Physical Laboratory at Cambridge. He was considered the most eminent natural philosopher of his age. "As to Cavendish's religion," says his biographer, G. Wilson (*Life of the Hon. H. Cavendish*, 1851, p. 180), "he was nothing at all."

Cecco d' Ascoli (1257-1327), Rationalist martyr. Francesco (diminutive "Cecco") degli Stabili of Ascoli, for many years professor at Bologna University, was one of the most learned men of science of the fourteenth century. He was distinguished in mathematics and astronomy and was a man of very wide culture. His long poem *Acerba*, of which twenty editions were published in the half-century after the invention of printing, embodied all the scientific knowledge of his age, and he made a valiant effort to induce the world to listen to the appeal which Roger Bacon had made, more feebly, and the Papacy had smothered. He was "a man of immense erudition and great and varied abilities . . . but his freethinking and plain speaking got him many enemies," said the article in the *Encyclopædia Britannica* until the Catholic revision of the last edition. As the Inquisition was now fully established and particularly attentive to science, Cecco was punished for impiety in 1324, and as he persisted, he was condemned and burned at the stake in Florence at the age of seventy. He met death with such courage that the friars declared that he was inspired by the Devil.

Celibacy. The state of the unmarried adult, a term usually applied to men and women who live under a vow of virginity. The sexual tabu, which begins to develop among the higher savages as a result of speculation on a woman's "uncleanness," is apt to lead to a demand for this abstention in sacred persons. We find not only the Virgins dedicated to the Sun in Peru or to the service of Diana at Ephesus, the Vestal Virgins of Rome, and the celibate Aztec priests, the Buddhist and Jain monks, and the priests of Serapis in the latest period of ancient Egypt, but many examples even among the shamans and medicine-men of the uncivilized Indians of America. In some cases, as in the

Phrygian cult of the Great Mother, the priests were compelled to castrate themselves. St. Paul stamped upon early Christianity such a loathing of the "flesh"—the idea that it was Devil-created had spread from Persia—and the Fathers so far sustained his feeling against marriage, especially as the Essenian aversion from it had been put into the mouth of Jesus in the Gospels, that a demand for the celibacy of the priests was inevitable. But the reluctance of the clergy and of a large part of the laity (who feared for their wives and daughters) was so great that the struggle of the puritans to impose a law in the Latin Church was drawn out for more than a thousand years and definitely ended only in the Lateran Council of 1215. The Council of Nicæa, in the fourth century, had refused to make a law, and the decrees of a few Spanish and Italian Councils—passed in spite of the fact that the Fathers, from Jerome and Augustine to Benedict, tell us [*see Monasticism*] that there was from the start an appalling corruption of the monks and "sacred virgins"—had only local effect. Marriage of priests, and in some countries (Ireland, parts of France, etc.) monks, was normal until the eleventh century, when Hildebrand and his fierce puritan associates started a violent, often brutal, movement—that of the Patarenes [*see*]—against the married clergy. The struggle continued until 1215. The details and the increase of vice which followed in the Latin Church—Greek priests may, and usually do, marry—are described in H. C. Lea's *History of Sacerdotal Celibacy in the Christian Church* (4th ed., 1932). F. Chavard, *Le célibat, le prêtre, et la femme* (1894), gives, besides chapters on the ensuing vice, some account of the efforts of the clergy in modern times to get the law revoked. Cotter Morison's *Service of Man* (cheap ed., 1903) has some very plain chapters on the corruption of the celibate clergy, but the full story would require many volumes. Irregularities were quite general and little regarded in the Italian, Spanish, and Spanish-American Churches until recent times, and they are common, in spite of the heretical environment, in the United States, Great Britain, and

Germany. For the recent appalling scandals in Germany, see Germany, Religion in.

Celsus, Aurelius (second century). The most learned scholar of the early Church, Origen, left a work (*Contra Celsum*) from which we learn that the chief opponent of the new religion was a sceptic named Celsus. Unfortunately, later Christians at their triumph burned his works, but we gather that he made a Voltairean attack in his *True Word* (about 175-180) upon the Gospel story and suggested that Jesus had learned magic in Egypt and duped the Jews. Celsus was probably an Epicurean. Froude has a chapter on him in his *Short Studies* (1907, Vol. IV).

Censorship, The Roman. From the second century onward the authorities of the Roman Church condemned heretical writings, but their Index of Prohibited Books did not appear until the sixteenth century. The rapid multiplication of books through the invention of printing and the spread of Protestantism had created a new situation, and various lists of books which had earlier been compiled for the guidance of Inquisitors were blended with lists of new Protestant publications to make the Index in its first form. It purported to give the names of books which were "injurious to faith or morals," but even Dr. Putnam, whose work on the subject is deplorably weak and often inaccurate—several American priests were invited to co-operate in the preparation of it—writes that "the most obscene books in any literature escaped the Papal censure." Catholic Italy in the fifteenth century had produced an erotic literature that would have astonished a Roman pagan of the fourth century, and Popes had patronized and rewarded the writers. The sole genuine purpose of the Index, which was published by the University of Paris (1544) and the University of Louvain (1546) before Rome moved, was to direct Inquisitors in the detection of heretics. The early editions were full of such comical blunders that they provoked the derision of the Protestants; yet some of the grossest errors were left unaltered until the nineteenth century, and even the latest edition (1929) is entertaining

reading and makes a mockery of the claim that the Vatican is a vigilant and well-informed international organization. Works are now rarely "put on the Index," because every priest lets his people know the law (emphasized in the latest edition of the Code) that it is a mortal sin (punished with hell) to read books that criticize the Church and its doctrines or ministers. Dr. G. H. Putnam's *Censorship of the Church of Rome* (2 vols., 1906) is the most learned work on the subject, but is designed to conciliate Catholics and is often, especially in the Introduction, unreliable. Its errors are corrected, and a much shorter account given, in McCabe's *History and Meaning of the Catholic Index of Forbidden Books* (1931, published in America).

Census of Religions. In most countries the census-paper no longer includes an inquiry into the citizen's religion, and where it is retained, the results are worthless and often ludicrous. In America the religious figures given by the Census authorities are admittedly supplied by the clergy, and even Catholic writers have [see United States] repeatedly exposed the dishonest method of compiling the statistics. "They are worth less than nothing," says the Rev. Dr. McConnell (*Christianity*, 1910, p. 229). In the case of Czecho-Slovakia [see] the total population at the last Census (1930) was said, in the *World Almanac*, to be 10,807,096, yet the Catholic section of the population was given as 10,831,000, besides 3,000,000 of other religions or none! This was repeated in all the chief annuals and works of reference. In "atheistic" Germany (Census 1933) 62.78 per cent. of the population were returned as Protestants and 32.56 as Catholics, leaving less than 5 per cent. as Jews, sectarians, or of no religion. In Italy, where at least one-third of the population have no religion—as the results of the last free elections showed—the Census returned 99 per cent. Catholic. In most of the countries which still inquire about religion the people are told to say in which creed they were baptized or which they favour, and there is no official provision for a declaration of "no religion." Denmark is more

advanced than Holland, yet at the last Census the Danes reported only 17,000 as of no religion and the Dutch 1,144,393. The world-totals of Catholics, Protestants, Buddhists, etc., are compiled from these ridiculous figures. [See *Statistics of Religion*.]

Centre Party, The. The larger of the two political organizations into which all German Catholics were drafted until 1933. It was established by Windthorst, an able lawyer, in 1871, when the annexation of Alsace-Lorraine added great strength to the Catholic provinces of the Empire and encouraged them to unite in opposition to Protestant Prussia. The struggle (*Kulturkampf*) which Bismarck then had for some years with the Church hardened the Catholic organization, and the Catholic delegates in the Reichstag formed a powerful body between Right and Left, or a Centre Party. They were reconciled with Bismarck in 1879, and Catholic writers ascribe this to the accession of "the Pope of Peace," Leo XIII. No German historian questions that Bismarck secretly bargained with the Pope for Catholic support of the military measures which inaugurated Germany's fatal modern development and of his attempt to crush Socialism. From that date, during fifty years, the Catholic vote diminished, in spite of the usual heavy Catholic birth-rate, and Socialism grew. According to the official *Statistisches Jahrbuch* the percentage of the Catholic vote fell from 20 to 18 before the end of the century, and in the last democratic elections (1932 and 1933) it was only about 11. The Catholic body, politically represented by the Centre Party and the Bavarian People's Party, was ruined before Hitler (whom the Pope directed Catholics to support in the last election) seized power. [See *Germany, Religion in*.]

Chair of Peter, The. The Roman authorities occasionally exhibit for the veneration of the faithful an armchair, handsomely decorated with gold and ivory, which they represent to be the authentic chair used by Peter when he was "bishop of Rome." In modern critical times it is admitted that the gold and ivory were added later, but even the *Catholic Encyclopædia* claims that the

antique oak chair which has been overlaid with them is genuine. The ground for this egregious (but profitable) claim is that a Feast of the Chair of St. Peter was certainly celebrated in the fourth century—the century in which Rome began to forge saints and relics on the heroic scale. The claim is ensnared by the admission that Rome had at that time two Chairs of Peter, in rival churches, and Antioch had a third. Apart from the notorious facility of the Roman Church in manufacturing relics and legends there is strong evidence that Peter [see] never was in Rome. Robertson (*Pagan Christs*, p. 357) suggests that the original chair was that of the Mithraic "high priest." Rossi, the Italian archæologist, thought it the seat of a member of the Senate.

Chaldeans, The. The statement of *Genesis* (XI, 31) that Abraham came of "Ur of the Chaldees" is one of the proofs of the late date of the legend, for the Chaldeans (properly Kaldi) did not enter Babylonian history until more than a thousand years after the supposed date of Abraham. Sir L. Woolley (*Abraham*, 1936) consoles the orthodox by suggesting that the phrase has no more significance than if a popular historian loosely said that Cæsar invaded England. It has, in fact, exactly the same significance, since, obviously, no writer could speak of Cæsar invading "England" until six centuries at least after the time of Cæsar. The anachronism is far worse in the Hebrew case, since the period is longer. The Chaldeans enter history in the seventh century B.C., when they helped to overthrow the Assyrians and took over the kingdom of Babylon. Under Nebuchadrezzar they made the city the finest and most advanced, in science as well as in prosperity, in the world, and the book of *Daniel* [see] is totally erroneous both in regard to the character of the monarch and the fall of the city. (See Sayce, *The Higher Criticism and the Monuments*, 8 ed., 1915.)

Chamberlain, Professor Basil Hall (1850–1918), authority on Japan. Son of Vice-Admiral Chamberlain, and brother of the Houston Stewart Chamberlain who became an apostle of Germanism, he settled in Japan, and

was for many years professor of Japanese philology at the Tokyo Imperial University. His dictionary or cyclopædia *Things Japanese* (4 ed., 1902) and other works were standard authorities on Japan. He was an Agnostic and an Honorary Associate of the R.P.A.

Chamberlain, Daniel Henry (1835–1907), American statesman. One of the leading lawyers of South Carolina, he served as Attorney-General from 1868 to 1872 and was Governor of the State from 1874 to 1877. He had a very high reputation, and many were astonished after his death to learn that he had left a declaration of Agnosticism, which was published in the *North American Review* and reprinted in *The Freethinker* (November 15, 1908). "I reject the whole Christian religion," he said, as well as belief in "a presiding and controlling Deity."

Chambers, Ephraim, F.R.S. (1680–1740), originator of *Chambers's Encyclopædia*. He began in early years to compile his *Cyclopædia* "for the people"—he was the son of a worker—and it was published in two volumes in 1728. It was this which inspired the great French Rationalists to write their *Dictionnaire Encyclopédique*. Chambers was admitted to the Royal Society and, although he was "an avowed Freethinker" (*Dict. Nat. Biog.*), he was buried in the cloisters of Westminster Abbey.

Chambers, Robert, LL.D. (1802–71), author of the *Vestiges*. He abandoned a course of training for the Church, having ceased to believe in Christianity, and became a bookseller at Edinburgh. With his brother he founded the publishing firm of W. and R. Chambers, and he established *Chambers's Journal* in 1832. He was admitted to the Edinburgh Royal Society in 1840, and in 1843 he published, anonymously, a work on evolution, *Vestiges of the Natural History of Creation*, which caused a sensation in the reading public. It was even attributed to Sir C. Lyell. Chambers was a non-Christian Theist.

Champollion, Jean François (1790–1832), eminent French Egyptologist. He was professor of history at Grenoble and master of several Oriental languages. His works put him in the front rank of

French savants, and his fame spread to all countries when he discovered the key to the Egyptian hieroglyphic writings (1822). The *Catholic Encyclopædia*, observing that "he was a genius, but it is the testimony of all those who came in contact with him that the man was even better than the scholar," claims him for the Church. The writer must have been aware that his chief biographer, Hartleben, reproduces a Rationalist manuscript which Champollion wrote at the age of thirty and says that it is "undeniable that a change had taken place in his religious views" (*Champollion*, I, 144). Letters quoted by Hartleben confirm this, though, as Champollion spent his mature years in a high position at the Collège de France under the Royalist reaction, his public utterances were discreet.

Chance. Apologists often ask whether the orderly structure of the universe, especially as regards the organic world, could possibly be due to chance or "a fortuitous concourse of atoms." They use the illustration that we might as well mix together a large number of printer's types (of the kind used before the linotype was invented) and expect some to arrange themselves in a line of poetry. In pre-evolutionary days the reply was made that natural processes were ruled by law, and that this excludes chance. This is apt to confirm the popular idea of natural law which is made the basis of an argument for the existence of God—that laws imply a law-maker or a controlling mind—whereas a law in science is merely a formula summing up a consistent series of events, not a force controlling them. The truth is that the printer's-type argument belongs to a century or more ago, and the "fortuitous concourse of atoms" to 2,000 years ago, when the Greeks guessed at evolution but had no knowledge of the processes of nature. The advance of science, especially in showing that atoms are composed of infinitesimally small dynamic particles (or sets of waves), in extending the period of evolution to thousands of millions of years, and in discovering a vast amount of disorder and irregularity in nature, has made the apologetic argument, which is merely an appeal to the imagination,

futile. By "chance" or "fortuitous" we mean merely not directed, and the idea of such a purposive direction of atoms of matter, which was never more than a superficial phrase—Are the atoms supposed to perceive and carry out a plan?—is now quite superfluous. No astronomer postulates a directing mind to explain the evolved structure of the universe—even Sir A. Eddington scouts the idea—and no biologist of distinction questions the natural evolution of living things. [See also **Design Argument**, and **Purpose**. For Sir A. Eddington's reintroduction of "chance" see **Indeterminism**.]

Chantrey, Sir Francis Legatt, M.A., D.C.L., F.R.S. (1781–1841), sculptor. He was the son of a carpenter and began to work at the age of twelve, so that he had only a scanty education in a village school, near Sheffield, yet he became one of the greatest sculptors in the history of British art. By his will he left a large fortune to the Royal Academy for the foundation of the Chantrey Bequest. Under the influence of his friend Horne Tooke [see] he "abandoned all Christian and religious feeling" (Holland's *Memorials of Sir F. Chantrey*, 1851, pp. 349–52). He uses theistic language, however, in his poems.

Chaptal, Jean Antoine Claude, Count de Chanteloup (1756–1832), French chemist and statesman. He was one of the sceptical leaders of revolutionary days who clung to his opinions under Napoleon and the Restoration. As Minister of the Interior under Napoleon he rendered notable service to education, science, and industry, and he was ennobled for this in 1811. He returned to his chemical studies at the fall of Napoleon, but Louis XVIII recalled him to the House of Peers. His great-grandson, the Viscount A. Chaptal, editing his *Souvenirs de Napoleon* (1893), says that he "had no religion" (p. 124), but adds that he had a vague belief in "a sort of Providence."

Character. In modern scientific psychology it means the complex of capacities, habits, and attitudes which distinguish one individual from another, though some psychologists take it in the narrower sense of a man's disposition to inhibit impulsive move-

ments. In either case the idea is independent of the question whether there is anything immaterial in man, and it does not imply "will," which the majority of recent psychologists reject. Careful experiment has led to a denial of the popular belief that character can generally be judged by the face and has shown that emotions are not registered facially to anything like the extent that is commonly supposed. [See **Psychology**.]

Character and Religion. [See **Saints**.]
Charity and Rationalism. [See **Philanthropy**.]

Charlemagne (742–814). The attempt is often made to redeem or to alleviate the barbarism of the Dark Age by appealing to the work of "Charles the Great," King of the Franks and first Roman Emperor (of the mediæval restoration), but modern history has greatly reduced the value of his achievement. About his personal character there was no dispute at any time. He never tolerated the slightest control of his conduct and had, besides five successive wives, a large number of mistresses. He permitted the grossest licence in his court, even to his daughters, and in his long war with the pagan Saxons he behaved with just the same savagery as they. A more important point is that modern historians agree that his public work was much less beneficent than tradition represented, and that he made hardly any permanent contribution to civilization. His educational plans, which are chiefly praised, were particularly ineffective. Few schools can be discovered to have been opened during his life, and all pædagogists agree that the entire scheme was abandoned by the bishops and monks after his death. An impartial and scholarly account will be found in Dr. J. Bass Mullinger's *Schools of Charles the Great* (1877). His empire fell into squalid disorder under his successors, and all Christendom steadily sank to the lowest degradation of the Dark Age (in the tenth century). His traditional fame—the French bishops canonized him—was partly based upon the impressiveness of his giant stature and strength and still more upon his services to the Church. He was

"the real founder of the ecclesiastical State, and he must be held mainly responsible for the evils which resulted from the policy of the Church," says Dr. Holland in earlier editions of the *Encyclopædia Britannica*. He might have added, however, that Charlemagne treated the Pope very contemptuously in his later years. The fine article by the distinguished historian is replaced in the last edition of the *Encyclopædia Britannica* by a panegyric by Davis. In the best, though not sufficiently critical, modern biography, that of H. W. C. Davis (*Charlemagne*, 1900), his looseness of life and "inexcusable cruelties" are admitted, and it is ingenuously explained that "the contribution of the Frank to modern civilization is altogether spiritual and impalpable." Woodruff's recent *Charlemagne* (1934) is slight and uncritical.

Charron, Pierre (1541-1603), philosopher. Originally a lawyer, he entered the ranks of the clergy and became a distinguished preacher. Under the influence of Montaigne, with whom he was friendly, he developed a considerable degree of scepticism, and his *Traité de la sagesse* (1595), a manual of ethics without religion, was violently assailed by the clergy. The Jesuits denounced it as "a brutal atheism." (See Robertson's *Short History of Freethought*, 1915, I, 480.)

Châtelet-Lomont, the Marquise Gabrielle Émilie du (1706-49), French writer. She was equally remarkable for beauty and talent, translated Virgil in her sixteenth year, and learned Italian and English as well as Latin. Voltaire greatly esteemed her, and she lived with him for thirteen years. She was, like him, a Deist, and expressed her views in her *Doutes sur les religions révélées* (published posthumously in 1792).

Chatham, The Earl of. [See Pitt, William.]

Chatterton, Thomas (1752-1770), poet. Chambers's *Encyclopædia* described him as "an English poet whose youth, genius, and tragedy have made him one of the wonders of English literature." At the age of fourteen he was apprenticed to an attorney, and, living in poverty, he forged mediæval poetry and prose which deceived even Horace

Walpole. His output was phenomenal and bewildering, but he committed suicide at the age of seventeen. Keats, Coleridge, and other poets declared him a genius and a prodigy. In his letters and will he professed his Rationalism. "I am no Christian," he wrote to his family shortly before his death. (See D. Masson's *Chatterton*, 1874.)

Chaucer, Geoffrey (1328-1400), the Father of English Poetry. The freedom, indeed pleasant cynicism, with which Chaucer speaks of the vices of Churchmen and monks in his *Canterbury Tales* has inspired a good deal of controversy about his religious beliefs. Caustic satire of monks and priests was then so common that from this alone no inference can be drawn, but, though Chaucer was certainly not a critical thinker, he seems in several places to betray a doubt about, or disbelief in, immortality. Professor Lounsbury, who has made the closest study of his religion (*Studies in Chaucer*, 3 vols., 1892), quotes two passages—one in "The Legend of Good Women" and one in "The Knight's Tale" in the *Canterbury Tales*—in which, he says, Chaucer is plainly sceptical about a future life. On the latter passage (lines 2809-15) he comments: "Can modern agnosticism point to a denial more emphatic than that made in the fourteenth century of the belief that there exists for us any assurance of the life beyond the grave?" (II, 514). He shows that Chaucer's hostility to the Church increased with age, and that he was "hostile to it in such a way that implies an utter disbelief in certain of its tenets" (II, 520). The Retraction which now closes the *Canterbury Tales* would, if it were genuine, mean that he had previously been a sceptic and was converted in his later years, but its authenticity is seriously disputed. We must remember that in Italy, to which Chaucer had been sent as an ambassador, disbelief in immortality was widespread, as Dante tells us in Canto X of the *Inferno*.

Chekov. [See Tschekov.]

Chénier, Marie Joseph (1764-1811), French poet. Religious writers, and some historians and literary men, still repeat the fable that a loose woman screeched an obscene song from the

altar of Notre Dame at Paris during the Revolution. That this is an untruth in every word will be shown in *Feast of Reason*. It is piquant that the dignified "Ode to Liberty," which was in fact recited by an unknown lady from a platform (not the altar) during an impressive pageant in the cathedral, had been composed by Marie Joseph Chénier, poet, dramatist, and politician, a Deist of high character, who worked for moderation in the midst of the Revolution. His very numerous poems, dramas, etc., are collected in eight volumes (1823-26).

Cherubini, Maria Luigi Carlo Zenobio Salvatore (1760-1842), Italian composer. He wrote a Mass at the age of thirteen and had an opera produced before he was twenty. Settling in London, he was appointed composer to the King (1780-4), but he passed to Paris and composed hymns and anthems for the Revolutionaries, a fine piece on the death of Mirabeau, and an opera entitled *Epicurus*. After 1816 he was Superintendent of the King of Italy's chapel, and he wrote a good deal of sacred music which is still popular in Catholic churches. He, however, remained a Rationalist throughout. His (Catholic) English biographer, E. Bellasis, has to admit that there is no evidence that he received the sacrament before death (*Cherubini*, 1912, p. 28), and he quotes the composer's Catholic daughter as saying that he was "not mystical but broad-minded in religion."

Child-Marriages. The *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics* devotes four pages to the lamentable practice of child-marriages in India, and—like all such censors—does not even mention that they were quite common in mediæval Christendom. Concern about property or alliances has in all ages led to betrothals, and even marriages, of the immature. In many of the ancient civilizations (Egypt, Rome, etc.) girls were often married in their early teens, but the frequency of marriage of the quite immature in Christian times is now suppressed in order to sustain the fiction that the Church "elevated" marriage, and in order to blame the Hindus more freely. The greatest and most religious of the Popes, Innocent

III, married Frederic II, for political reasons, at the age of fourteen to a totally unsuitable princess of twenty-four. Such marriages were normal, but marriages even of immature children were common enough. Dr. F. J. Furnivall's *Child Marriages, Divorces, and Ratifications* (1897) gives an account of twenty-seven of them in five years (1561-6) in the Diocese of Chester (which was then thinly populated). Many were infants of two or three years, though all were put to bed together after the marriage. The procedure was often used to prevent the Crown from taking over the guardianship (and property) of orphans, but in some cases children of eight to twelve arranged the marriages themselves, and the priests married them in church at any hour of the day or night. This was merely a continuation of Catholic custom, for Dr. Furnivall gives cases of the thirteenth century. An eight-year-old son of Lord Berkeley was, in 1289, married to a girl of eight, and they had a child at the age of thirteen. The Lancashire antiquarian J. P. Carwaker told Dr. Furnivall that he had collected a large number of cases in Catholic times and intended to publish them. He did not, and the fiction of the Church's austere protection of marriage is sustained. In Stubbes's *Anatomie of Abuses* (1593) we read that the practice was still common under Elizabeth. [For other abuses see *Divorce and Marriage*.]

Children, Pagan and Christian Attitude to. The claim that the Christian religion introduced a more tender attitude to and greater love of children is, although it has been urged by some of the leading apologists, as baseless as the statement that the Church abolished slavery or first founded schools or hospitals for the people. There is no evidence that the attitude to children in the older civilizations (Egypt, Babylon, Persia, etc.) was not normally affectionate, as it usually is even among lower peoples. The Jew is, and always has been, a kindly parent, and the Moslem sustained the tradition. The practice of infanticide or exposure in China does not concern this article, which meets the claim that a new feeling was inspired in Europe. Aside from

the fact that the zeal of the early Christians against exposure was not so much dictated by humane sentiment as by a concern for the infant's "soul," all authorities now admit that there has been a considerable exaggeration in statements about the Roman practice, and that under Stoic-Epicurean influence the Pagans themselves effected a good deal of reform before Christianity obtained any influence.

Infanticide, especially the killing of new-born girls, was a practice born of the hard conditions of the early Republic, but it was classed as murder by the Stoic lawyers and the Antonine Emperors. Lecky's passage on the subject (*History of European Morals*, cheap ed., 1911—which ought to have been severely annotated—II, 12–13), with its antiquated authorities, makes lamentable rhetorical statements, which are treasured by apologists, yet admits that the Emperors condemned the practice, and quotes Tertullian (*Ad. Nat.*, I, 15) as confirming this. There is no evidence at all that infanticide was "a crying vice of the Empire" after the first century; and in the second century Italy was more richly provided with orphanages [see] and institutions for children than any civilization until modern times. This must have greatly reduced the practice and taught regard for children. The exposure of new-born babies—laying them in a public square from which baby-farmers took them—continued, but Lecky quotes the great lawyer Paulus (*Dig.*, XXV, 3, 1, 4) as making it, in the third century, equivalent to murder. The much-quoted law of the Christian Emperors Valentinian (a notoriously brutal man) and Valens is a re-assertion of the Stoic law and does not clearly inflict the death-sentence (Pauly's *Real Encyclopädie*, "Aussetzung"). On the other hand, Constantine annulled much of the beneficent work of his Pagan predecessors by allowing poor parents to sell their children into slavery (Lecky, II, 13), his wars for the purple having caused much distress. After the collapse of the Empire there was no attempt made by the Church to restore the philanthropic or the school system of the Pagans, but doubtless exposure died out with the

decrease of pressure of population, which was reduced to one-tenth what it had been. Throughout the Middle Ages, and later, works of philanthropy for children were very few and rudimentary until the seventeenth century; but we need only recall the appalling conditions of child-life which still lingered at the beginning of the last century (no protection from cruelty, long hours of labour from the age of seven or eight onward, etc.) to realize how little Christianity had done in comparison with the fine work of the Pagan Emperors. [See also Exposure; Foundling Hospitals; Infanticide.]

Childe, Professor V. Gordon, D.Litt., D.Sc., F.R.A.I., F.S.A., F.S.A.Scot. (b. 1892), anthropologist. He is the son of an Australian clergyman and was educated at Sydney and at Oxford University, leaving Australia in 1914. He is professor of prehistoric archaeology at Edinburgh University and a member of the Archäologisches Institut des Deutschen Reichs and the Instituto di Paleontologia Italiana.

Chile, Religion in. Catholics claim practically the entire population of 4,700,000, but the fact that the Church was disestablished in 1925 at once exposes the untruth of the statement, since such a measure could be compassed only by a majority of voters, and the Church was violently opposed to it. The middle-class anti-clerical Liberals (mostly Agnostics) have been a powerful party since the War of Independence (1822), which was as much against the Church as against Spain, and they held power from 1881 to 1890 and carried a number of secularizing laws. The Church rules the illiterates, who were still 96.4 per cent. of the population at the beginning of this century. The spread of education and of advanced ideas after 1918 complicated the old feud of Blacks and Whites (clericals and anti-clericals) with the politico-economic issue, as in the whole of South America. For some years Rationalism made phenomenal progress, an Atheist-Socialist Government being in power for a time in 1922. The Church then patronized the White Guard (Fascists), and many Liberals joined with it and the Conservatives to inaugurate the

usual regime of reaction and prohibit any expression of Freethought.

China, Religion in. Religious statistics touch almost their lowest depth of absurdity in the case of China, the 400,000,000 inhabitants of which are said to be divided into Taoists, Buddhists, and Confucians. The truth is that religious feeling has never had any depth in the country, and a Chinaman may lightly profess or attend the ceremonies of two or three religions, yet have none in the European sense. "In proportion to the total population," says Mr. Chi-Hsien Chung in the *Chinese Year Book* (1938-9), the best authority, "the number of *bona-fide* Buddhists, Taoists, Christians, and Confucianists has been, and is, comparatively small," and "at present the only individuals who can in the strict sense be termed Taoists are the professionals" (priests and monks). There are 267,000 Buddhist temples and 738,000 monks and nuns, but the average Chinaman merely takes Buddhism as a contribution to public entertainment. The *Year Book* adds that there are believed to be 48,000,000 Mohammedans, 2,900,000 Roman Catholics, and 600,000 Protestants. The *World Almanac* gives the Mohammedans as 10,000,000, and, since the war with Japan began, the Catholic missions are to a great extent in ruins on account of the political alliance of the Vatican with Japan [see]. Missionaries often write with an insincere optimism about the situation, but in a gloomy article in the *International Review of Missions* (October, 1938) a Chinese missionary explains that "educated Christians in various walks of life are virtually lost to the Church" (p. 582). The Chinese are, he says, "by their racial genius rationalistic, pragmatic, and somewhat irreligious," and "the naturalism and humanism of Chinese scholars have created in Chinese youth a sceptical attitude toward all conceptions of God" (p. 585). Militant Atheism, which our literature quaintly persists in calling a "No God Movement," spread to tens of millions after 1918, and in conjunction with Communism got control of entire provinces of China. The Japanese and Chiang Kai-Chek (a blood-brother of

a Japanese fanatic and a professing Christian) astutely used the joint cry of religion and property to engage the interest of Europeans and Americans in the employment of the Chinese armies against Bolshevism while Japan prepared its campaign. No statistics are available, or would be of the least value, to-day, but all religion is doomed in China.

Chivalry, The Age of. There is no more baseless historical myth than that of a mediæval Age of Chivalry, yet literary men and editorial writers always refer to it as if it were as solidly established as the French Revolution. Not a single modern authority on the period (about 1100-1400), in either England, France, Germany, Italy, or Spain, recognizes such a development, and the leading works of reference which yield to religious sentiment by including a notice of it (the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, the *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics*, and in this case even the *Cambridge Mediæval History*) had to entrust the writing to romantic authors with no historical status whatever. Even Hilaire Belloc, who covers the period in the second volume of his larger *History of England* (4 vols., 1925), does not deign to mention the myth, and certainly describes no chivalry. All the standard authorities characterize the period as, precisely in the noble and knightly class of both sexes, sodden with vice, violence, theft, and corruption. Many, indeed, describe it as, particularly in regard to sex, the worst period in the history of civilization. In the case of England the Catholic historian Lingard (*History of England*, 14 vols., 1823-31) is as severe as Freeman, Green, Traill's *Social England*, or (apart from the totally unrepresentative short chapter on chivalry) the *Cambridge Mediæval History* (7 vols., 1911-32). The highest authority on France at this time, Professor Luchaire, is even more scathing in his *Social France at the Time of Philip Augustus* (Engl. trans. 1912) and in Lavissee's large *Histoire de France* (1901, vol. III). For Germany Giesebrecht (6 vols., 1874), Hauck (5 vols., 1912), Quanter (1925), Prof. J. W. Thompson (*Feudal Germany*, 1928), and H. A. L. Fisher (*Mediæval Empire*, 2

vols., 1898) tell the same story; and the classic works of Symonds, Burckhardt, and Gregorovius give an even worse account of morals in mediæval Italy. Special authorities (Anglade, Gautier, Méray, Nyrop, Krabbes, Rowbotham, etc.) on the troubadours, writers, and women of the so-called Age of Chivalry are agreed that the period was never surpassed, if ever equalled, in history for its licence of life and literature and the hard aggressiveness of its women (young or matrons). The recent work of D. de Rougemont (*Passion and Society*, 1940), claiming that the troubadours were pious mystics, is fantastic and negligible. No such thing as a knight-errant is described in the contemporary chronicles, and the religious Orders of Knights (Templars, etc.) speedily became as corrupt as the others. Bayard and the few real representatives of a code of chivalry—Richard the Lion-Heart, the Cid, etc., were brutal and treacherous—lived long after the period was over. Romantic writers are apt to quote a mutilated passage from the French historian Guizot, but he in fact agrees that it was the worst period on record (*History of Civilization*, III, 114). The myth was started in the seventeenth century by two French genealogists and sycophants of the nobility, Vulson and Menstrier, and it owes its extraordinary success to its complete falsification of the character of the Catholic period. Undisputed as the facts are, there is not a single work, in any language, to recommend on the true character of the mediæval knights and their wives and daughters, whose conduct in the overwhelming majority of their class was the exact opposite of what we call chivalry. The symposium *Chivalry* (1928), edited by Prof. Prestage, is a scrap-book of sketches, but acknowledges the general brutality and licence.

Chrestos. In view of the occurrence of the name in a passage of Suetonius, where it is held by many historians to be a mistake for the name Christus, it is to be noted that Chrestos ("best") was a not unfamiliar proper name in the Greek world. Several bishops in early ecclesiastical history bore it, and Conybeare (*The Historical Christ*, 1914) tells us that

it was a "common name among Oriental slaves" at Rome.

Christ. The Greek translation of the Hebrew word "Messiah," meaning "the Anointed." In the Greek text of the New Testament it is usually written "the Christ," but the Latin language does not use the particle "the" before names, as the Greek does, and the meaning of the word was generally lost when, in the third century, the Church at Rome abandoned the use of the Greek tongue for Latin. Hence Christ or Jesus Christ came to be taken as a proper name. [See *Jesus* as to historicity and other questions.]

Christian Science. An organization started by Mrs. Mary Baker Glover Eddy—she had three successive husbands, in spite of her intense spirituality and disbelief in the existence of matter—in 1866. California was, as it still is, rich in idle and neurotic folk (on account of its climate) and spiritual adventurers, and Mrs. Eddy, a farmer's daughter who died worth \$2,000,000, borrowed the verbiage and trade-apparatus of a certain P. P. Quimby, a faith-healer. She used to deny this, but the publication of the Quimby manuscripts and her letters to him by Horatio Dresser, in 1921, put the fact beyond question. She published the Bible of the movement, *Science and Health with Key to the Scriptures*, in 1875, formed a Christian Science Association in 1876, and built the First Church of Christ, Scientist, at Boston in 1879. The book (though "improved" by one of her assistants) is a tiresome and badly-written string of verbiage, ludicrously opposed to science and reflecting an abysmal ignorance. She says, for instance, that "the history of the Chinese Empire derives its antiquity and renown from the true ideas the Buddhist entertains of God." The antiquity she postulates for China, which was not civilized until some 2,000 years after India, is fabulous: the Buddhists did not enter it until nearly 2,000 years after its civilization *did* begin; and Buddha [see] was an Atheist. The basic idea of the movement is that Spirit alone exists, so disease is an illusion to be expelled by prayer and thought. Within limits this sort of nerve-treatment is effective,

particularly among the more neurotic supporters of the sect, but more serious claims have been repeatedly exposed. The "religion" is to-day an economic organization skillfully directed by men of affairs in Boston, who spend large sums in attempting to spread it to Europe. See Mark Twain's *Christian Science* (1903), J. M. Logan's *Christian Science Expounded and Exposed* (1923), H. A. L. Fisher's *Our New Religion* (Thinker's Library ed., 1933), and, for a substantial work by medical and psychological experts, *The Faith, the Falsity, and the Failure of Christian Science* (1925) by W. Riley, F. W. Peabody, and C. E. Humiston.

Christian Socialism. The name was first used by the liberal Churchman F. D. Maurice in 1848. The failure of the Chartist Movement in that year led him, Charles Kingsley, and J. F. Ludlow to create a new movement to help the workers. While Maurice admitted to Holyoake (*Life and Letters of G. J. Holyoake*, 1908, I, 188) that their primary aim was "to Christianize Socialism," it was a very sincere, if small and short-lived, movement, and it rendered considerable service in connection with Trade Unions, Co-operation, and Working Men's Colleges. The movement which later adopted the name in Germany and Austria was more political and ecclesiastical, and it fatally prepared the way for Nazism and savagery against the Jews. It began among the Catholics of Germany in the early seventies as a Christian Social Movement—to divert Catholics from Socialism—and it was taken up on the Protestant side by the fanatical Pastor Stöcker and directed truculently against the Jews (as the leading financiers). The movement subsided in Germany, and in 1882 it was adopted in Austria, where it has wrought grave evil. The Liberal ruling class in Austria refused to give the clergy control of the schools, and the new movement fought them. By the end of the century it had twenty-eight members in the Reichsrath, and in pressing for better conditions for the workers, it came up against Jewish employers and financiers and became more bitterly Anti-Semitic. Vienna passed from Liberal to Christian Socialist

control, but after the 1914-18 war the Social Democrats, pointing out that the Christian Socialists did very little for the workers and much for the Church, dislodged them and began their long and generally admired rule of the city. [See *Austria*.] The treacherous destruction of their power by the Christian Socialists under Dollfuss and Schuschnigg opened the way for the German invasion in 1938. (E. Benjon, *The Christian Socialist Movement in England*, 1931; C. A. Macartney, *The Social Revolution in Austria*, 1926.)

Christianity. The comparative relaxation during the last quarter of a century of the historic conflict of science and religion, which is due in part to the broad acceptance of scientific teaching by educated Christians and in part to the reluctance of scientific men to discuss the very important remaining issues [see *Science and Religion*], coincides with a graver abuse than ever by the apologists of the teaching of history. The traditional conception of the Bible and of Christian doctrines being no longer seriously defensible, the stress is transferred to social and moral values; and this is encouraged by the pragmatic spirit of the times. The older plea, that Christianity created, or was one of the primary influences in creating, the civilization of Europe, is now supported by an amazingly false version of its history and social effects. Hardly any professional historian ventures to point out to the public that the facts which he gives in academic works, which they never read, completely discredit the moral and social claims which the apologist makes [see *Art*; *Baths*; *Chivalry*; *Dark Age*; *Education*; *Law*; *Middle Ages*; *Philanthropy*; *Slavery*; *Torture*, etc.], and indeed some historians, especially in America, under Catholic influence, suppress the ugly facts and exaggerate the better elements in the mediæval chronicles (which many of them cannot read). The sociological value of a creed or an institution must obviously be judged by its *general* effects, not by a partisan selection. Even non-Christian writers join sometimes in this selection of a few pleasant pages and polite reticence about the hundred malodorous pages;

and the superficial literature of the millions, ignoring the fact that equally good results have been attained under all creeds and under purely humanitarian cultures (Buddhist, Confucian, or Modern), repeats that the Churches render an irreplaceable service in the maintenance of civilization. A hundred articles in this Encyclopædia show upon what deplorable historical untruths this myth is based and how urgently a new social history of Christendom is needed. Here a few broad indications of the lines of criticism may be given.

1. The origin of Christianity is still one of the most obscure problems of ancient history, yet the one which is most avoided by professional historians. On the question (which very few of them ever seriously discuss) whether the religion started from an historical personality *see* Jesus; but the more responsible or the few historically informed apologists (compare T. R. Glover's *Influence of Christ in the Ancient World*, 1929) admit that, instead of a new light appearing miraculously in a world of moral darkness, the age assigned to Jesus witnessed almost the culmination of a great advance in life and thought over the whole area of civilization from the seventh century B.C. onward. Christianity admittedly arose in maritime cities like Alexandria, Antioch, and Ephesus, where (as well as in Tarsus) every ethical philosophy and religion, including the new ethic and religious liberalism of the dispersed Jews, was familiar. [See Epicureanism; Essenes; Isis; Mithraism; Serapianism; Stoicism, etc.] There is not a single moral sentiment in the New Testament that is not found in later Judaism and contemporary cults and moralists. [See Gospels.] The Christian synthesis, instead of improving upon the contributory cultures, lowered the value of the best moral elements it borrowed by associating them with doctrines that were as abhorrent to the Greek as they are to the educated modern—eternal torment, bloody atonement, inherited sin, ascetic exaggerations, approaching end of the world, etc.—and sacrificed the social ethic of the Stoic-Epicureans for a morbid moral individualism with bases in lingering superstitions. Hence

very few men of intellectual strength such as Origen embraced it, and these few were generally persecuted as heretics.

2. The claim that the new religion was hindered in its progress by repeated general persecutions in which thousands or tens of thousands perished is based upon a mass of forgeries which are so crude that even Catholic experts on the subject like Fr. Delehay, Mgr. Duchesne, and Dr. Ehrhard have exposed them. [See Martyrs.] Only a few hundred martyrs in the course of 250 years are identifiable. The saying that "the blood of martyrs is the seed of Christians" is, in fact, doubly fraudulent, for the progress of the Church, as well as the number of martyrs, is grossly exaggerated. In the course of the 250 years from Paul, its real founder, to Constantine, Christianity made not one-tenth the progress that Atheism [see] made in fifteen years in our time (1918-1933). Estimates of the number of Christians in the Greek-Roman world at the end of the third century vary from 5,000,000 (Gibbon and Bury) to the fantastic figure of 50,000,000 (Stäudlin). But even the elaborately calculated figure of 10,000,000 given by Schultze (*Geschichte des Untergangs des griechisch-romischen Heidenthums*, 2 vols., 1892) is vitiated because he greatly overestimates the proportion of members to priests and bishops. The correct figure is probably between 2,000,000 and 3,000,000 in a total population of 100,000,000. Eighty years later St. Chrysostom declared in a sermon (in the year 385) that, of the 500,000 people of Antioch (one of the most Christian cities), only one-fifth were Christians—he added that they were so vicious that he doubted if a hundred of them would be saved—and in the previous year Augustine had found Rome overwhelmingly pagan in spite of truculent imperial decrees (*Confessions*, VIII, 2).

3. Gibbon's famous chapter (XV) on the spiritual causes of such progress as was made is outdated. Even Catholic historians like Mgr. Duchesne (*Early History of the Christian Church*, 3 vols., 1904-29) admit, besides the spurious character of the martyrs, that the discipline of the early years was relaxed by the end of the second century, and, as St.

Cyprian and other Fathers describe, a remarkable amount of vice and violence crept into the Church. The wealth and privileges which the conversion of the Emperors brought to it in the fourth century led to a further demoralization. After the middle of the century we find every contemporary Christian leader—Jerome for Rome, Augustine for Africa, Chrysostom for the Greeks, Salvianus [see] for the whole of Christendom—bitterly complaining of the general depravity of clergy and laity. The apologist is here quite dishonest. He quotes Jerome's praise of a dozen ladies of Rome and conceals Jerome's scorching indictment of the priests and people as a body; he dilates on the piety of Augustine's mother and refuses to notice Augustine's painful accounts of the monks and the people. That Christianity converted the Greeks and Romans to a higher life is a fiction that is discredited by all contemporary Christian evidence. The Greek-Roman world was not, in fact, converted to a new religion, but compelled to embrace it. We have still in the Theodosian Code imperial decrees or rescripts of the years 341, 345, 356, 381, 383, 386, and 391 which were won by the bishops from the Emperors. They suppress all rival religions, order the closing of the temples, and impose fines, confiscation, imprisonment, or death upon any who cling to the older religions. [See Paganism.]

4. Still more extravagant is the claim that civilization gained by the establishment of Christianity. The Dark Age of six centuries (about A.D. 450–1050) which followed is attributed by apologists to the barbarians. The fact that nearly all these were Christians is ignored, but the claim is decisively refuted by the equal barbarization of the Greek or Byzantine civilization [see], which the Huns and Goths did not devastate, and the fact that all the chief attempts to sustain or restore civilization in Europe were made by Teutonic monarchs [see Barbaric Invasions, Goths, Lombards, etc.] and thwarted by the Popes. Moreover, the Arabs, who were at first as barbaric as the Goths and Vandals, created a high civilization in Syria and Spain in less than a century [see Arabs].

Historians who are susceptible to Catholic influence try, therefore, to prove that the Dark Age was less dark than the Rationalist historians (Buckle, etc.) of the last century represented. The fallacy of these recent works (Prof. G. B. Adams, *Civilization During the Middle Ages*, 1922, Prof. L. Thorndike, *Short History of Civilization*, 1926, and a few others) is that they either extend the Dark Age to the sixteenth century, which no critic does, or they stress occasional bright pages in the Dark Age, which no one ever denied. [See Dark Age.]

5. The chief fallacies about the later Middle Ages (roundly 1050–1550) are to claim for the Church the credit of having inspired the Guilds [see] and the artistic and scholastic movements [see Art; Cathedrals; Classics; Education; Universities]; to sustain the completely baseless legend of an Age of Chivalry [see]; to give a dishonestly romantic account of the Crusades [see]; to obscure the comprehensive corruption of the clergy, monks, and nuns by enlarging upon the virtue of an occasional and rare saint or strict abbey [see Monasticism]; to expatiate on the theory of the work of a few strict Popes like Gregory VII and Innocent III and suppress the actual general depravity to which those Popes and all contemporary witnesses testify [see Papacy]; and to ignore or deny the excellence of the Arab civilization in Spain and Sicily, which, together with normal economic evolution, really roused Europe to a sense of decency in some respects.

6. In the Post-Reformation period there was no general improvement of character [see Reformation and Counter-Reformation] and no advance in the realization of social justice. The state of Europe at the beginning of the nineteenth century [see Crime and Religion; Education; Justice; Philanthropy; etc.] fully proves this. Most of the vices of the Middle Ages persisted until the last century, when the growth of Rationalist criticism compelled the Churches to turn to moral and social interests; and during the first half of the century, when agitation for reform was most dangerous, the great majority of the pioneers and leaders were Rationalists, though the Churches still

counted nine-tenths of the community. See McCabe's *Social Record of Christianity* (Thinker's Library, 1935) and articles on *Bentham*; *Burdett*; *Owen*; *Place*, etc. Until the second half of the century the Catholic Church still allied itself with feudal monarchs and supported them in a ghastly struggle against reform in which 400,000 unarmed men, women, and children were done to death [see *Democracy*]. From 1870 onward public life was increasingly secularized—completely so in advanced countries by the end of the century—and reform proceeded on humanitarian lines and made more rapid progress than ever before in history. The late intrusion into the work of Church leaders and organizations was admittedly a self-defensive measure. The present position of Christianity will be discussed in *Statistics of Religion* and articles on each of the leading countries.

Christmas. Literally the Mass celebrated on Christ's birthday, a word that first occurs in the eleventh century and is now applied to the day itself, December 25th. The birth-story, which is not in *Mark*, belongs to the later stratum of the Gospel legends and gives no indication of a date. The feast was, in fact, so thoroughly pagan that as late as 245 we find Origen protesting against the very idea of celebrating the birthday of Jesus as if he were an earthly king, and the date of birth was fixed by such fantastic calculations that almost every month of the year was selected in one or other part of the Church. The first undisputed reference to a celebration on December 25th—Christian scholars admit that references to it in the second and third centuries are spurious—occurs after the middle of the fourth century. From 360 to 450 the celebration spread from Rome to the leading cities, but the remoter Greeks and the Armenians clung to January 6th (Conybeare's *Myth, Magic, and Morals*, 1909, p. 176). There was no great festival and no general agreement about the date until the fifth century.

Modern divines assign various strained reasons for the adoption of December 25th in a ludicrous attempt to obscure the fact that it was borrowed from rival religions—hence the long struggle against

it—which they admit located the birth of their saviour-gods in mid-winter. The choice of December 25th was obviously part of the general policy of disarming the pagans and Mithraists when their cults were suppressed, and it began, significantly, at Rome. In pre-Christian times knowledge of astronomy and the calendar was so imperfect that the great nature-festivals, originally fixed at mid-winter, spring, mid-summer, and autumn, often got out of date, but even in Roman days the birth of a solar or a vegetation-god, saving the world from the darkness, discomfort, and sterility of winter, was widely celebrated at the winter solstice (December 21st) or just after it, when the day began to lengthen again. From very early times the Romans had celebrated their Saturnalia in honour of the old vegetation-god at that time with a great display of presents, candles, and dolls (probably a reminiscence of an earlier sacrifice of children). From the reign of the Emperor Aurelian (270-6), who introduced a solar cult of a high ethical character, December 25th was the outstanding day of their calendar and was officially described as "the Birthday of the Unconquered Sun." The coming of Mithraism [see] from Persia confirmed the date. The Mithraic cave-temple was on the Vatican Hill, close to the Christian settlement, and the midnight celebration of the birth of the saviour-god, with blaze of candles and clouds of incense (as in the Catholic "midnight mass" to-day), would be familiar to every Christian. The Egyptian Isis and Horus also were greatly honoured at Rome, and we learn from Macrobius (*Saturnalia*, I, 18), who is confirmed by the Christian *Paschal Chronicle* (Migne, Greek Series, XCII, 384), that the Egyptians at this period celebrated the birthday of the sun-god Horus in mid-winter, having (as Catholics now do) a tableau of a divine babe (the sun at its feeblest, or just reborn) in a manger and the mother beside it. Epiphanius further tells us (*Adv. haer.*, LI) that in Alexandria there was a Temple of the Virgin (*Koreion*) in which, on the same date, the people, after praying all night, burst into rejoicing because Kore (the Virgin) had "given birth to the Eternal."

Even the Teutonic barbarians, who are said to have been (after becoming Christians) the first to fix Christmas on December 25th, had a great mid-winter festival. It is absurd to look for other reasons for the Christian selection of the date. See Conybeare (above) and J. M. Robertson, *Christianity and Mythology* (1900, 163-197); and for Christmas customs C. A. Miles, *Christmas* (1912).

Church. There is some dispute about the derivation of the word, but the prevailing opinion is that it comes from the Greek *Kyriake*, "the Lord's (House)." Most of the Slav and Teutonic languages have it, but the Latins followed the Greeks in preferring *ecclesia*, which means a conference or assembly. The nearest Aramaic or Hebrew equivalent of this Greek word meant the assembly of the people of Israel; hence the text in *Matthew* (xvi, 18), in which Christ is said to have founded his Church on Peter, is, apart from the childlike pun on the word "rock," a piece of second-century fiction. A Jewish speaker of the first half of the first century would have been unintelligible to his hearers if he had used the word.

Churching. A ceremony of the Catholic Church which is performed over the mother after the birth of a child. It is not compulsory but customary. Catholic writers now call it a voluntary service of thanksgiving on the part of the mother; but since she has to remain "at the church door" (*ad fores ecclesiae*, the ritual says)—in other words, outside a consecrated place—until the priest blesses her, it is clearly an archaic relic of the ascetic superstition about sex even in marriage. The Jews were more outspoken. A mother was "unclean seven days"—fourteen if Jahveh had sent her a girl—and had to make "atonement" for "sin" (*Levit.*, xii, 1-7). Catholic ladies, even of superior education, keep up the custom.

Cicero, Marcus Tullius (106-43 B.C.). The famous Roman orator was one of the few Latin writers on philosophy and an advanced sceptic, and his works evince a high idealism at a time when too many imagine the Republic to have been wholly corrupt. Greek philosophers and sophists had invaded Italy

in large numbers, and the old Roman religion was already rejected by cultivated men. Cicero professed to belong to the Academic School, which had at that time deserted Plato for what we should now call Agnosticism. His treatise *On the Nature of the Gods* gives the arguments for and against the existence of God and adopts neither side. From other works it is often inferred that he believed in immortality, but the chief modern authority on him, Prof. G. Boissier, observes that "the noble hopes of immortality with which he fills his works never come to his mind in his misfortunes and perils; he seems to have expressed them only for the public" (*Cicero et ses amis*, 1875, p. 59). See also Boissier's *La religion romaine* (1892).

Civilization and Religion. The relation of Christianity to the European-American civilization is discussed in the article **Christianity** and in articles named therein. Its establishment did not simply coincide with, but, as experience in the Greek half of the Empire proves, co-operated in, the ruin of the Greek-Roman civilization. Augustine's *City of God*, the theme of which is that the ruin of a mere secular kingdom does not matter, struck the key-note for the new Europe. The time taken by Europe under Christianity to rise again to the level of Greek-Roman life is the longest period of reaction in history. In spite of the daily reiteration of the claim, inspired by clerical writers, that religion or belief in spiritual realities is necessary for the maintenance of civilization, history shows exactly the opposite. No historian explicitly discusses the theme—an ironic reflection on the claim that modern history is very attentive to social values—but it will be found that in the discussion by historical experts of the agencies which periodically raised Egypt, Babylonia, Persia, Greece, Rome, China, or any other civilization to its higher level religion is never mentioned, nor is the decay of religion ever counted among the causes of periods of retrogression. Purely secular causes are considered adequate in each case. Historians ignore religion as a constructive element as severely as they

now exclude miracles or providence. The highest periods of civilization were always—where we have an adequate literature—characterized by a considerable growth of scepticism [see *Golden Ages*], while periods of strong religious feeling, such as the Puritan period in England and the Calvinistic in Scotland, never rose high in the scale of civilization; and the advance of modern civilization, which has risen above all others, has coincided, decade by decade, with the greatest growth of scepticism in history. No statement is more common in our literature than that religion is of peculiar value in connection with civilization, and none is more massively discredited by the facts of history. Even modern sociologists, who commonly include religion among the constructive forces, never attempt a factual proof of it. (See McCabe's *Golden Ages of History*, 1940.)

Clark, Jonas Gilman (1815–1900), an American philanthropist. Having fought his way, in a very honourable career, from poverty to affluence, he decided to use his fortune to provide other poor youths with an opportunity of getting higher education. He gave \$2,000,000 for the founding of Clark University—"the largest sum ever given in New England up to that time by any individual for education," says the *Dictionary of American Biography*—and bequeathed it a further sum of \$1,200,000. He was a Rationalist, and expressly stipulated that no religion was to be taught in it, although its first President, Stanley Hall, pressed him to admit it.

Clarke, Marcus Andrew Hislop (1846–81), leading Australian poet and novelist. He won a high reputation by a story, *His Natural Life* (1874), and by his poems and dramas. In an essay which he published in the *Victoria Review*, in 1879, he disavows Christian belief and admits only an unknowable God.

Classics, The Monks and the. One of the many myths which, to the advantage of the Catholic Church, still flourish in general literature and are admitted without inquiry into certain new types of historical manuals is the statement that the mediæval monks

preserved the classics for us. The legend originated in Montalembert's *Monks of the West* (1860–7), a repertory of fairy-tales about the monks. About seventy years before it was published, Professor Heeren, a genuine scholar, had concluded after severe research that the monks "rendered no service whatever in connection with classic literature" (*Geschichte des Studiums der Classischen Literatur*, 1796). Modern research, of which Dr. Sandys gives an excellent summary in the *Encyclopædia Britannica* ("Classics"), broadly supports Heeren. It has shown that only one or two abbots (out of thousands) in a century ever set their monks to copy the few classical works they had. The overwhelming majority of the monks, except in short periods of reform (when they would rather burn than copy a pagan book), were lazy, sensual, and indifferent to culture. Compayré shows in his *History of Pedagogy* (1903, p. 68) that in what is regarded as the height of Catholic culture, the thirteenth century, not one of the thousands of monks in the Abbey of St. Gall, one of the greatest in Europe, could read or write.

The Greek classics, more valuable than the Latin, were not preserved in the West, where knowledge of Greek became almost extinct by the tenth century, but were kept in the Greek world and brought to the West during the Renaissance by Byzantine lay scholars. The Latin classics had been so heavily denounced by the Fathers as "Devil-inspired," and most of them were so abhorrent to the pious mind—they were all saturated with paganism, and the poets were for the most part erotic—that the idea of good monks preserving them for the race is amusing; indeed, the Benedictine Rule which is quoted as proof of the copying industry of the monks expressly restricts them to religious literature. The historical truth, which one can recognize, though it is not emphasized in the article by Dr. Sandys, is that a few liberal abbots and bishops, who can be counted on the fingers, kept intact during the Dark Age the fraction of Latin literature which we have; that the chief centres for copying and preserving these were in the cities of the anti-Papal Ostrogoths and (later)

the Lombards, where culture was largely in the hands of laymen; that interest in these classics almost died out after the tenth century; and that when lay scholars like Petrarch and Boccaccio began to search for them in the dust of monastic libraries it took more than a century and a half (about 1330 to 1500) to get together such survivals of Roman literature as we have to-day.

Clemenceau, Georges Eugène Benjamin, M.D. (1841–1919), French statesman. Son of a Breton medical man (an Atheist), Georges adopted his father's profession and ideas, but in 1870, after spending two years in the United States, he turned to politics. He was also one of the most powerful journalists in Paris, a stern opponent of the Church (especially during the Dreyfus case), a warm humanitarian and idealist. His ideas are best found in his works *La mêlée sociale* (1895) and *Le grand Pan* (1896). He was Minister of the Interior in 1906 and Prime Minister from 1917 to 1920, when he became a world-figure. His attitude to Germany at Versailles must be understood in the light of his experience in the war of 1870–71 and the siege of Paris, when he was Mayor of Montmartre, as well as of German military schemes and methods. In his later years he was an Honorary Associate of the R.P.A. (See McCabe's *Georges Clemenceau*, 1919.)

Clemens, Samuel Langhorne (1835–1910), "Mark Twain." The famous humorist was at one time a pilot on the Mississippi, and the pen-name which he later adopted was an expression used in taking soundings. Many of his works, especially *Christian Science* (1903), *Eve's Diary* (1906), and *The Mysterious Stranger* (1918), show his disdain of Christianity, but the depth and solidity of his scepticism are best seen in *What is Man?* (Thinker's Library ed., 1936). In his letters (2 vols., 1917) he often tells his correspondents that he is an Agnostic and despises Christian beliefs. In one he brackets Jesus and Satan together as the most influential members of the Christian Pantheon, and thinks that Satan was "worth very nearly a hundred times as much to the business as was the influence of all the rest of

the Holy Family put together" (II, 817).

Clement, Epistle of. [See *Corinthians, Letter to the.*]

Clifford, Professor William Kingdon, F.R.S. (1845–79), mathematician. Appointed professor of applied mathematics at University College, London, in 1871, he had made a brilliant reputation in his science before his premature death, and he was universally respected for his high character. His Agnostic and Materialistic views, which included a theory that there is a special "mind-stuff" as well as ordinary matter, and his emphatic aversion from Christianity, are seen in the R.P.A. Reprint, *Lectures and Essays* (1918), edited by Sir L. Stephen and Sir F. Pollock.

Clodd, Edward (1840–1930), banker and anthropologist. He was one of the distinguished group of business men of the last century (Lubbock, Laing, etc.) who won high repute as exponents of science and critics of religion, and from 1906 to 1913 he was Chairman of the R.P.A. Clodd's circle of intimate friends included many of the most brilliant men of science and letters, and some of his own works (*The Childhood of Religions*, 1875; *The Story of Creation*, 1888; *Pioneers of Evolution*, 1897, etc.) had a large and influential circulation. He also did much original work in the field of folk-lore and was President of the Folk-Lore Society, 1895–6. (See his *Memories*, 1917, McCabe's *Edward Clodd*, 1932, and the article in the *Dict. Nat. Biog.*)

Clough, Arthur Hugh (1819–61), poet. In 1848 he resigned his position as tutor and Fellow of Oriel (Oxford) on the ground that he had ceased to believe in Christianity. He produced little, but it was considered by critics to be poetry of a very high order. Jowett (*Letters*, p. 177) quotes Carlyle describing Clough as "the most high-principled man he had ever known" and adds that he had "a kind of faith in knowing nothing." A memorandum on his attitude to religion, written near the close of his life and annexed to his *Prose Remains* (1888), shows that he rejected Unitarianism and was rather Agnostic than Theistic (p. 419).

Clouston, Sir Thomas, M.D., LL.D.,

F.R.S.E. (1841–1915), physician. Lecturer on Mental Diseases at Edinburgh University, President of the Edinburgh Royal College of Physicians (1902–3), editor of *The Journal of Medical Science*, and author of many important medical works. In *Morals and Brain* (1911) he questions the influence of Christianity, and in *Unsoundness of Mind* (1911) he rejects belief in a separable mind and severely criticizes what he calls "religionists."

Cohen, Chapman (b. 1868), third President of the National Secular Society. He began to give Freethought lectures in 1890, and in 1915 he succeeded G. W. Foote as President (of the N.S.S.) and editor of the *Freethinker*. His chief works are *A Grammar of Freethought* (1921); *Theism and Atheism* (1921); *Materialism Restated* (1927); *God and the Universe* (1927); *Primitive Survivals and Modern Thought* (1935); and *Almost an Autobiography* (1940).

Coit, Stanton, Ph.D. (1857–1944), Ethicist. Born in America, he graduated in Berlin, and in 1886 founded the New York University Settlement. Soon afterwards he settled in England, where he was naturalized, and organized the Union of Ethical Societies and the Moral Instruction League. He was intuitionist and anti-Materialist, but where he uses the word "God" in his works he means "the Good."

Cole, George Douglas Howard (b. 1889), economist. He was educated at St. Paul's School and Balliol, and is now Reader in Economics at Oxford and member of the Economics Advisory Council. Besides a number of economic works of a moderate Socialist character, he has, in collaboration with his wife, written brilliant detective stories. He took part in the International Congress of Freethinkers in 1939, and in his speech accepted Rationalism and pleaded for an alliance of it with social work (*Report*, pp. 67–9).

Coleridge, Sir John Duke, First Baron Coleridge, F.R.S., D.C.L., M.A. (1820–94), Lord Chief Justice of England. Although in 1857 he, as prosecuting counsel, brought upon Pooley so severe a sentence for blasphemy that G. J. Holyoake got it quashed, he in later years abandoned Christianity and,

as M.P. for Exeter (1865–73), supported the abolition of religious tests at the universities and the disestablishment of the Irish Church. In 1886 he corresponded with Holyoake on the subject of trials for blasphemy and said: "I believe the world would be a better place if all men were as fair and honourable as you" (*Life and Letters of G. J. Holyoake*, 1908, II, 147). He became Solicitor-General in 1868, Attorney-General in 1871, and Chief Justice of the Queen's Bench in 1880. In a letter to Lord Bramwell he writes: "Of ecclesiastical Christianity I believe probably as little as you do," and he fears that the Church will last "longer than is good for the world" (*Some Account of G. W. Wilshire*, by G. Fairfield, 1898, p. 105). He remained a Theist.

Coliseum, *The Martyrs of the*. This is a particularly gross example of the way in which mediæval myths so linger in our literature that not one reader in tens of thousands knows that they have been even challenged. It is the more flagrant because the writer who exposed this myth is the chief Catholic authority on the martyrs, the Jesuit Father Delehaye. In *L'amphithéâtre Flavien* (1897) he shows that there is no evidence that any Christian was ever exposed to the lions or any other sort of death in the Roman amphitheatre, and even the *Catholic Encyclopædia* (article "Coliseum") endorses his conclusion. Very few Christians are known to have been put to death at Rome [see *Martyrs*], and the familiar stories of exposure to lions in the arena—a form of passive resistance that would have disgusted rather than entertained the spectators of the games—are taken from late and admittedly spurious lives. Until 1560 Rome itself ignored these stories, but Pope Pius V, one of the most virtuous of the "reformed" Popes, then tried to raise funds by selling sand from the ruins on the ground that it had been "wet with the blood of martyrs." A few years later Pope Sixtus V showed his disdain of this by proposing to instal a wool-factory in the Coliseum. Bull-fights were held in it. But the possible profit of the martyr-fiction had not been forgotten, and the legend was encouraged throughout the Church. In

our critical age it grows in popularity. Artists (G. B. Shaw's *Androcles and the Lion*, etc.) impress it upon thousands, and recently (1940) an Italian film, sponsored by the Vatican, of the Coliseum has solemnly stamped it upon the minds of millions in Britain and America (and probably most countries), while the source of the legend in spurious literature is so clear in history that the *Catholic Encyclopædia*, which supports thousands of untruths and superstitions, has to admit it. For the final part of the legend—that a heroic monk sacrificed his life to put an end to the games—see *Telemachus*. For the building itself see *Amphitheatre*.

Colleges. The name is ultimately derived from the trade unions (*collegia*) of the Roman world, which the Romans of the Dark Age more or less sustained under the name of "schools"—they are mentioned in the description of the reception of Charlemagne at Rome in 800—and the Germans took as models of the early guilds [see]. There had been small unions of workers in Egypt, but the larger idea came to Greece and Rome from Lydia [see *Brotherhood*] and spread to all the cities of the Greek-Roman world. Each local group of workers in a trade had its clubroom, with periodical meetings and suppers and fees for sick benefits and funerals. Inscriptions found in Italy show that the buildings were often donated by rich citizens, and that at least frequently, if not generally, women and slaves were admitted as members, while workers from other cities were hospitably received. It has been suggested that Paul, in his voyages, found his first contacts in the *collegia* of his craft. Each had a patron deity and a marked religious atmosphere. A. Kalthoff's *Rise of Christianity* (1907) has an interesting chapter (V) on "The Communistic Clubs" and the possible relation of the new religion to them.

Collier, The Hon. John (1850–1934), painter. Son of Lord Monkswell, he married a daughter of Professor T. H. Huxley, and when she died, did much to secure a reform of the law by marrying her sister (1889). He was an Agnostic and a member of the R.P.A. See his article in the *Rationalist Annual* for 1934.

Collins, Anthony (1676–1729), Deist. A country gentleman of high character, Collins became a friend and devoted disciple of Locke and abandoned Christianity. His *Essay Concerning the Use of Reason* (1707), *Discourse of Freethinking* (1713), and other works, had a very material influence in the spread of Deism.

Collins, Prof. John Churton, LL.D. (1848–1908), literary critic. He was disinherited in youth by an uncle mainly because he refused to join the ministry, and he left the Church. In 1904 he was appointed Professor of English Literature at Birmingham University. He wrote sympathetic studies of Deists like Bolingbroke and Voltaire, and his son explains (*Life and Memoirs of J. C. Collins*, 1912, p. x) that, though he remained a Theist, he disbelieved in Christianity and a future life.

Colman, Lucy (1817–1906), American reformer. She was one of the remarkable group of American women of the first half of the nineteenth century who devoted their lives to the campaign against slavery and superstition and for the emancipation of women. Mrs. Colman wrote in the Boston *Investigator* and the *Truthseeker*, and she abandoned the Spiritualism which she had at one time adopted and became a complete Agnostic.

Combes, Justin Louis Émile, M.D., D.ès.L. (1835–1921), French statesman. He studied for the priesthood, but abandoned the Church before ordination and, after a brilliant course of study, graduated in medicine and letters. From the practice of medicine he passed to politics, and, as Minister of Public Instruction (1895–6) and Minister of the Interior and Premier (1902–5), he presided over the final stages of the separation of Church and State. Many French Rationalists complained of his leniency to the Church, but Catholics everywhere denounced him as their bitterest enemy.

Communion. It is explained, in the article *Cannibalism*, how the superstitious eating of the dead—to get the dead man's soul, strength, or magical powers—leads on to communion by eating victims sacrificed or offerings made to the gods. This was done by

many people of Nigeria, India, and America. See Frazer's *Spirits of the Corn and the Wild* (II, 48-108) for instances among backward peoples in all parts of the world. The Aztec rite, described at length by Frazer (II, 86-94), came nearest to the Catholic, and perplexed the Spanish missionaries. On certain festivals dough images of Huitzilpochtli were made and blessed by the priests. Like Catholics, the people fasted before the communion, and the priest's words were believed to effect a sort of transubstantiation, turning the consecrated dough image, which was broken up and divided among the group, into the flesh of the god. The ceremony was called "eating the god." Robertson gives a "Genealogy of the Sacrificial Sacrament" in his *Pagan Christs* (1903, p. 207), but without references, though on p. 201 he gives evidence that, borrowing from the cult of Dionysos, the early Christians ate the dough image of a child at Easter—it is suggested that this gave rise to the pagan charge of killing and eating children—and on p. 334 shows that there was a sort of communion in the cult of Mithra. The partaking of corn and wine at the Eleusinian mysteries doubtless had even more influence on the Christian idea of a Eucharist. Rendel Harris (*Eucharistic Origins*, 1927) endeavours to prove that the Christian rite was taken almost bodily from the Cult of Isis and Osiris.

Communism in Early Christianity. Socialist writers, Christian Socialists, and certain historical writers who exaggerate the virtuousness of the earliest followers of Christ, repeat that they "held all things in common." The statement is based upon a document (*Acts*) of very equivocal value [see], and even this refers to only one small community. Most scholars regard the Pauline Epistles as more reliable, and these very plainly describe the customary inequalities in the churches. They often refer to slaves of the members, and the Epistle to the Corinthians speaks explicitly of rich and poor members, while apologists usually infer from the Epistle to the Philippians that high officials of the imperial palace belonged to the Church. From stories

of martyrs, and from Suetonius's account of the execution of Clemens by Domitian, it is claimed even that rich relatives of the Emperor joined the Church. There was not the least approach to the genuine Communism of the Essenian communities [see].

Comparative Anatomy and Evolution.

One of the arguments for the evolution of all organisms from simple unicellular forms is derived from the continuity of what might be called the ground plan from level to level of the organic world. This is most plainly seen in the Vertebrate section, where the typical structure of four limbs and a vertebral column is so persistent that, even where there are apparent divergencies from it, vestiges of a gradual evolutionary departure from the type often remain. The resolute and uninstructed creationist might protest that the different families or orders of the Vertebrates exhibit deliberate architectural variations of a fundamental type, but the argument becomes ridiculous when we find atrophied limb-bones (and even claws) in certain serpents, vestigial teeth in birds or toothless mammals, the shrunken relic of a tail (coccyx) in man and the anthropoid apes, wing-bones in flightless birds, claws on the wing-bones of other birds, and so on. The argument is not much needed to-day and is of little use against Fundamentalists without illustrations. These, with ample explanation, will be found in Haeckel's *Evolution of Man* (cheap ed., 1910, vol. II) and Hird's *Picture Book of Evolution* (2nd ed., 1920, Part II).

Comte, Isidore Marie Auguste François Xavier (1798-1857), founder of Positivism. In earlier years he was a Saint-Simonian, but he broke away and devoted himself to the construction of an organic scheme of the sciences—his most important work—and to the foundation of a religion of humanity. For many years the latter had a distinguished following in some countries, though where they were most active (South America, etc.) it was the Agnostic character of the religion and its disarming title which attracted them. Comte had conceived his organization as a Church, broadly on the model of

the Roman Church—hence Huxley's caustic definition of it as "Catholicism minus Christianity"—and he deprecated criticism of other Churches. This had the unfortunate result that he and his chief followers confined their attention to the brighter or the theoretical features of the Church of Rome, as described by its own propagandists, and so supported a false description of its history and influence. F. J. Gould's *Auguste Comte* (1920) is a short biography by a Positivist and Rationalist.

Conception, The Immaculate. [See **Immaculate Conception.**]

Conclave. The meeting of cardinals of the Roman Church to elect a Pope, so called because they are "locked in" (*cum clave*). The phrase recalls one of the most piquant chapters of religious history. From the middle of the fourth century, when the Roman bishopric had become very wealthy through imperial patronage, elections were attended by the most sordid violence and bribery. About 150 of the faithful were killed in the election-fights of the year 366. [See **Damasus.**] At that time, and for many centuries afterwards, the priests and people of Rome elected the Pope, but the election was later restricted to the chief or "cardinal" [see] priests and bishops. The violence and corruption were as grave as ever, and in 1271, when the cardinals, assembled for an election at Viterbo, spent two years and nine months in fiery quarrels, the civic authorities locked them in a room and forced them to decide. The Pope elected, Gregory X, then, in spite of the bitter opposition of the cardinals, made it a law of the Church that elections be held in locked and sealed rooms, the cardinals sleeping in the room and having their food passed in through a small opening. The scandal merely assumed new forms—at the election of Alexander VI, in 1492, vast sums were spent in bribery and 200 were killed—and continued until the last century, when the intrigues became subtler. Since the election has from very early times begun with a solemn invocation of the Holy Ghost, the record of the long series is one of the strangest volumes in the history of religion. See Petrucelli della Gattina, *Histoire*

diplomatique des Conclaves (4 vols., 1864-6), and V. Petrie, *The Triple Crown* (1935). The latter is based upon the French work, and, though neither is sufficiently critical, the general story is sound and very entertaining.

Concordat. A Latin word applied in the Middle Ages to agreements between monks and bishops, who often fought over property, or between bishops or Popes and the civil power. Since the fifteenth century the name has been reserved for agreements between the Vatican and heads of States.

Condillac, Étienne Bonnot de Mably (1715-80), French philosopher. He abandoned a clerical career and the Church—in which he had been conspicuous for purity of life in an age of clerical corruption—under the influence of Locke's works, and applied himself to working out Locke's statement that all knowledge comes through the senses. He is commonly classified as a Materialist, but in fact he was a Deist and believed in a future life.

Conditioned Reflexes. The phrase now occurs in all discussions of the bearing of psychology on religious controversy. Simple reflex action is when, for instance, the mouth "waters" at the sight or smell of food. The famous Russian physiologist, Pavlov, conducted a long series of experiments in what he called "conditioned reflexes"; a simple case of which is when a dog is trained to expect food at the ringing of a bell, and in time the sound of the bell provokes the flow of saliva whether or not food is provided. The process gives us a very important key in explaining the acquisition of knowledge, and is analogous with the Behaviourist system of "built-in," or conditioned, reactions.

Condorcet, Marie Jean Antoine Nicolas de Caritat, Marquis de (1743-94), one of the most brilliant of the French Encyclopædists. He had a precocious distinction in mathematics, and was only twenty-one years old when he presented to the Academy his famous paper on the Integral Calculus. He was admitted to the Academy and appointed Perpetual Secretary. This did not deter him from joining Diderot and the Encyclopædists and publishing a caustic Rationalist work, *Lettres d'un théologien* (1774).

He accepted the Revolution in 1789 and became President of the Legislative Assembly, but the excesses of the Terror provoked his indignation. He was arrested as an aristocrat, and he committed suicide. His wife, the Marquise Sophie de Condorcet (1764-1822), a lady of equal beauty, refinement, and culture, loyally accepted the Revolution with him and shared his Rationalism. She translated into French Adam Smith's *Theory of the Moral Sentiments* and edited her husband's works.

Confession. The practice, enforced by law in the Roman Church, of privately telling one's "sins" to a priest once a year or, voluntarily, once a month or week. While the confession of sins, in general or in detail, was common in the Hebrew and other religions, and not unknown among lower peoples (America, Africa, etc.), the Roman Church-made law is one of the most blatant survivals in modern life of mediæval priestcraft. Such confession to priests was a normal part of temple life in ancient Babylon, because all afflictions were understood to be punishments by the gods for transgressions, and this was the natural means of relief (from disease, etc.). We have copies of the lists of sins which the priest read to the penitent so that he might recognize and confess his sin and receive a sort of absolution. See J. Morgenstern, *The Doctrine of Sin in the Babylonian Religion* (1905), M. Jastrow, *The Religion of Babylonia and Assyria* (1898), or any work on Babylonian religion. Prof. Pinches (*The Religion of Babylonia and Assyria*, 1906) traces the practice back to Sumerian times. The "City of Sin," as most Christians imagine it, really groaned with a sense of sin, and its chief deities were very ethical. Confession was a normal feature of religious life also in ancient Mexico. Father B. de Sahagun, one of the earliest missionaries to the Aztecs, describes in his *Historia general de las Cosas de Nueva Espana* (Span. trans., 1829) how it was usual to confess sins to a priest, who gave absolution and imposed a penance. Voluntary confession was also part of the preparation of the Greeks for the Eleusinian Mysteries [see].

In the Roman Church it is compulsory "under pain of mortal sin" (that is to say, condemnation to hell) to confess to a priest at least once a year, at or about Easter, and it is not disputed by Catholics that this became a law of the Church only at the Fourth Lateran Council (1215), or at the height of the power of the mediæval clergy. It was a natural result of the rigour of the primitive Church that there should be a large amount of voluntary confession of sin, public and private. With the late insertion in the Gospels (*Matt.* xvi, 19 and xviii, 18) of the myth that Christ gave the apostles power to forgive sins, discipline was relaxed, and Pope Callistus (217-22), a man of dubious character, announced, to the great indignation of the rest of the Church, that he and his clergy could forgive, clearly after confession, even the gravest sins committed after baptism. Sins and sinners multiplied at once in the Church, as the contemporary Bishop Hippolytus tells us, and the apostasy of the overwhelming majority of priests and people in time of persecution further enlarged the practice of confession and absolution. From the sixth century lists of sins (Penitentials) were provided for the priests and bishops to examine the people, and they are valuable witnesses to the extraordinary grossness of morals in the Dark Age. Babylonian lists of sins compare favourably with those given in a modern Catholic prayer-book, but one would not be permitted to translate, for instance, the list in the *De ecclesiasticis disciplinis* (Migne Collection of the Fathers, CXXXII) of the pious Abbot Regino of Prum (tenth century). He describes sexual offences that were unknown to Martial. By local enactments confession was in the course of time made compulsory (in theory) for priests and monks, but the resistance of the laity checked the ambition of the Popes until 1215, when the powerful and truculent Innocent III made an annual confession compulsory for all. The Schoolmen of that and the following century then, as usual, provided a doctrinal basis for the practice, and it was formulated as "the Sacrament of Penance" by the Council of Trent in 1651. It is one of the clearest examples

of priest-made law, and it has never in any age promoted morals. The thirteenth century itself is one of the most dissolute in history. [See article under that title and Middle Ages.] H. C. Lea's *History of Auricular Confession* (3 vols., 1896) is primarily an account of the development of the institution, but provides a very large amount of material in regard to abuses of it.

Points of actual controversy are whether absolution is ever sold, whether the confessional (the "box" in which the priest sits to hear confessions) is abused for improper purposes, and whether, as some sentimental non-Catholics with a purely theoretical knowledge contend, the practice has a considerable moral and spiritual value. The sale of absolution was always indirect. In the Middle Ages lists of money payments for various sins were drawn up, but the defence is that they were "alms" (to the Church) by way of penance. Pope John XXIII [see] was charged by the Council of Constance, in 1415, with the direct sale of absolution, and there are other cases in which Popes [see Avignon] and bishops virtually sold absolution for sins. The Reformation put an end to all this, and the slit for coins in the grille which separates priest and penitent in the modern confessional is for paying fees for Masses. The grille, or wooden partition with a porous grille, is quoted by Catholics as proof that there cannot now be abuses, but the priest may hear confessions in any room, without separation. In regard to the abuses which still occur, the evil effect on certain types of girls and women, and the supposed spiritual advantages—the overwhelming majority of Catholics detest the institution—are discussed in McCabe's *Twelve Years in a Monastery* (Thinker's Library ed., 1930, ch. VI). Although it is compulsory to confess only once a year, most Catholics belong to societies or confraternities which demand confession monthly, and the members discharge the obligation mechanically and reluctantly. The obligation begins at the age of seven, the Catholic Church holding that a child of that age is capable of deserving eternal torture in hell!

Confucianism. The religion which is listed in Chinese statistics or general religious statistics as Confucianism is almost as violently opposed to the ideas of Confucius as Buddhism is to those of Buddha, or Catholicism to those of the Jesus of the Gospels. Even as it was practised before the Revolution, by the Emperor and his officials, it endorsed superstitions which its supposed founder disapproved. The greatest of the Confucian Emperors, one of the greatest in Chinese history, Tai-Tsung [see], refused to conduct these sacrifices and services. Kung-fu-tse (551–479 B.C.), whose name is usually given in the barbarized Latin form, Confucius, was born during a spell of confusion and reaction in Chinese history. It was also an age of remarkable world-advance—the era of independent thinking which simultaneously produced Buddha in India and the Ionic philosophers in the West, if not Zarathustra in Persia—but the chaotic condition of China gives a special character to the teaching of Kung. He had not the least idea of founding a religion or restoring the old religion. He endeavoured to persuade rulers and princes (while Buddha went among the people, and the Greek sages discussed with their educated fellow-citizens) that salvation was to be found in a restoration, on a purely social and humanist basis, of the fine old literary and social traditions of the country, which he collected and codified.

To what extent the Confucian classics, the King [see], represent the work of Confucius will be considered under that heading. But the common description of them as Sacred Books, or the Bible of China, is a misrepresentation, and there is among experts even less dispute about Kung's attitude to religion—his complete rejection of it—than there is in the case of Buddha. Prof. Chamberlain slightly paraphrases his words when he quotes him as saying: "Respect spiritual beings, if there are any, but keep aloof from them" (*Things Japanese*, 4 ed., 1902). The missionary Walsh, however, says of him in the *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics*: "There is practically nothing of a religious nature in Confucianism pure and simple." Another missionary, a high authority on

China, Dr. Legge, writes the article on him in the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, and says that "his teachings were singularly devoid of reference to anything but what was seen and temporal." These clerical verdicts by experts on China suffice, and authorities on Confucius like Dr. Douglas entirely agree. Kung refers occasionally, it is true, to Heaven, if the texts may be trusted, but it is agreed that he means no more than the Stoic Law of Nature, or just uses conventional language; and the claim that he may have believed in God but never mentioned him is, as in the case of Buddha, violently opposed to all our experience of moralists. The Rev. Dr. Legge, in the above article—which is grievously mutilated in the latest edition of the *Encyclopædia*—answers also a few clerical writers who say that Confucius taught the Golden Rule only in a negative form. Challenged to give his philosophy of life in a word, he used a compound character which means "As Heart" (or Reciprocity), and this plainly implies positive as well as negative duties. All authorities, even if missionaries, admit that his followers in all ages have been Atheists, and that this purely humanist Confucian culture has been, since it was formally adopted by the Han Emperors (about 200 B.C.), one of the most effective social agencies in the history of civilization. As an ethical system it was never contaminated with mystery or superstition, but it was essentially conservative and bound up with the old feudal system, so that it has given place to modern humanitarian thought in the mind of the educated Chinese of the present century. A. Brown, *The Story of Confucius* (1927); R. K. Douglas, *Confucianism and Taoism* (1895); Pao Chien-Hsu, *Critical Realism in Neo-Confucian Thought* (1933).

Conrad, Joseph (1857–1924) novelist. The pen-name of the Polish writer Teodor Jozef Konrad Karzeniowski, who, after years at sea, became one of the most famous novelists of his generation. He professed a non-Christian Theism, but was nearer to Agnosticism. In *Some Reminiscences* (1912) he says: "The ethical view of the universe involves us at last in so many cruel and absurd contradictions . . . that I have

come to suspect that the aim of creation cannot be ethical at all" (p. 163).

Conscience. The popular name for the moral judgment and its accompanying emotions. The word belongs properly to the days when psychology, in its metaphysical stage, represented man as endowed with different "faculties." Modern philosophy [see], in all but its most conservative and expiring wing, finds no such special aptitude or activity in man. It entirely ignores the word "conscience," and recognizes only ordinary judgment and emotion directed to questions of conduct, and in the individual shaped by his educational environment. The modern science of ethics [see] concurs and traces the natural development of "conscience" in the race. See Prof. E. Westermarck's *Origin and Development of the Moral Ideas* (2 vols., 1906), Prof. Carveth Read's *Natural and Social Morals* (1919), and other works recommended in the articles to which reference is made. The attempt of Kant [see], who was in this followed by Cardinal Newman, to represent conscience as a categorical imperative [see] which, when rational arguments failed, provided evidence of God and immortality, was based upon the analysis of a single highly sophisticated moral experience and has, with the advance of psychology and ethics, lost any force it may ever have had. [See also Intuition.]

Consciousness. An ultimate fact of experience which it is, accordingly impossible to define in terms of other, facts and, in the present condition of science, impossible to explain. The Behaviourist School [see] in psychology regards it as an illusion or a piece of mere verbiage like Free Will; but, although Behaviourism has generally converted psychology into "the study of behaviour," it is not followed on this point. The word denotes a fact of experience, and most psychologists are not prepared to admit that all inner experience is illusory or that consciousness is less real than emotion or memory. Attempts, however, to explain it on the lines of modern scientific psychology are premature and hardly worth considering. They are not more realistic than the Spencerian "friction in the

ganglia." Cerebral physiology had a late start, and the cortex is the most complex phenomenon in nature to unravel. The reasonable attitude is to reflect that we are steadily advancing [see *Brain and Mind*] and that it is not only neither explanatory nor logical to declare an energy "spiritual" because of our present incapacity to explain it, but that the procedure has, in the case of aequosity, vitality, miracles, etc., been discredited throughout the whole progress of modern thought. A. Gergo's *Physiologie des Beuristseins* (1939) is the latest attempt at a Materialist explanation. [See also *Materialism*; *Mind*; *Psychology*.]

Consent, Argument from. [See *Universality of Belief in God*.]

Conservation of Matter and Energy. A point in the sceptical attitude to science which is recommended by apologists is that nineteenth-century science made a basic principle or dogma of the conservation or indestructibility of matter and energy, and that "the New Physics" has discredited this. Under the influence of Relativism it has been found that matter (or mass) and energy are identical in the sense that they are two aspects of one reality—which was one of the fundamental ideas of Haeckel's much-abused *Riddle of the Universe*. A glance at any older manual of physics or encyclopædic article will show that energy [see] is now taken in a new sense—it has become the name for a concrete reality instead of an abstract word—so that in a conversion of mass into what is now called energy there is no annihilation. One sort of material reality is transformed into another, just as when an atom of uranium breaks up into its constituent particles. The latest and most authoritative manuals of physics recognize this. Prof. H. A. Perkins says, in his *Course of Physics* (1938), that "the law of the conservation of energy must be extended to include mass, so that the conservation of the totality of the mass and energy of a system would replace the older system" (p. 61). Prof. Helmkamp says that "the laws of the conservation of mass and energy constitute one broad generalization" (*An Orientation of Science*, 1938, p.

118), and the law remains valid (p. 138). The ill-informed attempts of Sir J. Jeans and Sir A. Eddington to represent that those who in the last century held the indestructibility of matter never suspected that atoms are composed of particles of something else are mainly responsible for the confusion. [See *Atoms*.]

Constantine, The Emperor (†288–337). The glorification of Constantine "the Great" in popular literature, which is due to his establishment of Christianity in the Empire, is not sustained in modern history. He was most probably the illegitimate son of the Emperor Constantius—St. Ambrose says, in an important sermon (*De obitu Theodosii*, § 42), that his mother was "a tavern-girl"—and his ambition for the monopoly of the throne, at a time when the imperial power was legally divided, cost the Empire hundreds of thousands of lives in an age when they could ill be spared. His division of the Empire and building of Constantinople further weakened it, and it is now generally agreed that he was compelled to leave Rome because in a fit of jealousy he had ordered the murder of his wife, his son, and a boy-nephew. So St. Jerome, in his *Chronicle* (year 326), and Eutropius (X, 6). It is impossible to determine in what sense he was really a Christian. Throughout life he bore pagan offices and titles, and he was baptized only in his last days; and his death was followed by an appalling massacre of relatives in his palace in the interest of his sons (Gibbon, Ch. XXIII), who proved to be a very degenerate brood. His legislation was of very mixed value, and his patronage of Christianity and rewards for baptism divided and weakened the Empire and led to a still more debilitating and truculent persecution. His later years were passed in an effeminate luxury which provoked the derision of the Romans. The chapter on him in the *Cambridge Medieval History* (Vol. I) is by an ecclesiastical writer, and uncritical, but the article in the *Encyclopædia Britannica* is generally sound and has escaped the Catholic censors of the last edition. See also J. B. Firth's *Constantine the Great* (1905), but a critical biography is still to be written.

Contingency, Argument from. [See *God, The Existence of.*]

Controversy, Hints about. Since it is one of the chief purposes of this Encyclopædia to give information on all aspects of the Rationalist-religious controversy to Rationalists who have not access to large libraries, and may wish to engage in local controversy, a few general hints may be useful. The articles included in this work show that not merely sophistry, but false statements, are more common in the religious than in any other field of controversy. Many years ago a religious weekly of great influence, in a leading article, quoted with approval the statement of "a foremost modern theologian, by no means of the radical school," that "one of the main characteristics of apologetic literature is its lack of honesty" (*Christian World*, August 20, 1903, p. 10). This very serious charge of a respected religious writer of the time must be endorsed without hesitation in the sense that, wittingly or unwittingly—and there is abundant evidence of the former—apologetic writers repeat statements which have been refuted scores or hundreds of times, quote names as authorities which entirely mislead the reader, and alter or mutilate quotations from opponents. These practices are so flagrant that the experienced controversialist—the experience of the present writer covers nearly half a century—will refuse to accept authority for any quotation or statement unless the status and expertness of the authority quoted are clear and an exact reference to his work is given. Catholic writers, whose readers are forbidden to consult the works of opponents, are particularly unreliable; and they have in recent years boldly adopted a practice of omitting the clerical prefix, when they quote their own writers, and putting them in a common list with acknowledged authorities. They thus make statements for which, if challenged, they could quote only their own clergy, and deceive the public about other writers. Another very common trick is to conceal the date of the work or authority quoted, so that one finds lists of "great Catholic scientists" most of whom died when science was in its infancy, or

men who were demonstrably not Catholics (Pasteur, Claude Bernard, etc.), or were of dubious orthodoxy (like Mendel), are quoted for the recent period. Anti-evolution writers use the same tricks when quoting "distinguished scientists" (all long since dead) who opposed evolution, or invest quite insignificant writers with high authority. On all such questions one must ascertain whether the writer quoted has any authority *on the matter under discussion*. Physicists now dogmatize on biological and psychological questions, and literary men courageously pronounce on every variety of subject. On most pages of this work, examples of these vices of apologists will be found. The critic himself must be sure that the authority he quotes is up-to-date. In half a century our knowledge has been materially rectified, especially in science, history, and comparative mythology, and works that are now known to be inaccurate in scholarship are sometimes recommended for use. The Rationalist case needs no straining of evidence and always gains by the severest self-criticism; and all additions to or corrections of our knowledge during the last forty years strengthen the Rationalist position.

Conway, Moncure Daniel, D.D. (1832–1907), author. Trained for the Methodist ministry in Virginia, he soon abandoned its creed, graduated in divinity in a more liberal Church at Harvard, and became a Unitarian minister. Zeal for the abolitionist cause brought much persecution upon him, and he emigrated to England and was appointed leader of the South Place Chapel. He became an Agnostic and guided the Society in its final development as a purely humanist body. His impressive and scholarly discourses and works (*Demonology and Devil-Lore*, 2 vols., 1879; *Life of Thomas Paine*, 2 vols., 1892; *Autobiography*, 2 vols., 1904, etc.) made him a respected and influential figure in the public life of London.

Conway, William Martin, Lord Conway of Allington, M.A., F.S.A., F.R.G.S. (1856–1937), art expert and traveller. He was professor of art at Liverpool University College 1885–88, and Slade Professor of Fine Arts at Cambridge

1901-4, but he was better known as one of the most famous travellers and Alpinists of his time. He climbed the Himalayas, the Alps, and the Andes, and he received the Gold Medal of the Paris Exhibition (1900) and the Founders' Medal of the Royal Geographical Society. His Agnostic position is seen in his work, *The Crowd in Peace and War* (1915). He rejects Christianity and defines religion as "man's description of his ideas about the great unknown, his projection on the darkness of what he conceives that darkness to contain" (p. 214).

Conybeare, Frederick Cornwallis, M.A., D.D., LL.D. (1856-1924), Orientalist. He was a Fellow and Praelector of University College, Oxford, and a scholar of world-wide reputation in Oriental matters: a Fellow of the British Academy, an officer of the French Academy, and a member of the Armenian Academy of Venice. He was an outspoken Agnostic (see pp. 340-6 of his *Myth, Magic, and Morals*, 1909) and a member of the R.P.A. In *The Historical Christ* (1914) he criticizes severely the thesis of the non-historicity of Jesus.

Cooper, Anthony Ashley, First Earl of Shaftesbury (1621-83). Although he had fought in the Puritan army, and been a Privy Councillor under the Commonwealth, he was created Earl of Shaftesbury and Lord Chancellor under Charles II. He was the author of the Habeas Corpus Act (1679), quarrelled with the King and had to fly to Holland. There has been much dispute about his public conduct, but the general opinion to-day is that he was "ever incorrupt," and in his private life of "rare purity for his age" (*Dict. Nat. Biog.*). He was an intimate friend of Locke and was "indifferent in matters of religion" (*Life*, II, 95). It was he who replied to a question about his religion, "Wise men are of but one religion," and, when asked what this was, said, "Madam, wise men never tell." Disraeli borrowed the aphorism from him. His grandson, **Anthony Ashley Cooper**, third Earl of Shaftesbury (1671-1713), whom he had entrusted to Locke for education, was one of the most famous of the English Deists. He attended church

and deserted Locke for Plato, adopting intuitionism in ethics; but he pensioned the Deist Toland, and shows his own Deism and his "lofty and ardent character" (*Dict. Nat. Biog.*) in his chief work, *Characteristicks of Men, Manners, Opinions, and Times* (1711). (See J. M. Robertson's *Pioneer Humanists*, 1907, pp. 181-229.)

Cooper, Peter (1791-1883), American philanthropist. Of a poor New York family, and with only six months schooling, he—though strictly honest in business—amassed a considerable fortune. In order to provide for other workers the education of which he had been deprived, he established and financed Cooper's Union (or Institute), which is still active and greatly appreciated in the educational life of New York, paying \$660,000 for the building, and in the course of his life expending a further sum of \$1,550,000 on it. In *The Political and Financial Opinions of Peter Cooper* (1877) the Curator of the Institute, and an intimate friend, Professor Zachos, says: "Mr. Cooper was so broad, sincere, and catholic in his religious principles that I believe he would be recognized by any minister of the Christian religion as a truly religious man" (p. 22). It is the customary phrase for a good man who was not a Christian, and he left no bequests for ecclesiastical purposes. In what sort of God, if any, he believed, his biographer does not state.

Cope, Prof. Edward Drinker, M.A., Ph.D. (1840-97), American palaeontologist. He was one of the most renowned palaeontologists of his time and published 350 papers and many volumes on his science. The Royal Geographical Society awarded him the Bigsby Medal, and from 1867 onward he was Palaeontologist to the U.S. Geological Survey. Cope, one of the most powerful protagonists of evolution in America, was a Theist (*Theology of Evolution*, 1887), but sceptical about a future life.

Copernicus (properly, Niklas Coppernigh, 1473-1543). References in religious literature to "the devout Polish priest who made the great discovery of the revolution of the earth round the sun" must be corrected. He was of German, not Polish, blood; he was not

a priest and not at all devout; and he did not discover the central position of the sun. (See the most authoritative biography, L. Prowe's *Nicolaus Copernicus*, 2 vols., 1883-4.) His uncle, one of the loose-living bishops of the time, got him elected—though he was not in orders and neither devout nor virtuous—a canon of the cathedral solely in order to provide him with an income. He had graduated in medicine. The statement of Belloc, and other Catholic writers, that he lectured on his system in the Papal University at Rome, in 1500, is false. Prowe proves that he never lectured in an Italian university, is not known to have given lectures on astronomy anywhere in Italy, and probably himself learned the centrality of the sun from Italian astronomers. The revival of classical literature had informed them that Pythagoras and Aristarchus had held this, and the question was under discussion when Copernicus visited Italy. The system in which he blended this theory with Aristotelian ideas was so erroneous that even Tycho Brahe, the greatest astronomer of the time, rejected it. Copernicus kept his book, *On the Revolutions of the Heavenly Bodies*, in manuscript for twenty years and wrote a letter to Pope Paul III complaining that he met bitter hostility in the Polish Church. As the Papal Court was then very corrupt, he hoped to find in it a more lenient attitude. His friends, timidly explaining that it was only a hypothesis, got the book printed in the last year of Copernicus's life, but he was dying and unable to read it when the first copy reached him. For a long time it attracted little notice, and when the first trial of Galileo drew attention to it, the Vatican, so far from being favourable, put it on the Index and kept it there until the nineteenth century, repeatedly refusing to remove it (Putnam's *Censorship of the Church of Rome*, 1906, I, 309-14).

Corinthians, Letter to the. This letter, written by the Christians of Rome to those of Corinth, rebuking them for their quarrels and vices, is one of the most important Christian documents of the first century. Loisy and a few others date it in the second century, but

the opinion of the great majority of experts, firmly supported by internal evidence, is that it was written in or about the year 96. The Catholic trick of calling it "The Epistle of Clement" and representing it as the first assertion of Papal authority is crude. It nowhere mentions Clement or any leader or Pope, and is a purely collective or democratic document. The tradition that the Roman Church then had a bishop named Clement appears later. The interest of the Letter is that it refers to two persecutions—clearly those of Nero and Domitian—and, while it says that Paul came to Rome and was martyred there, it uses very different language about Peter and plainly implies that he never came to Italy. Though it is rarely mentioned, it is one of the most effective disproofs of the Catholic claim that Peter founded the Roman Church. It describes its officials as bishops and deacons, showing that there was no caste of priests in the last decade of the first century between bishops and presbyters; and, while it quotes very lavishly from the Old Testament and the Pauline Epistles to enforce its words, it gives only two supposed sayings of Jesus, and these are not worded as they are in the four Gospels. These were therefore either unknown in Rome (though the language of the Christian community was Greek) in A.D. 96 or were regarded as of no authority. Bishop Lightfoot published a translation with a learned commentary (2 vols., 1890).

Cosmological Argument, The. The classical arguments for the existence of God are the Ontological [see, Cosmological, Aesthetic [see *Aesthetics* and *Theism*], and Ethical [see *Conscience* and *Ethics*.] The cosmological argument is that we can deduce the existence of a Supreme Mind from the beauty, order, movement, or even the existence, of nature (or the cosmos). The inference from beauty is discussed under **Beauty in Nature**. In the article **Chance** it is explained that the old apologetic practice of presenting us with the alternatives of intelligent plan or a "fortuitous concourse of atoms" as an explanation of the order of nature is now meaningless. It had force only

against some of the ancient Greek evolutionists, and even they answered it with the argument that in an infinite time any pattern (including nature as we see it) would be bound to issue from a fortuitous concourse of atoms. The subject will be further discussed under **Design**; and in the article **Science and Religion** it will be shown that, of the experts who are most familiar with order in nature, not one in ten now believes in a personal God, while almost all philosophers, and a large number of the leading apologists, think the argument invalid. [See **God, Existence of.**] It is unsatisfactory to make the reply that the universe evolved in virtue of law, not by chance, because law in the scientific sense is not a compulsion of events but a formula summing up a regular series of events. It follows that to infer a "Supreme Legislator" from the "laws of nature" is an absurdity. [See **Nature, Laws of.**]

Other aspects of the cosmological argument are that since there are movements in nature, there must be a Prime Mover—some being or cause that originates movement but is not moved—and that the chain of causes and effects implies a First Cause. Cause [see] and effect in nature are now in the last analysis regarded as movements, and modern physics increasingly suggests a fundamental material reality, whether we call it Ether or the Continuum of the Relativists, the stresses or strains of which cause all movement. To give it capital letters and call it a Prime Mover or First Cause is futile and unwarranted. A creative cause for this itself or its properties cannot be claimed until there is proof that it is not eternal. All attempts to prove this have failed [see **Beginning of the Universe.**] The argument of Catholic philosophers that all the contents of nature are "contingent"—that we can imagine them not existing—so there must be a "necessary" reality, is an empty piece of mediæval verbiage.

Cotton, Sir Henry John Stedman, K.C.S.I. (1845–1915), statesman. He was Home Secretary to the Indian Government 1896–8 and Chief Commissioner of Assam 1898–1902. In those offices, and later as M.P. for

Nottingham, he applied a rare idealism to the settlement of Indian problems. Sir Henry was a Positivist of high character.

Counter-Reformation, The. Modern Catholic writers, being no longer able to deny entirely the corruption of the Church which led to the Reformation, claim that the Popes detected such evil as there was and effected a complete internal reform independently of any pressure of Protestantism. It is one of the most audacious of the myths they impose upon their people under cover of their censorship. Dr. L. Pastor, their best historian in recent times, tries feebly to vindicate the myth in the earlier volumes of his *History of the Popes* (29 vols., 1891–1938), but the names of the small minority of strict prelates which he quotes are unknown in history, and they had no influence. The facts he gives show that these few men began to draw up lists of the necessary reforms in 1497, but the Court of Cardinals refused to elect a reform-Pope until 1555, when half of Europe was in rebellion against the Papacy, and Rome itself had been fearfully ravaged and impoverished by the armies of the Catholic Emperor (1527). To that date every Pope was actually vicious or had merely outlived his notorious vices, and the Court and the body of the clergy remained extraordinarily corrupt. A strict (if rather bibulous) Pope then ruled for four years, to be followed by a man of so low a character, Pius IV, that, Pastor says, "the evil elements immediately awakened once more." After six years of this, Rome endured for five years the truculent puritanism of Pius V, and, after his death, vice had again thirteen years of licence (1572–85) under Gregory XIII. Sixtus V next imposed five years of rigour upon Rome, which cursed his nepotism and his cruelty, and the Counter-Reformation was then over. It had consisted of fourteen or fifteen years' temporary suppression of certain vices and ended in futility. Too much of Europe was now anti-Papal to permit the flaunting licence of the golden days, and the treasury had sunk by three-fourths or more, but the city and Italy again became very corrupt. (See

McCabe's *History of the Popes*, 1939, pp. 421-31.)

Courtney, Leonard Henry, Baron Courtney of Penwith (1832-1918), statesman. After practising at the Bar for some years, he became professor of political economy at University College, London. He entered politics and was Under-Secretary to the Home Department 1880-1, and to the Colonial Office 1881-2, Financial Secretary to the Treasury 1882-4, and Chairman of Committees and Deputy Speaker 1886-92. He was "the greatest British statesman since Cobden of those who never held Cabinet rank" (*Dict. Nat. Biog.*). In his *Diary of a Churchgoer* (at first published anonymously, but under his own name in 1918) Lord Courtney gives us interesting revelations of unsuspected scepticism among his distinguished contemporaries, and admits that his own real place is "in the outermost court of the Gentiles" (p. 225). He was a non-Christian Theist, and rejected the idea of a future life.

Courtney, William Leonard, M.A., LL.B. (1850-1928), writer. Editor of the *Fortnightly Review* from 1894 onward, and on the editorial staff of the *Daily Telegraph*, he was able to do much for the expression of liberal thought. In an introduction to the symposium *Do We Believe?* (1905) he writes that "a hard, definite, logical, and systematic religious faith is almost an impossibility in the England we know" (p. 7), and in his *Constructive Ethics* (1886) he adopts a Kantian Agnosticism, defining God as "the sum of individual consciousnesses." (See *The Making of an Editor*, 1930, by J. C. Courtney.)

Courts of Love. These were one of the features of life in the "best" part of the Middle Ages which are now commonly suppressed in order to protect the current false description of the character of the women of the period. Noble and royal ladies used to meet for discussions (the equivalent of modern teas) of amorous questions and they openly disdained marriage obligations and made a spirited defence of the right of free love. It is generally agreed among the experts on these matters that the *Tractatus Amoris* ("Treatise on Love") of Andreas

Capellanus—which means Andrew the Chaplain (of Pope Innocent IV) of the pious thirteenth century—describing these courts is an account, only slightly embroidered, of the facts; and the priest enlarges upon them with obvious pleasure. Queen Eleanor of England, her daughter the Countess of Champagne, the Countess of Flanders, and other great ladies, were among the most aggressive leaders. They formed juries, discussed principles (such as that "a woman has no right to let her marriage interfere with her love") and cases, and wrote their decisions for circulation. For England see J. F. Rowbotham's *The Troubadours and the Courts of Love* (1895). "Immorality," he says, "was fostered as it has rarely been before or since" (p. 106). For Europe generally see the authorities recommended in *Chivalry, The Age of*.

Cousin, Victor (1792-1867), French philosopher and statesman. He was the chief philosophical writer and the leading figure in the educational world of France under the restored monarchy, and was for some years Minister of Public Instruction. His distinction in French philosophy is second only to that of Descartes, and it is to be remembered that he lived under somewhat similar conditions of Catholic tyranny. He did not, however, aim at originality, preferring to blend what he considered, rather from a Platonist point of view, the best elements of ancient and modern systems. His Pantheistic ideas are best seen in *Le Vrai, Le Beau, Le Bien* (1858). Besides writing a large number of volumes he edited the works of Plato, Abélard, Descartes, and Proclus (27 vols.).

Cowen, Joseph (1831-1900), politician and reformer. He was a wealthy business man who used the facilities of his business to smuggle revolutionary literature into Italy, Hungary, and France in the years of reaction, and he spent large sums in aiding the cause of reform and progress. As M.P. for Newcastle, which enthusiastically supported him, he in 1878 opposed a Bill to increase the number of bishoprics, saying that the country wanted no more "sleek and oily parsons." He called religious creeds "the ghosts of obsolete

opinions" and was a cordial ally of Bradlaugh (*Life and Speeches of J. Cowen*, 1885, p. 494).

Crane, Walter, R.W.S. (1845-1915), artist. He received the Grand Cross of the Crown of Italy (1903) and the Albert Gold Medal (1904), and collaborated with William Morris. In *An Artist's Reminiscences* (1907) he says that early in life he cleared his mind of "superstitious shadows and theological bogies" (p. 78) and "decided for Freethought" (p. 80).

Creation Stories. All peoples above the most primitive level of mentality, at which there is no speculation, came to believe that wise ancestors or gods had made the world in which they lived. Even the Bushmen have childlike legends about the making of the heavenly bodies by ancestors, and the Australian aboriginals attributed them to a race of powerful ancestors, the Alcheringa. In all such cases it is not a question of "creation" in the Christian sense, which is theologically defined as "making out of nothing"; not merely giving shape to existing material, but by an act of will causing the material itself, whether in a chaotic state or otherwise, to begin to exist. As soon as men rose to the level of philosophy they concluded that the substance of nature was eternal and its shape due to an eternal evolution (see J. Baudry, *Le problème de l'origine et de l'éternité du monde dans la philosophie grecque*, 1935); but the Hebrew literature, which the Christians took over, was understood to draw a distinction between "making" and "creating" and to insist that the world came into existence by the latter process. It is doubtful if the writer of the first Hebrew words of *Genesis* ("In the beginning") meant more than "first of all" or "to begin with"; and the common statement that he clearly distinguishes between the word *bara* (create) and *asa* (make) is quite false (see, for instance, ii, 4). However, the Latin word *creare* (which no Roman ever understood to mean making something out of nothing) was appropriated for the new idea, and because the Hebrews had adopted certain Babylonian legends which go back to the childhood of the Mesopotamian

race, the world was burdened for 1900 years with a dogma which liberal Christians now pronounce absurd.

Sir L. Woolley has suggested that Abraham took these legends with him from Ur, but, from differences in local colour, Biblical experts conclude that they had travelled very slowly from Babylonia to Judæa. The cuneiform tablets which give the stories in the course of a semi-religious romance that is called the Epic of Gilgamesh [see] began to be discovered nearly a century ago and may be seen in the British Museum. At least from the time of Hammurabi (about 2000 B.C.) the Babylonians did not take the creation-stories as any part of revealed truth. The Pennsylvania University Expedition to Mesopotamia discovered tablets from a school library of that date which give several different versions of origins, so that there is no point in stressing the differences between the Genesis and the familiar Gilgamesh stories. One of the newly discovered tablets (described by Prof. Chiera in the *New York Times*, July 12, 1925, p. 4, and later in his *Sumerian Epics and Myths*, 1934) has a crude evolutionary theory of the origin of man, telling that men were at one time quadrupeds and ate grass. It was reserved for the Aryans of 3,000 years later to call these childlike creation-stories "revealed truth." For savage and other versions of creation see Sir J. G. Frazer, *Creation and Evolution in Primitive Cosmogonies* (1935) and *Folk-Lore in the Old Testament* (3 vols., 1918, I, 1-44). A useful summary is given by Prof. R. W. Sellars in his *Next Step in Religion* (1918, pp. 30-43). The British Museum publishes a cheap account and translation of the Babylonian tablets (*The Babylonian Legends of the Creation*, 1931), and longer studies are Prof. S. Langdon's *Ancient Babylonian Epic of Creation* (1923) and W. C. Leonard's *Gilgamesh, the Epic of Old Babylonia* (1934).

Cremer, Sir William Randal (1838-1908), Nobel Prize winner. Although, on account of the poverty of his family, he began to work at the age of twelve, he attained a high position in public life by his humanitarian work and integrity of character, especially by a

judicious and devoted campaign for peace. He was awarded the Nobel Prize in 1903, and, though he was a man of very moderate means, he gave the greater part of the money to the International Arbitration League. He received also the Cross of the Legion of Honour, the Norwegian Order of St. Olaf, and knighthood (1907). Howard Evans, his biographer, observes that Cremer "was religious but had abandoned Christianity" (*Sir R. Cremer*, 1909).

Crete. [*See Ægean Religion.*]

Crime and Religion. A vast literature about crime has been published during the last half-century, and very many of the works recommend religion or the Churches as a preventive agency, yet none of the works, even when written by scientific sociologists, give statistics of the religious beliefs of convicted criminals, or notice that statistics are available, or comment on the fact that crime has in modern times been reduced in the same proportion as religion has decayed. Even the *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics*, to which one would look for an exact determination of this relation, has not a line about it; nor has the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, the new *Encyclopædia of the Social Sciences*, the *Cyclopædia of Education*, or any other standard work of reference or work on sociology or penology. This refusal to apply the only available scientific test, while general literature and the Press refer daily to the need to sustain the Churches in order to check crime, not only reveals the need of an ampler Rationalist literature, but confesses that the truth would be very damaging to religion. Criminal conduct has the same relation to unsocial (immoral) conduct in general as the visible rays of the spectrum have to the total solar radiation. Its volume, and its increase or decrease, in a community in proportion to the entire population, and assuming that the police and the judiciary institutions are not abnormal (as they are in the United States), are the best positive means of ascertaining the general character of the people and the efficacy or futility of such organizations as the Churches which profess to promote it. The invisible spectrum—

unsocial conduct which does not come under police notice—will always be proportionate to the visible. Yet, in all the flood of rhetorical assurances about the service of the Churches, neither Christian nor Positivist nor any other writer ever notices these facts, and the professional sociologist seems to be intimidated by Church influence. The facts, however, are less open to controversy and more decisive than in almost any other field of Rationalist-religious controversy, especially as regards the simultaneous rapid reduction of crime and decay of religious influence.

The official statistics of crime in different countries since the publication of such statistics began, in the last century, are collected in Mulhall's *Dictionary of Statistics* (1899) and Webb's supplementary volume (1911), which are in every good library. The ten pages of statistics show at a glance, and close examination strengthens the conclusion, that all the rhetoric about the social service of the Churches is false. Such rhetoric has nowhere been more strident than in England and Wales, yet the reduction of crime during the last hundred years of religious decay has been phenomenal. It is obvious that, before the reform (one might say creation) of the police, crime must have been far worse, and we have reliable evidence of this. At the beginning of the century a London magistrate of serious ideals, P. Colquhoun, published a treatise (*The Moral State of the Metropolis*), based upon police information, from which we see that crime of every kind was several times worse in 1800 than in 1840; and this appalling prevalence of vice and crime was just a continuation of mediæval life. From 1840 onward we have statistics, and they show a steady and rapid reduction. Convictions in the Superior Courts averaged 21,280 a year in the decade 1840-9. At the end of the century they were reduced by half, and, since the population had doubled and detection was much more effective, this is equivalent to a far greater reduction. They are now about one-third (7,185 in the latest available figures) though the population has trebled. That this is not due to a

re-classification of offences is shown by the fact that convictions in the Courts of Summary Jurisdiction have been equally reduced (27,710, in 1840, to about 8,000 a year), and even non-indictable offences, in spite of the enormous growth of city life, show the same reduction. Scotland has much the same record: while Ireland, significantly enough, has not. These are statistics of convictions, and we must remember that only half a century ago far more criminals evaded arrest, so that the volume of actual crime at that time was worse than the figures indicate. As late as 1878-88 the police failed to make an arrest in 1,094 out of 1,766 cases of murder.

Still more cogent is the social lesson in the case of France, where the influence of the Church has fallen in much the same proportion as in Great Britain, and the State has been fully secularized for nearly half a century. Convictions for grave crime fell from 5,486 a year (1831-40) to less than 2,000 a year (1910); murders from 500 to 200 a year; the sum of all convictions from 230 to 51 per 100,000 inhabitants. During a half-century after 1825, when the State was still Catholic, convictions for crime increased three-fold, and crime by boys four-fold (Dr. Lacassagne, *Revue Scientifique*, May, 1881), but since the adoption of secular education, in 1886, the number of boy offenders has been reduced by one half. Since scientific methods of detection were not adopted until 1879 (under the Rationalist Chief, Bertillon), the figures for the earlier period do not give the full volume of crime. In the case of the United States, general statistics are not published; the conditions of public life are favourable to crime, and the abnormal expansion of the population further complicates the problem. It is enough that (a) grave crime is rife in this land in which the Churches are the richest and most powerful in the world, and (b) a new extension of the police (G-men) made immeasurably more impression on it in five years than the Churches had made in fifty. In Germany, which had until 1918 far more religious instruction in schools than Great Britain or France, the reduction of crime was significantly less; and the figures are worse in Catholic

than in Protestant provinces. In Italy, where Papal rule, until eighty years ago, had permitted an appalling prevalence of crime [see *Papal States*], the anti-Papal Government, after 1870, made a considerable reduction (Mulhall and Webb) until the usurpation of power by Mussolini and his alliance with the Church, when, as the Italian official figures published annually in the *Statesman's Year Book* (and not noticed by any paper in England) testify, crime nearly doubled in four years, and only about one-tenth of it was political crime. It is an outstanding general feature of the statistics in Mulhall and Webb that Catholic countries have the worst record, and countries (except America) in which the majority never go to church the best.

Statistics of the religion of prisoners in jail in recent times are scanty and not easy to consult, but wherever they have been published they show that Roman Catholic prisoners are by far the most numerous in proportion to their total numbers in the general population. Fr. McCaffey, Catholic chaplain of Sing Sing (the New York jail), said, in an article ("The Church and Crime") in the (Catholic) *Commonweal* (December 14, 1932), that on taking a census of the prisoners he found that 855 out of 1,581 were Catholics (and only eight Atheists). The Church which boasted loudest of its character-forming virtue counted less than 20 per cent. of the total population, but nearly 60 per cent. of the jail population; and we shall see [Culture and Religion] that it does not count 5 per cent. at the other and more respectable end of the social scale. Australia and New Zealand confirm these figures. In 1914 the late Chief Justice of New Zealand, Sir Robert Stout, gave the present writer an analysis, from the official records in his department, of the creeds of New Zealand prisoners, and it showed that Catholics, who were only 14.07 per cent. of the total population, were 41.74 per cent. of the inmates of jails. Similar figures have repeatedly and officially been published in Australia. The latest issue of the New South Wales *Statistical Register* (p. 216) says that, of 1,330 prisoners, 505 were Catholics; and Catholics claim only to be one-

fifth of the population (550,000 in 2,600,000). Victorian official statistics (last available 1936) report that Catholics are 18 per cent. of the total population and 29.61 per cent. of the jail-population. It is the same in the other Australian States. The British Government no longer publishes an analysis of the religious beliefs of prisoners, but the chief Catholic centres—Liverpool, Newcastle, and Glasgow—are not conspicuously sober and orderly. It is enough that the available figures, which are ample, consistently make a mockery of the claim for the Churches.

Croce, Prof. Benedetto (b. 1866), philosopher and historian. Croce is not only the most eminent Italian philosopher of our time, but also a distinguished historian and man of letters. His chief work, *The Philosophy of the Spirit* (Engl. trans., 4 vols., 1909–21), has a world repute; and, as secretary of the Neapolitan Historical Society and editor of *La Critica*, he has done valuable work in establishing the vices of Papal rule in Italy in the nineteenth century. Although he is a Neo-Hegelian and Anti-Materialist, he rejects Christianity and the belief in a personal God and immortality. H. Wildon Carr says, in his *Philosophy of Benedetto Croce* (1917, p. 172): "The religious activity has no place in it. . . . Religion is mythology." Croce was the boldest critic of the Fascist policy under Mussolini.

Cross, The. A symbol which is broadly called a cross, though it is often more like a wheel, and in most cases it had nothing to do with crucifixion, is found over the world in a number of different fundamental types: Egyptian, Mexican, Greek, Latin or Christian, Celtic—there is a collection of Manx crosses in the Liverpool Free Library—St. Andrews, and Swastika. Among the Celts it is said to have been a solar symbol—compare the Yule (wheel) of the Teutons, which gave its name to the winter-solstice and Christmas—and among the Mexicans and Peruvians it was solar in some cases, but generally a symbol of the four quarters of the heavens from which wind and rain came. Other suggested meanings—in most cases they are very hypothetical—in

various regions are the sky, the earth (particularly in China), the solar radiation, space, or generation. The crooked cross, which is now called by the Hindu name *Swastika* (which is in its derivation phallic), spread from the Ægean region to Scandinavia in the north—the Germans are said to have adopted it from the Finns—and to India, China, and (some say) America in the east. Some experts believe that it originated in the Danube region during the Bronze Age and was popular as a charm, but they do not agree about its meaning. In the royal chapel (a few yards square) of the Cretan Palace at Cnossos (destroyed about 1450 B.C.) there is a large marble cross, with four arms of equal length, which completely baffles all experts. Special interest attaches to the Egyptian tau-shaped cross, or *ankh*, in which a ring or circle replaces the head-piece. Egyptologists agree that it in some way symbolizes life or life-giving, but most of them reject the claim that it represents the union of the sex-organs, though there is strong reason to suppose this. It was spread over the ancient world by the Phenicians, who combined it with the phallic cone of Astarte. Discussion of the phallic significance of the cross is in very many cases marred by exaggeration on one side and prejudice on the other. It has to be recognized that the ancient nations among whom we find the cross *were* very candid about sex matters. Down to the last century Irish churches often had, as keystones of the door arches, what we should now call blatantly obscene statues of women (Scheila-na-gig)—see the article "Phallicism" by Hartland in the *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics*—and the Egyptians were very ingenuous. No recent work on the cross taking modern scholarship into account is available. The title of A. H. Allcroft's *The Circle and the Cross* (2 vols., 1927) is misleading, as it does not discuss these issues. See also H. Cutner, *A Short History of Sex Worship* (1940).

Cross, Mary Ann or Marian ("George Eliot," 1819–80), novelist. Mary Ann Evans, as she was until she married the banker, Cross, two years before she died, was brilliant from girlhood, learning Greek, Latin, Italian, and

German after leaving school. She published some religious poetry, but by 1844 she had so far abandoned Christianity as to translate Strauss's *Life of Jesus* (1844-6). She joined the staff of the *Westminster Review* in 1851 and was welcomed in the brilliant group of Victorian writers. Three years later she allied herself with G. H. Lewes, whose marriage was unhappy, and she retained the high respect of her contemporaries. The Rev. Dr. Jowett pronounced her "the gentlest, kindest, and best of women" (*Life and Letters*, II, 144). Lewes inspired her to begin the writing of the novels which put her in the front rank of British writers, and it was after his death that she married Cross (1878). She was an Agnostic with Positivist sympathies.

Crozier, John Beattie, M.D., LL.D. (1849-1921), historian. A Canadian by birth—University Medallist and State Medallist of Toronto University—Crozier came to London and settled in medical practice. He published several historical works (chiefly, *The History of Intellectual Development*, 3 vols., 1897-1901) of distinction and wide reputation. Although he at times uses Theistic language, he speaks in his *Last Words on Great Issues* (1917) of "this pale and somewhat watery Theism of mine" and explains that he believes only in "an Unchangeable Something" (p. 224).

Crucifixion. A mode of execution much used by the Romans, particularly in their Oriental provinces. Josephus tells us that during the siege of Jerusalem, in A.D. 70, Jews escaping from the city were crucified by the hundred (*Jewish War*, V, II), and Philo often refers to crucifixion. The Romans are believed to have borrowed this method of execution from the Carthaginians in the time of the Punic Wars—the ancient Persians also had frequently employed it—but under the Republic they confined it to slaves. The form of the cross they used is not clear in references to it, and many think that it was often a mere pole or stake. Seneca (*De Vita Beata*, XIX, 3) implies that the victim was, at least sometimes, nailed to the stake. The punishment was so commonly inflicted upon rebels in Judæa that

contemporary cults in which, at the annual celebration of the death of a god (Attis, etc. [see]), a human figure was bound to a tree need hardly be invoked to explain this detail of the legend of Jesus, though the influence of the saviour-god ceremonies on the doctrinal conception of the death of Jesus and the story of the Resurrection is another matter. That Jesus was crucified by the Roman authorities is stated in detail in all four Gospels; and crucifixion (not explicitly attributed to the Roman authorities) is a central theme of the Pauline Epistles, the cross being the means by which Paul's supreme idea—atonement or redemption—is supposed to have been realized. The Crucifixion therefore belongs to an older stratum of the Gospel-material than the birth stories. From an unprejudiced historical point of view the only question is whether this Christian tradition of the second half of the first century does or does not, especially keeping in mind the frequency of such executions in Judæa, suggest a basis of fact. Rationalist writers of the mythological school deny this. Drews traces the story of the sufferings of Jesus to *Isaiah liii* and agrees with Niemcewicz that the Crucifixion itself may have been an astral myth (*Witnesses to the Historicity of Jesus*, 1912, pp. 169-79). Robertson holds that the whole story of the betrayal, trial, and death is a description of a mystery or ritual play which, he postulates, the Jews were accustomed to perform, and he looks to contemporary cults for added details (*Pagan Christs*, 1903, Pt. II, Ch. I). Conybeare criticizes the myth theory (largely because the Jews of the first and second centuries never claimed this) in *The Historical Christ* (1914). The subject is part of the general question of the historical value of the Christian documents, which is discussed elsewhere [Acts; Gospels; Jesus; Paul.]

Cruelty, Pagan and Christian. It is a commonplace of religious literature that with the introduction of Christianity a more tender and more humane sentiment was engendered in the Roman world. This statement, which is part of the rhetorical modern apologetic, would have astonished some of the older

ecclesiastical historians. They were familiar with the letters in which St. Cyprian describes the condition of the African Church, the strictures of Eusebius (ch. VIII) on the whole Church in the third century, the violent character of the Roman Christians of the fourth century [see *Damasus and Jerome*], the savagery with which the great theological controversies were conducted, the survey of the entire Christian world by the priest Salvianus [see] in the fifth century and his emphatic assurance that all but a very small minority were worse than the pagans had been in respect of cruelty and impurity, the *History of the Franks* of Bishop Gregory of Tours of the sixth century (almost unique in literature as a record of ferocity and vice), and the steady lapse of Christendom to the lowest depth of the Dark Age. These documents are now never noticed, and the new claim is based upon imaginary services which are disproved in special articles [*Child* ; *Gladiators* ; *Hospitals* ; *Philanthropy* ; *Slavery* ; *Woman* ; etc.]

On the other hand, the ecclesiastical writers of two or three centuries ago recognized, since their claim for Christianity chiefly regarded its promise of salvation in another world, the high social ethic of the Stoic-Epicurean writers (Cicero, Dio, Epictetus, Seneca, etc.) of the Roman world, and they did not clumsily mix together, as modern apologists do, the vices of the pre-Christian Republic and the later and improved Roman world in which the Christians moved. The adoption of more critical methods in history and the enlargement of our knowledge by archæological research, which has been considerable in Rome and Italy, have banished from serious history the idea that the Romans of Imperial days were callous and vicious men who needed to be converted [see *Rome, Ancient*], and the more learned and more conscientious ecclesiastical historians (Duchesne, etc.) show how little fitted the Christians of the fourth century were to convert them. The sounder historical conception is typified by the well-known fact of the pagan Prefect Symmachus and the pagan writer Ammianus Marcellinus (XXVII, 3, etc.) expressing, in the second half of the fourth century,

their polite astonishment at the brutality of the Christians of Rome, though they use less severe language about them than St. Jerome does. It is now not uncommon for historians to represent the entire solidly Christian period (about 500-1800), as a hollow between the Greek-Roman and the modern heights of civilization. The attempt of some to claim a moral recovery of Christendom after the eleventh century is refuted in a number of articles [*Chivalry* ; *Middle Ages*, etc.]. John, Bishop of Salisbury, the most learned writer of the twelfth century, and equally familiar with England and France, wrote a work, *Polycraticus*, in which he shames the knights and nobles of both countries with an account of the greater decency and honour of the pagan soldiers. Guizot, the Protestant French historian, calls the period "one of the most brutal, one of the rawest, in our history" (*History of Civilization*, III, iv). The cruelty that lingered in England until the nineteenth century ought to be enough to warn any writer against repeating this myth of a humanization of Europe by Christianity.

Crusades, The. The expeditions of Christian knights and soldiers for the delivery of Palestine (the "Holy Land") from the Moslem were called Crusades (Campaigns of the Cross) because the soldiers marked themselves with a cross. The idea proved so useful to the Popes that they began to call for Crusades against the peaceful and wealthy Moslem cities of Spain, against bodies of heretics (Albigensians, etc.), and at length against Christian monarchs who defied the Papacy. This gross abuse culminated when Gregory IX demanded a Crusade against the kingdom of Frederic II, even (against the laws strictly laid down by the Popes themselves) while he was absent on Crusade, because he got favourable terms for Christians from the Sultan by negotiation instead of by an unnecessary war. Moreover, the romantic idea of the Crusades in Palestine which one still finds in school-manuals and religious writers is heavily discredited by modern historical studies, which are based upon contemporary documents. There is a general agreement that, while some

soldiers were prompted by religious fervour, the primary impulses of the immense majority both of leaders and soldiers were love of fighting and richness of loot in the opulent East; that the Papacy and local Churches sought and gained an enormous accession of wealth and power by organizing the Crusades; and that though hundreds of thousands of lives were sacrificed, they ended in complete futility. Our highest authority, *The Cambridge Medieval History*, a by no means anti-clerical summary of modern scholarship, observes that genuine religious zeal was almost confined to the rank and file, while the leaders (including those heroes of the romantic version Godfrey of Bouillon and Raymond of Toulouse) were "intent solely on their private interest . . . that of carving out principalities for themselves" (iv, 335). Archer and Kingsford's lenient work, *The Crusades* (Story of the Nations Series, 1894) says that "only of a few of the Crusaders can we predicate absolute purity of motive" (p. 446). Other writers point out that the common soldiers themselves had very secular motives. "Famine and pestilence at home drove men to emigrate hopefully to the Golden East," says Prof. E. Barker in the *Encyclopædia Britannica* ("Crusades"); and even the very resolute American Catholic propagandist Dr. Walsh, who (though he has not the least authority in history) is entrusted with the corresponding article in the new *Encyclopædia Americana*, admits that "for the lower classes in the West life had become almost intolerable because of the oppression of the nobles, the frequent wars, and the almost (!) servile duties that feudalism enjoined." Yet not one of those writers mentions the fact that Urban II, who is usually described as summoning the First Crusade in a mood of pure religious fervour—his conduct in Italy had already been so vile [see Urban II] that it shocked Christendom—openly appealed to the cupidity of the knights and princes. "The wealth of our enemies," he said in his famous address to them (Migne, CLI, Col. 586), "will be yours, and you will despoil them of their treasures"; and his chief aim was to secure the submission of the Greek

Church to the Vatican (*Camb. Med. Hist.*, iv, 599). No historian reminds his readers that, of the rich loot which had already attracted the French knights to join the Spaniards in ravaging the Arab-Spanish cities, a large part had been sent to Rome; nor do they tell how, as we read in the contemporary monk-chronicler Ordericus Vitalis (*Hist. Eccles.*), when the news of the splendid loot secured by the first Crusaders reached Europe, the Duke of Aquitaine (the most licentious and most irreligious prince in France), the Duke of Bavaria, and other nobles, with more than 100,000 men and "swarms of girls" (the monk says, though the one historian who reproduces this translates his phrase, "a great crowd of pilgrims"), set out gaily to join them, and all but a few score perished on the way. On the other hand, modern historians agree that the traditional practice of blaming the Greek Christians, who were alienated by the looting even of the followers of Peter the Hermit, for the failure is unjust, and that the appalling losses were due to the incompetence of the leaders. They were mighty in single combat, but too ignorant to direct campaigns.

The Syrian Moslem princes had from the start been for the most part tolerant and sceptical, like those of Spain, but in the tenth century Egypt and Palestine had fallen under the power of the ignorant and fanatical Fatimite Caliphs, and pilgrims had been vilely treated; and this continued when, in 1073, Palestine passed to the Turks in their primitive zeal for Islam. Peter the Hermit then began to inflame crowds, but modern historians smile at the old accounts of his influence, and they recognize that the horde which followed him and perished was a disorderly rabble, "the dregs and refuse of Christendom" one historian says. No one questions that large numbers of soldiers took the cross out of religious fervour in the First Crusade (1096-9); but now that we know the real character of the mediæval knights and nobles [see Chivalry] we understand how rare even a man like Godfrey of Bouillon, with all his defects, was among them. The Second Crusade (1147) was of the same

character, and was, although some claim that it numbered 1,200,000 men, a complete failure. The Third (1189-92), against Saladin, who had captured Jerusalem, obtained generous terms from that prince, whose character put to shame the Christian leaders. Romantic versions of this Crusade under Richard the Lion Heart are the most numerous of all. In sober history Richard, a Frenchman who knew hardly a word of English and despised England—the film *Crusade* was in this and other respects ludicrously false—was “a splendid savage” and “a man of brutal violence and callous indifference to honour” (*Dictionary of National Biography*). The contemporary documents collected and translated in T. S. Archer's *Third Crusade* (1888) throw a lurid light upon the whole body of knights and men of this Crusade. The Fourth (1203) was not seriously needed and was just part of the power-policy of Pope Innocent III; and to his intense anger the Crusaders appropriated, with every circumstance of barbarity, all the wealth of Christian Constantinople and refused to go to Palestine. The Fifth was that of Frederic II, who got generous terms for pilgrims by friendly negotiation and was excommunicated for this by the Pope. Europe was now itself getting rich and critical, and the Sixth (under St. Louis) and Seventh Crusades failed. By 1291 the Moslem had regained the whole of Palestine, and the Christian princes and knights refused to stir. They were now comparatively rich, and there was a widespread contempt of the clergy.

As some compensation for stripping the Crusades of their glamour, modern historians strain the facts to prove that they had beneficent consequences. The first claim, that it was this cultural contact with a superior civilization which roused Europe from the Dark Ages, may seem a dubious compliment to Christendom, yet it must be corrected. The awakening of Europe, which was due to friendly contact with the Arabs of Spain, not to brutal clashes (from which, indeed, few returned) in the East, had proceeded far in Southern France before the First Crusade was launched. The second claim, that the passage and

transport of the soldiers promoted the revival of trade in Italy, is just; and it is equally true to say that the need of the nobles to raise money for the venture enabled many towns to purchase charters of freedom, and bodies of serfs to win or buy emancipation. We should, in fact, find it counted one of the greatest benefits of the Crusades that the common people of Europe got for a time considerable relief from the brutality of the knights and princes if this argument did not compel the apologist to recognize their true character, as Walsh inadvertently does. Against these services we must put the enrichment of the Papacy, the bishoprics, and the abbeys which hastened their mediæval degradation; the debilitation of the Eastern Empire and eventual sacrifice of it to the Turks; the encouragement of a pious violence which soon showed itself in the massacre of the Albigensians and the founding of the Inquisition; the growth of such abuses as the sale of indulgences [see] on the plea that to pay to the Church the price of the voyage to Palestine earned as many indulgences as actual participation; and the general imposition, by Innocent III, of tithes, which had hitherto been local and sporadic. The *Cambridge Mediæval History* (vols. IV and V) generally endorses these criticisms, though the writers of the various chapters are unequal in candour and often contradict each other. G. A. Campbell's *The Crusaders* (1935) is candid about the brutality of the Crusaders and greed of the Church, but not broad enough. Harold Lamb's works (*Iron Men and Saints*, 1930, and *The Flame of Islam*, 1931) are vigorous but not consistently critical. A. Jamieson's *Holy Wars in the Light of To-day* (1918) is a summary of sound criticisms, but little more than a pamphlet, and E. R. Pike's *Story of the Crusades* (1927) is a good popular account, without serious criticisms, by a Rationalist.

Culture and Religion. A complementary study to that of the relation of crime [see] and illiteracy [see] to religion is the study of the proportion of religious or Christian to non-Christian men or women in the higher grades of culture. The disappearance of the quotation,

once so popular, that "a little learning is a dangerous thing," the discovery that it is futile to "count heads," the remarkable paucity of names of men of high intellectual distinction in ecclesiastical gatherings and publications, and the notorious fact that the Churches are strongest in the most backward countries and themselves admit that in a country like Great Britain they have twice as many members (in proportion to population) in rural districts and small towns as in cities, broadly indicate the situation. Unfortunately, while we have today sociological inquiries into almost all other aspects of life, our universities do not encourage scientific or exact investigation of the status and influence of religion. Such facts and figures as are available confirm the general impression. In Great Britain the Rationalist Press Association [see] publishes a list of intellectually distinguished men as Honorary Associates, recently deceased or actual, which is a crushing reflection on Churches with a thousand times the membership. An analysis of the *Catholic Who's Who* (a veritable "Book of Snobs") betrays an appalling intellectual poverty in comparison with the Rationalist list. In this country and France the Catholic *intelligentsia* is mainly confined to a few literary men and women, and their utterances on religion betray a lamentable ignorance of the requisite historical and scientific knowledge.

In the case of America, Professor Leuba published, in 1916, an analysis (*The Belief in God and Immortality*) of a private inquiry into the attitude of 1,000 American men of science, historians, and psychologists. Of the greater men—objectively classified—who replied to the inquiry whether they believed in God or immortality, less than a third admitted belief; of the greater historians, psychologists, and sociologists, who may be considered of more weight in such matters than physicists or heads of museums, more than 70 per cent. professed "disbelief," which is the authoritative definition of Atheism. Of the total number of persons who replied—and apparently many were in institutions under sectarian influence—42 per cent. believed, 42 per cent. disbelieved, and

14 per cent. were Agnostic. The proportion of "disbelievers" (expressly distinguished from Agnostics) is notable. This inquiry was held in 1914. In 1934 Prof. Leuba repeated the inquiry, and found (*Harper's Magazine*, August, 1934) that the percentage of believers had sunk to 30, and the percentage of disbelievers had risen to 56. It is further entirely reasonable to assume that the large number who did not reply were Rationalists, as no one would suffer for professing belief, but in many cases a professor or curator might lose his place if his confession of Atheism leaked out. It will be noted that this considerable increase of Atheism among the "greater" scientists occurred just in the period (1914-34) when the loudest assurances were given in periodical literature that science was "abandoning the Materialism of the last century and returning to spiritual realities."

The opinions about religion of scientific men have always been of particular interest to the public on account of their mental training. In this there is a large element of fallacy, since it is obvious that an extensive and broad knowledge (chiefly of biology, psychology, history, and comparative religion) is required to give value to a man's judgment of Theism or Christianity, but most scientists are, and must be, narrowly specialized. Physicists and mathematicians especially—compare Faraday, Lodge, Jeans, Eddington, Fleming, etc.—are apt to be erratic and superficial in their views about religion. We treat this under Science, and need add here only that in 1912 the Christian Evidence Society published (*The Religion of Scientists*) the results of an inquiry sent to Fellows of the Royal Society. With the characteristic looseness of apologists, most of the questions asked were so framed that well-known Agnostic Fellows like Sir E. Ray Lankester could, and did, give an affirmative answer; and the editors did not explain to their readers that the Royal Society includes patrons of science (dukes and wealthy men) as well as men of science. The one question (in six) which was a real test asked if the Fellow believed in personal immortality. Of 200 (out of

503) Fellows who replied, 47 (37 of whom were physicists !) only said yes, 41 said no, and the rest were vague.

A broader test is the analysis of the professions of men and women in *Who's Who in America*. The English *Who's Who* does not invite professions of faith, and it is material to notice that the American edition does not ask to what Church a man *belongs*, but—on a “reformed” plan suggested by the Churches—which Church he prefers. In spite of this painfully dishonest trick, the analysis (published in *Builders of America* by Profs. Huntington and Whitney, 1931) of the 30,000 names shows that, while 1,185 per 100,000 members of the Church vote for Unitarianism and 390 for Universalism—neither of which Churches in America requires even belief in God—Catholics have only 7 per 100,000 of their body in the roll of honour, and the Fundamental Church the same. Even the Episcopal Church, to which it is politic and fashionable to belong, has only 156 per 100,000; and the entries for the Catholic and the Protestant Episcopal Churches are very largely Church dignitaries and politicians. The Nobel Prize for Literature affords a world-test, and it will be shown under that head that the enormous majority, including nearly all the more eminent, of the recipients are Rationalists. For the relation of religion and knowledge at the other end of the cultural scale see *Illiteracy*.

Cumont, Prof. Franz Valéry Marie, D.-ès-L. (b. 1868), Belgian archæologist. His studies of Mithraism, a subject which had hitherto been much neglected, won for him an international repute and threw a very important light upon early Christianity. He is a member of the Académie Royale de la Belgique, the French Institut, and the Academies of Göttingen, Munich, Berlin and Copenhagen, and a Corresponding Fellow of the British Academy. His learned papers in the academic publications of various countries number 546. There is an English translation of his invaluable *Mysteries of Mithra* (1903), but his Rationalism—as professor at the University of Ghent he had to be discreet—is better seen in his *After-*

Life in Roman Paganism (Engl. trans., 1922). His works on ancient Rome have done much to correct libels of the pagans.

Curia. The word originally meant a division of the Roman people, but in the Middle Ages it came to mean a royal court. It is now commonly used as the name of the Papal Court, though it officially means the group of congregations and tribunals which assist the Pope to rule the Church, and in particular the five offices which are most closely connected with the Vatican.

Curie, Pierre (1859–1906), Nobel Prize winner. As Curie died in the early years of radiological development, and in part owing to the zeal of feminist writers, the fact that he had an equal share with his wife in the discovery of radium has been obscured. He was a professor of physics at the Paris Municipal School when he began (1896) to study the Becquerel rays which led to the discovery of radium. In 1904 he was appointed professor of physics at the Sorbonne. In her memoir of him (*Pierre Curie*, 1924), his widow says that they had a civil marriage only, “in conformity with the views of both of us,” as “Pierre belonged to no religion and I did not practise any” (p. 52). He remained a sceptic all his life and had a civil funeral. His widow, *Manya* (Marie) Curie (1867–1934), of Polish race, had had a freethinking father (she tells us), but was brought up a Catholic by her mother. She abandoned the creed before she was twenty, and had a secular marriage and funeral. After the death of her husband she brilliantly sustained their research, receiving sixteen gold medals, nineteen degrees, and eighty-eight other academic honours. The Nobel Prize for Physics was awarded to them jointly in 1903. The biography of her by her younger daughter (*Mme. Curie*, 1938) repeats that all the members of the family are Rationalists. The two daughters, Irene (Mme. Joliot) and Eve, continue the work with outstanding ability. The elder daughter was awarded the Nobel Prize for Physics jointly with her husband in 1935.

Cybele. The Greek name for the Great Mother or Mother of the Gods particularly worshipped by the Phrygians and Lydians of Asia Minor.

These Aryan peoples adopted the Mother-Earth goddess, Ma, of the Hittites, when they invaded Asia Minor and modified it. Their cult spread to Greece, and in the third century B.C. to Rome. It became popular under the Emperors and was, with Mithraism, Manicheanism, and the cult of Isis, one of the rivals of Christianity and one of the sources of its ritual. The emasculated and effeminately dressed priests of Cybele, the Galloi, are recorded in Alexandria in the third century B.C., and Augustine saw them in the streets of Rome in the fourth century A.D. Attis [see] was the son and lover of Cybele—originally a symbol of the relations of sun and earth—and the celebration of his death and resurrection (March 15–27) in the streets of Rome was the model of the Catholic "Holy Week" [see]. Statues of Cybele and her divine son became statues of Mary and Jesus, and her ritual epithets were largely transferred to Mary.

Cyrano de Bergerac, Savinien (1620–55), famous French dramatist. He began to write after two years' brilliant service in the Army, and his wit and faculty for satire gave him a great reputation. But he turned his gifts upon the Church—his *Chanticleer*, a play that is still often produced, is a biting satire of the clergy as the birds and beasts of the night—and he was bitterly persecuted to the end of his life. (See E. Rostand's *Cyrano de Bergerac*, 1897.)

Cyrenaics, The. The sceptical school of Greek philosophers founded by Aristippus of Cyrene. The province of North Africa of which Cyrene was the capital lay between Carthage and Egypt, and roundly corresponds with the modern Italian province of Libya. But in ancient times it was fertile and prosperous, and was esteemed one of the most agreeable provinces of the Greek world—a natural environment for the temperately hedonistic Cyrenaic philosophy. [See *Aristippus*.]

Czecho-Slovakia, Religion in. The apathy, if not cynicism, with which reference books give statistics of religion, as contrasted with their meticulous care in regard to all other statistics, is richly illustrated in the case of Czecho-Slovakia. The latest issues of several

annuals like the *World Almanac*, etc., give the population of the country as (before the German invasion) 10,500,000, and almost on the same page give the Roman Catholic share of the population as 10,831,636 (besides 3,000,000 Protestants, nearly a million "no religion," etc.). No one ever notices the blatant way in which the clerical authorities have here overreached themselves. That there is a large Catholic majority in the country is due in part to the very backward condition of Slovakia, where political priests like Fr. Hlinka prepared the way for the Germans by rousing hostility to the Czechs, and partly to the domination of the country by Austria since the Thirty Years War (1618–48), when the very fine-spirited and anti-Papal old Bohemia was almost annihilated.

In the nineteenth century Austria severely restricted the industrial expansion of the Czechs, one of the most robust and most progressive peoples in Europe, and encouraged the immigration of Catholic workers (and Austrian capital) from Austria and Germany into the border or Sudeten provinces. These were *not* provinces transferred to the Czechs at Versailles. The Catholics in them, under cynical promises to their Church by Hitler, prepared the way for the Nazis at one end while the political Slovak priests undermined at the other. Though Hitler had made similar promises in regard to the Church in Germany and in Austria [see], the Vatican had suffered such losses in the country since it had recovered its independence (1919) that it decided to trust the Nazis, and used its influence to divide the Czechs and the Slovaks and make France repudiate its obligations. The Papal Nuncio at Prague had been expelled for political intrigue in 1933, and the French had obliged the Pope by securing his return (article in the Catholic *Revue des Deux Mondes*, Aug. 1, 1935). A writer in the Catholic *Tablet* (Oct. 31, 1936) stated, on the authority of a Czech priest, that between 1919 and 1930 "nearly 1,900,000 left the Church" (p. 591) and that all but 150,000 of these became Freethinkers. Under its Rationalist President Masaryk [see], the finest statesman in Europe, the

country had been thoroughly secularized and modernized, and its Rationalist organizations were the best in the world, having their own schools, hospitals, etc. At the National Congress of Freethinkers which was held at Prague, in 1935, the chief meeting was attended by 40,000 men and women. Germany robbed and completely destroyed the movement, and, as usual, also shattered the Catholic allies who sold their country to defeat Atheism. At the last census (1930) 854,638 declared themselves of "no religion." This is, in proportion to population, the largest number of declared Atheists in Europe—it is, in fact, surpassed only by the coloured folk of South Africa—and the men who make this declaration in the census-paper are never more than a fraction of the total number of sceptics.

It was this notable spread of scepticism in Bohemia that moved the Vatican to support the movement, under the priest Hlinka, for autonomy in Slovakia. Under Hlinka's clerical successor, Mgr. Tiszo, it demanded separation and invited Hitler to intervene and destroy the great little Republic.

Czolbe, Heinrich, M.D. (1819–73), German philosopher. He is always included in the short list of "Materialists of the last century," when apologists *do* condescend to name the men they mean, but, like Haeckel, Büchner, and most of the others so described, he always rejected the title Materialist. His philosophy, however, might be described as a sort of Materialistic Pantheism, or Spinozism without Spirit. He was a military surgeon by profession and an amateur in philosophy.

D.

Damasus, Pope (ruled 366–84). He is the first Pope, though the thirty-seventh in the list, of whose character or personality we have reliable and fairly ample knowledge. Although he, like nearly all his predecessors, is inscribed in the calendar of Saints, he was a man of unscrupulous character, and his story illustrates the generally low moral quality of the new Church established by Constantine. It is an ironic reflection on Catholic descriptions of the early Roman Church that the only predecessor of Damasus about whom we have some detailed knowledge—left us by his contemporary and rival, Bishop Hippolytus (*Refutation of All Heresies*, Bk. IX, Ch. VII)—"St." Callistus (217–22), was equally poor in character. By the year 366, when Damasus, a priest of Spanish extraction, obtained the Pontificate, the Roman See was rich. The contemporary and austere Roman writer Ammianus Marcellinus, commenting on the appallingly savage electoral fight for the Papacy which took place, says that the Roman bishops lived like princes (*Res Gestæ*, XXVII, 3) and the intrigue for the position of Pope was fierce. St. Jerome, secretary of Damasus, briefly confirms the account of the massacres in his

Chronicle (year 366), and the full and extraordinary story is told by two Roman priests in a petition to the Emperor (in Migne, *Libellus Precum*, vol. XIII). The only difference between them is whether the supporters of Damasus, at the election, murdered 137 or 160 of his rival's supporters. Some years later, in 378, the Pope was charged in the civil court at Rome with adultery, as the semi-official *Pontifical Chronicle* admits. Even Mgr. Duchesne (*History of the Christian Church*, II, 371) falsely says that we do not know the charge, and the *Catholic Encyclopædia*, which admits the charge, untruthfully says that the Emperor, on receiving an appeal, tried and acquitted the Pope. The rescript of the docile and youthful Emperor, Gratian, shows that, under pressure from St. Ambrose to avert scandal, he held no trial, but quashed the proceedings. The petitioning priests say that the Pope was familiarly known in his Church as "the tickler of matrons' ears," and Jerome [*see*] describes the Church as extraordinarily corrupt in both clergy and laity. It was this Pope who reopened the Catacombs [*see*], and the highest Catholic authorities admit that his stories of the martyrs [*see*] were fictitious. Mgr. Duchesne maliciously

adds that the quality of the poetry in which he glorified them was as bad as his history.

Dandolo, Count Vincenzo (1758-1819), Italian chemist. He had some distinction in chemistry, but Napoleon, on taking Italy, made him Governor of Dalmatia, which he ruled with a strong sense of justice and humanitarianism. This appears also in his work *Les Hommes nouveaux* (1799), which is Deistic. Napoleon made him Count and Senator in 1809.

Daniel, The Book of. In 1893 the Rev. Prof. Sayce, a learned Assyriologist and conscientious writer, published *The Higher Criticism and the Verdict of the Monuments* (8th edition 1915), which opened the stream of books purporting to prove that archæological research had corrected the severe strictures on the Old Testament of the Higher Critics. It is explained under **Archæology and the Bible** that such new discoveries as have been made do not affect Rationalist criticism of the orthodox view of the Old Testament. On the other hand, Prof. Sayce devoted a chapter to Daniel, and showed that the suggestion of critics that it was a late and worthless work of fiction was fully substantiated. His points, which orthodox apologists meet with feeble quibbles and a large ignorance of archæology and history, still hold. The famous writing on the wall at the feast of Belshazzar is as mythical as the court of King Arthur. Belshazzar was not King of Babylon, the city was not taken by violence, but by corruption and betrayal, and it was not "Darius the Mede," but Cyrus, who took it. Darius was not the son, but the father, of Ahasuerus (Xerxes), and Nebuchadnezzar was one of the greatest and most enlightened monarchs of the age. In short, all names are spelled outrageously, and all details which can be checked are so far astray that the writer, instead of being in Babylon in 439 B.C., as he claims, clearly belongs to several centuries later. We now have the official tablets in which Cyrus describes the taking of the city. We must not, it is said, call the book a forgery, because the practice of writing falsified history for sectarian purposes, and claiming that the writer had first-

hand knowledge of the events, had now become common among the Jews. It is not immaterial to reflect that this practice began with the triumph of Jahveh over the wicked gods and goddesses of Canaan, and multiplied with the final victory of the Jahvist priests after the Exile.

Dante, Alighieri (1265-1321). Dante's place among the world's greatest poets has been seriously challenged by such competent judges as Goethe, Goldsmith, and Savage Landor; but even if we accept the general valuation, we have to point out that his *Divine Comedy* was the first book written in Christendom since Augustine's *City of God* which any but a specialist in literature now reads. In other words, nearly 900 years of the Ages of Faith, including a century and a half of the second and better part of the Middle Ages, are comprised in this appalling stretch of lack of genius or of great literary inspiration. This is unique in history. Further, the customary references to Dante as "the great Catholic poet" (or properly, the only great Catholic poet) conceal facts of deep interest in regard to his work. He rejected the theology of his age on very material points. The horrors of his *Inferno*, which Goethe pronounced "abominable," do not dispose the reader to expect to find in it a moral sensitiveness which would resent the barbaric teaching of the mediæval Church; but in fact, in his classification of sins and punishments, Dante ignores the theologians and follows Aristotle and Cicero. (See the Note at the end of Gollancz's edition, 1900, and K. Witte's *Essays on Dante*, 1898.) The ethic is social rather than theological, and Dante defies the Church in his leniency to pagans and to sexual offenders. He puts several Popes deep in hell and is a valuable witness to the spread of scepticism in Italy. In the *Purgatorio* he throws Catholic doctrine to the winds. A pagan and suicide, Cato, is in charge of Purgatory, and it is a place in which souls mentally purify themselves instead of being tortured. The Church doctrine of indulgences is ignored. The *Paradiso* is a pathetic failure to make the orthodox idea of heaven attractive.

Danton, Georges Jacques (1759–1794), leader in the French Revolution. A lawyer of considerable ability and good family who abandoned his profession to take part in revolutionary politics and for a time, when France was gravely threatened, approved of violent measures. The excesses sobered him—he opposed the use of the guillotine—and the extremists rallied to Robespierre, who had him arrested and executed. Even Belloc's *Danton* (1899) brings out the greatness of his personality and clears him of libels, but it misrepresents his attitude to religion—he was one of the most outspoken Atheists of the time—and gives a deplorably false account of the general religious situation. [See *French Revolution*, The, and Prof. Aulard's *Christianity and the French Revolution* (Engl. trans., 1927).]

Dark Age, The. The period between the collapse of the Roman Empire and the re-awakening of Christian Europe in the eleventh century, described by Dr. Inge as "several centuries of unredeemed barbarism, the most protracted and dismal retrogression which the human race has suffered within the historical period" (*Christian Ethics and Modern Problems*, 1930, p. 13). As it set in and ended gradually, it cannot be sharply defined, but is usually understood to mean the six centuries between 500 and 1100. The ancient civilization was generally ruined by 450, and the new vitality of Europe was well developed in Southern France before 1100, so that, although an appalling amount of barbarism remained in Europe after 1100 [see *Middle Ages*], the phrase best represents the stretch from about 450 to 1050. The familiar date 1066 roughly indicates the close. In America, where Catholic influence on education and the circulation of books is very marked, several distinguished professors of history have in recent years contended that "Dark Age" is substantially a libellous fiction due to the Rationalist historians of the nineteenth century. See Prof. G. B. Adams, *Civilization During the Middle Ages* (1922), Prof. L. Thorndike, *Short History of Civilization* (1926), Prof. C. Perkins, *History of European Peoples* (1927), and a few others. English historical works, including the

Cambridge Mediæval History, have not yet materially shown this influence, and continue to speak of the Dark Age and its barbarism.

The new claim has two fatal weaknesses. Most of the writers assume that the European historians whom they set out to correct mean by the Dark Age the entire period of the Middle Ages, or from about 500 to about 1550. Prof. Haskins (*The Renaissance of the Twelfth Century*, 1927) says that by the Dark Age is understood "all that came between 476 and 1453" (thus bringing into it the Gothic cathedrals, the universities, Renaissance art, etc.), and for this surprising statement the distinguished historian quotes no authority. None of the writers of this school names, or could name, any responsible Rationalist historian or author who uses the phrase in that sense. Buckle, whom they seem to have in mind, clearly defined the Dark Age (*History of Civilization*, 1856, II, 108) as a period of "about 500 years," or from about 500 to about 1000. The second and quite general defect of these apologists, who seem to be unaware that the phrase was coined by a leading Catholic historian, Cardinal Baronius (*Annales*, 900), is that they assume that it means that Christendom was *uniformly* dark from 500 to 1100, and that they refute the libel when they find a learned or pious abbot or bishop here and there in the gloom, or a province which (like Saxony under the Ottos) had its barbarism relieved for a time by, owing to a royal marriage, the introduction of Byzantine culture. These features were always recognized in history, especially since Hallam's *View of the State of Europe During the Middle Ages* (2 vols., 1818). Recent critical history has reduced, rather than enlarged, the claims made for the age of Charlemagne [see]—for the age which preceded him, Bishop Gregory of Tours's *History of the Franks* and the letters of St. Boniface show a general and revolting corruption—and the apologetic historians fail to consider how the post-Carolingian "renaissances" to which they appeal left Rome and the Papacy in, as no one questions, a condition during a century and a half of remarkable grossness and depravity.

The general condition was one of semi-barbarism. There had been universal free education in the Roman world, but from 500 to 1050 at least 95 per cent. of the people, outside anti-Papal Lombardy and Moslem Spain, were illiterate. There had in the fourth century been three or four free men to one slave, but 90 per cent. of the people had now become slaves (serfs). The splendid pagan system of philanthropy, municipal administration, provision of pure water, baths, medical service, etc., and the just enforcement of an enlightened code of law, had wholly perished. Trade was very scanty and primitive; the most brutal tortures (including removal of eyes, ears, tongues, hands, feet, genital organs, etc.) were common; the nobility themselves were filthy in their habits, generally illiterate, and cruel to the people; and the life of the serf-population, which means nine-tenths of the whole, was unspeakably squalid and coarse. [See *Education*; *Iron Age*; *Justice*; *Law*; *Papacy*; *Philanthropy*; *Serfdom*; *Torture*.] As stated in the article *Abélard*, the steady recovery began in the south of France with the permanent restoration of trade, school-life, and literature, and it is only a lingering in history of the traditional prejudice against Arab influence that obscures the source of the impulse (Spain). This began long before the First Crusade. A survival of Lombard culture [see] in the cities of North Italy materially helped, but Rome remained one of the most backward cities in Europe during the centuries of restoration. (See Gregorovius, *History of the City of Rome*, Engl. trans., 8 vols., 1900-9, and *Middle Ages*.)

Darmesteter, Prof. James (1849-94), French Orientalist. A master of Oriental literature who in 1877 was appointed professor of Zend and, in 1885, of Iranian languages at the Collège de France (Paris University). He translated the Avesta for "The Sacred Books of the East" and published works on India, Persia, and Judæa (especially *Les prophètes d'Israel*, 1892) which put him in the front rank of European scholars. In his *Penseurs et Poètes* (1896), Gaston Paris says, in the course

of a fine appreciation, that Darmesteter rejected in early years the Jewish creed in which he had been educated and "never in the heaven of his thought replaced the Jewish God on his overturned throne" (p. 41).

Darrow, Clarence (1857-1938), American lawyer. Educated in the public schools, Darrow, who was called to the Bar in 1875, won a reputation as the greatest American criminal lawyer which was widely recognized even in Great Britain. He never forgot the class from which he had sprung, often took cases with little or no emolument, and was attorney for labour organizations in many disputes. In 1902 he became a member of the Illinois legislature, and several attempts were made to ruin him. He was an Agnostic, exceptionally well-read, and a sincere if rather pessimistic humanitarian. His work in defending criminals, whom he always saved from the death-sentence, was misunderstood. He explained to the present writer, after the Loeb-Leopold trial, that he considered the execution of criminals barbaric and unjust. (See his *Crime: Its Cause and Treatment*, 1934, Watts & Co.)

Darusmont, Frances (1795-1852), pioneer of the feminist movement. As Frances Wright—she was the daughter of a wealthy Dundee Rationalist, whose views she adopted—she made an early mark in British life. At the age of eighteen she wrote a work (*A Few Days in Athens*, 1822) in defence of the Epicurean philosophy. After some years in France she settled in the United States, where her eloquent lectures on Rationalism, feminism, and other reforms won her a high reputation. She became Mme. Darusmont in 1838. The article in the *Dictionary of National Biography* says that she held that "kind feeling and kind action are the only religion," and that "few have made greater sacrifices for conviction's sake or exhibited a more courageous independence."

Darwin, Charles Robert (1809-1882). He had a medical education at Edinburgh University, but, disliking medicine, went on to Cambridge to study for the Church. From this he turned to natural history, and in 1831 he sailed as

naturalist in the *Beagle*. He began, in South America, to collect evidence in favour of evolution, and, settling at Down in 1842, he devoted fifteen years to the accumulation of facts and the preparation of his book. At the close, in 1858, he learned that Wallace had come to the same conclusion, and he very generously issued a joint statement with him. Wallace's superficial attraction to the theory of Natural Selection would have had no influence if it had not been for Darwin's twenty years' laborious collection of proofs and his learned application of the principle. The *Origin of Species* was published in 1859, the *Descent of Man* (after Huxley had applied the theory to man in 1863) in 1871. Although he was an invalid and incapable of working more than a few hours a day, he continued during the next ten years to prepare and publish works on various aspects of evolution, leaving the polemical activity to the more vigorous Huxley. None has ever ventured to question the quiet dignity of his character, but a few foolish attempts have been made to deny the firmness of his Agnosticism—these were promptly and decisively answered by his sons—or to claim that it and his scientific work led to defects of personality. He himself gave occasion for the latter by an exaggerated complaint of his "lamentable loss of the higher æsthetic taste" (*Life and Letters*, I, 100); but L. Huxley shows, in his small biography (*Charles Darwin*, 1921, Ch. XV), that this gives quite a wrong impression. He had a rich and affectionate personality; but feeble health and absorption in a great task naturally checked its expansion in some directions. This was clearly shown in the *Life and Letters of Charles Darwin* by his son, Sir F. Darwin (3 vols., 1887); and the recent work on him by Geoffrey West (*Charles Darwin, the Fragmentary Man*, 1937) is an unfortunate illustration of the tendencies of literary men. It was, however, not written with hostile intention, and the words "Fragmentary Man" did not appear in the American edition. See the severe criticism of it in *Nature* (May 7, 1938) by Prof. Poulton. As to Darwin's views on religion, his position is so clearly proved, from

his own words, by Sir F. Darwin, in the *Life and Letters*, that the reminiscences of old ladies to the contrary ought to have been beneath discussion. In an autobiographical paper which he left, Darwin wrote in 1876: "Disbelief crept over me at a very slow rate, but was at last complete" (I, 309). In a letter dated 1879 he wrote: "I think that generally (and more and more as I grow older), but not always, an Agnostic would be the correct description of my state of mind" (I, 304). Three years later the great Agnostic was buried in Westminster Abbey.

Darwin, Erasmus, B.Sc., M.D. (1731–1802), physician and grandfather of Charles Darwin. He practised medicine at Lichfield, and later at Derby, where he founded the Philosophical Society for the purpose of discussion. His *Zoonomia, or the Laws of Organic Life* (1794), written in verse, is Deistic, but it was one of the works which helped to revive interest in the old Greek idea of evolution.

Darwin, Sir Francis, D.Sc., M.B., F.R.S. (1848–1927), botanist. Third son of Charles Darwin, he studied medicine, but assisted his father instead of practising, and became a leading authority on botany. After the death of his father he was appointed University Lecturer and later University Reader in Botany at Cambridge. He was President of the British Association in 1908, and was knighted in 1913. **Sir George Howard Darwin, F.R.S.** (1849–1912), the second son, was an astronomer of great distinction and author of the generally accepted theory of the moon's origin. He was Plumerian Professor of Astronomy at Cambridge from 1883 to his death, and he received the Gold Medal of the Royal Astronomical Society. **Major Leonard Darwin, D.Sc.** (1850–1943), the fourth son, a military engineer, and for a time in the Staff Intelligence Department, was also M.P. for Lichfield (1892–5) and President of the Royal Geographical Society (1908–11). He specialized in genetical science and was President of the Eugenics Education Society. The fifth son, **Sir Horace Darwin** (1851–1928), was a distinguished engineer. All shared the Agnosticism of the famous naturalist,

Darwinism. It illustrates the low grade of scientific culture of religious opponents of evolution: that they generally make the theory identical with Darwinism. In some cases it is clear that they do this wilfully—for the distinction is a platitude of evolutionary literature—so that their Fundamentalist or Catholic readers will assume that the scientific men whom they quote as critics of the particular theory of evolution known as Darwinism have also rejected the fact of evolution. Darwinism is a theory of the agencies which effected evolution, or a theory of biological evolution by means of Natural Selection [see]. Darwin's study of species, especially of their geographical distribution and the relation of living to fossil forms in South America, while he was on the staff of the *Beagle*, convinced him that—as Buffon, Erasmus Darwin, Goethe, and Lamarck, to say nothing of the Ionian philosophers, had taught—they had been formed by evolution, but he saw no plausible explanation of the mode or mechanism. The idea of Natural Selection, of a struggle for existence in which the less fit to meet the conditions die out and the fitter survive and breed the next generation, came to him later when he read Malthus's book and reflected on the population problem. It was the provision of this plausible explanation, with the immense body of facts given in the *Origin of Species*, which forced the recognition of a great truth that had hovered on the horizon of the scientific mind ever since science began in ancient Greece. That is the unforgettable service to the race of Charles Darwin.

It doubtless helps sophists to delude the ignorant when we quote his famous work by the abbreviated title *The Origin of Species*. The title he gave it is *The Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection*. That is Darwinism; and its author, gentle to the point of humility, would have been the first to acknowledge that his work, like that of any other scientific pioneer, would probably need considerable modification. Here scientific writers, sometimes of distinction, have unfortunately given encouragement to the crude popular attitude and

its clerical and literary (Shaw, Chesterton, Belloc, etc.) mouthpieces. In the first flush of the success of Mendelism, or genetical science [see Genetics], many affirmed, almost in the familiar language of the cheaper apologists, that Natural Selection, or Darwinism, was "dead." They might at least have recalled, as Prof. A. Dendy does in his *Outlines of Evolutionary Biology* (4th ed., 1938), that in the 6th edition of the *Origin* (p. 421) Darwin had said: "I am convinced that Natural Selection has been the main, but not the exclusive, means of modification." As a subsidiary cause he developed the idea of Sexual Selection [see]. But it is more important that, as the science of heredity was in his time still in its infancy, he recognized that he did not know the cause of the variations upon which Natural Selection acted. This the Mendelists discovered, and many went to the extreme of saying that Natural Selection was now superseded or, in a phrase that was familiar twenty years ago, that nature (inherited structure) is everything and nurture (or environment) nothing. This was never "the teaching of science." In 1922 a session of the British Association Meeting was devoted to Darwinism, and it was amusing that, while some speakers still declared Natural Selection "as dead as the Dodo," every second intervener in the debate accepted it. The position to-day is that genetical writers acknowledge the exaggerations of the first quarter of the century, and, as Prof. J. B. S. Haldane says, "in general the two beliefs still go together" (*The Causes of Evolution*, 1932, p. 2). Sir P. Chalmers Mitchell, who called himself "a hard-shelled Darwinian evolutionist"—and Sir A. Keith gives such titles as *The Religion of a Darwinist* (1925) and *Darwinism and its Critics* (1935) to his books—says that genetical science has "smoothed the path for Darwin" (*Materialism and Vitalism in Biology*, 1930, p. 18), and Prof. Conger observes, in his *New Views on Evolution* (1929), that "the prevailing opinion among biologists is that the Darwinian struggle for existence is real and very important." Genetical authorities like Dr. R. A. Fisher (*The Genetical Theory of Natural Selection*, 1930) say that their

science "supplied the missing facts of the structure first created by Darwin," or, in the measured words of Prof. S. F. Shull (*Evolution*, 1936, one of the best of recent manuals), that "while the Natural Selection theory has not come through the cross-fire of criticism unscathed it still is not disabled" (p. 165) and is, in fact, "more highly esteemed than ever provided it be not regarded as universal in application" (which Darwin did not claim). Many such declarations might be quoted from the highest authorities. The general scientific view to-day is that genetics explains the origin of variations from the parental type, and Natural Selection, though inadequate in some cases, prunes the tree of life. [See *Evolution; Genetics; Mendelism.*] J. H. Willis's recent *Course of Evolution* (1940) continues the Genetist attack on Natural Selection.

The attempt to discredit Darwinism on the social side, or to make it inconsistent with Socialism and bound up with the present economic order, is crude. Darwin never even glanced at the world as it is and has been since the dawn of civilization, or discussed the question of values. His theory that struggle was the main cause of organic transformations in a world devoid of intelligence, whether true or not, has no bearing upon the conditions of mental and social advance. Sir A. Keith's opinion that war is a preventive of degeneration has no support in the scientific world. Darwinism is a theory of the earth's past.

David. None of the numerous and jubilant books on "the Bible and the Spade" can claim that archaeological research—and research in Palestine chiefly aims at vindicating the Bible—has found the least support of the stories of David and Solomon. Writers of liberal views who still speak of them as historical figures rely solely on the probability that the Hebrew writings, when they were first compiled, included traditions of the nation or "royal annals." Historical analogy, which gives plausibility to this idea, reminds us also how such traditions were likely (as in the case of Arthur of Britain, etc.) to be distorted beyond recognition before they were incorporated in history. That the

story of Solomon was thus clothed with fiction, if it had an historical nucleus, is generally recognized, and the reconstruction of the history of the Hebrews has no place for his supposed splendour. The Biblical account of David, on the other hand, has raw features which suggest an early origin. It is something like what is suggested by the original Arthur of our legends mentioned by a monk chronicler of the eighth century: a leader of men in the armies of the brutal British kings whom Gildas paints so darkly. The "kernel of fact" which some Biblical divines find in the story—others see no reason to find even this—is as unimportant to-day as a Pathan raid of the last century.

David, Jacques Louis (1748–1825), eminent French painter. He was the outstanding artist of revolutionary and Napoleonic days and is described by historians of art as "the regenerator of French art." David was an Atheist, an active revolutionary, and the organizer of the pagan festivals. Napoleon greatly honoured him, but he was sent into exile at the royalist restoration.

David, Professor Thomas William Rhys, LL.D., Sc.D., Ph.D. (1843–1922), Orientalist. His interest in Indian affairs, which made him the highest authority on Buddhism, began when he was in the Civil Service in Ceylon. He left it to study law and was called to the Bar, but his command of Indian languages and literature was such that he was professor of Pali and Buddhist Literature at London University from 1882 to 1912. He was a Fellow of the British Academy and president of several learned bodies. In *Is Life Worth Living?*—the reprint of a lecture delivered to the London Sunday Lecture Society in 1879—he rejects Christianity and the belief in immortality.

Davidson, John (1857–1909), Scottish poet. After some years in a chemical laboratory, in which he began work at the age of thirteen, and as a schoolmaster, he settled in London and devoted himself to letters and journalism. In his *God and Mammon* (1907) he says that he "would have all men come out of Christendom into the universe," and his Rationalism is also expressed, rather on Nietzschean lines,

in his *Testament of John Davidson* (1908).

Dayton Trial, The. Dayton is a small town in Tennessee, with a population of 1,700, which became known throughout the world in 1925 by the trial of a teacher for introducing evolution into his classes. Tennessee is one of the backward States in which the strident apostles of Fundamentalism wrought up the ignorant farmers and small-townfolk into making such teaching a legal offence. L. D. Scopes, teacher of science in the High School, was put on trial, and, although he was defended by Clarence Darrow, was found guilty on July 21. The State Supreme Court later quashed the sentence on a technicality—to the relief of most of the people of Dayton, who regarded the proceedings with contempt and annoyance. The Fundamentalists secured W. L. Bryan, a former candidate for the Presidency of the Republic, and a famous orator, for the prosecution, and he died suddenly on July 26. There is no reason to doubt that Bryan was sincere in professing Fundamentalism, but so much misguided sympathy is given to these "simple believers" that the truth should be told. Clarence Darrow assured the present writer, shortly after the trial, that Bryan caused his death by gluttony, and had for years been addicted to it.

Dead Matter. The phrase recalls one of the ironies and irritations of conducting controversy about science and religion with apologists who rarely know anything about science. Until the early years of this century it was customary to reproach Rationalists for their extravagance in holding that life could have been evolved from "dead matter." When physicists established the fact that the atoms of matter are minute spheres of intense energy, the apologists began to reproach Rationalists with the charge that they had regarded atoms as dead inert particles like marbles. The word "dead" has, of course, no application to inorganic matter. It applies only to things which have once lived. The discovery that metals have diseases, fatigue, etc., implies only something analogous to life in them. In any case we have now

such a gradation of bodies—subatomic particles, atoms, molecules, advanced synthetic carbon-compounds, enzymes, viruses, microbes, etc.—that the old antithesis of dead and living matter is outdated. For the idea that we were entirely mistaken about the nature of matter see **Atoms and Energy**.

Dead Sea, The. Probably very few pietists now discover proof of the childish and obscene story of *Genesis* xviii and xix in the saline waters of the Dead Sea, as so many generations of even educated Christians did. It has been the universal belief since the first century that the Dead Sea covered the site of Sodom and Gomorrah. There is no trace whatever of such cities. The Dead Sea was at once explained when science turned an eye upon it. There is no outlet for the water which the Jordan pours into the basin, and evaporation carries off the water and leaves the salts. Geological examination has further shown that at one time the sea was much larger and teemed with life like any other. It has, in fact, been recently discovered that there is life (micro-organisms) in the water to-day (*Nature*, Sept. 12, 1936, p. 467), and the fable, at one time generally believed, that birds will not fly over it is as baseless as that of the natives who identify the pillar of salt into which Lot's wife was turned.

Death. The cessation of life. Normal death—not caused by accident or obvious disease—is widely regarded by very primitive peoples (Hottentots, Australians, Melanesians, etc.) as unnatural, and in many such cases it is attributed, as in the story which found its way into *Genesis*, to a curse by the gods. The span of life is so unrelated to the size or complexity of the organism (being longer in the parrot than in man, for instance) that "explanations" are apt to be descriptions of the process instead of reasons why or how the process is inevitable; and the so-called immortality of the unicellulars, which divide into two living organisms and leave no "corpse," is irrelevant. Death is of interest here chiefly in relation to the claim that it means the disappearance of an immaterial or spiritual agency from the body. The basis of this

belief, the claim that vital operations cannot be explained without assuming the presence and control of such an agency, has been discredited by the progress of physiology [see *Life* and *Vitalism*]. But it was never more than a useless piece of verbiage, the substitution of a word for a scientific explanation of processes, and normal death has always been one of the many phenomena which make the proper experts on the subject, physiologists, more sceptical than others about immaterial principles. In Professor Leuba's analysis of beliefs, physiologists are unfortunately lumped together with botanists, etc., as biologists, and teachers in sectarian institutions (other than Catholic) are included; yet only a quarter of the "greater biologists," and only eight per cent. of the psychologists, believed in immortality. In the Christian Evidence Society inquiry among Fellows of the Royal Society, in which 47 out of 503 Fellows professed belief in the soul, not one was a physiologist. For both inquiries see *Culture and Religion*. Recent experiments and experiences confirm that life is just the collective activity of the cells of the body. In large numbers of experiments, groups of cells or portions of tissue—in some cases the heart of a chicken—have been kept alive, and tissue has grown in suitable chemical media though the rest of the organism dies. More recently there have been cases in which, after a man or woman had legally and physiologically died, the heart having ceased to beat, life was restored, even if only for a time. To thoughtful medical men who from the days of Sir Thomas Browne have seen the body die in sections—old folk dying "from the head downwards," paralytics from the feet upwards, and so on—these things are not discoveries. The body is an army of cells arranged in battalions (tissues) and divisions (organs) under the control of glands, nerve, and brain, but why the cells lose their rebuilding power after a period of months (in some animals) or years is a problem reserved for a generation with larger knowledge.

Death-Sentence on Heretics. It is too often assumed, or accepted from un-

scrupulous Catholic propagandists—few of the laity know the law of their own Church—that the Roman Church has, like all others, abandoned the principle that heretics must be put to death. The apologist now commonly asserts that in the Middle Ages, when the community is supposed to have been solidly and deeply pious, "princes and peoples" urged the Church to protect them by executing heretics. This is a particularly mean untruth [see *Inquisition*], and the inference that is suggested, that the great diversity of opinions in a modern State has entailed a change of attitude, is false. It is equally deceitful to point out that in the English translation (published in America) of the Canon Law, the death-sentence is not found. As explained in the article *Canon Law*, this edition contains only the domestic law of the Church, and in any case it expressly states that it does not abrogate any law that is "of divine right," as the law of the death-sentence is claimed to be. This part of Canon Law is still under the veil of a dead language, but it is by no means left in mediæval tomes. It is continually reprinted, and is still emphatically taught in the Gregorian (Papal) University at Rome and in all colleges for advanced clerical pupils. Fr. Marianus de Luca, the author of the Latin version published by the Vatican Press in two stout volumes in 1901, with a letter of approval from the Pope, was professor of the subject in the Gregorian University. In several passages and at great length he reproves liberal Catholics who say that the Church has surrendered "the right of the sword," and argues that the Church has the right and the duty to put heretics—by which Catholic law means apostates—to death (Vol. I, pp. 132 and 270). This is the most authoritative exposition of Church Law as it is to-day. The second most authoritative work of recent years, that of Cardinal Lépicier, entirely agrees. After proving that apostates "may justly be put to death" (p. 194), he completes the repulsive teaching by claiming that they are all in "bad faith," since "no one can lose the faith except by the very gravest sin" (*De Stabilitate et Progressu Dogmatis*, 1910,

p. 201). Yet, while this manual is in actual service in Canadian and American seminaries, the Catholic apologists in America deny the fact, and an association (the Calvert Associates) which goes beyond all others in mendacity, and says that it was just "unscrupulous politicians" who, during the Reformation struggle, were responsible for past executions (*The Calvert Handbook of Catholic Facts*, 1926, p. 66), is sponsored by Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler, President of Columbia University, and several other American professors. It is a milder untruth to say that the Church merely judges a man heretical and the State imposes the lethal punishment. Fr. de Luca insists that the Church itself has "the right of the sword"; and, lest an opponent of the Church who has not been baptized in it should think himself safe, he explains that in a Catholic country (Italy or Spain to-day) unbelievers may be "compelled to accept the faith," when they at once come under the savage law. Only fear of the consequences in Great Britain and America restrains the present fanatical Pope from enforcing this law in Spain, but the end is attained by charging the culprits with Bolshevism.

De Bosis, Adolfo (1863-1924), one of the leading Italian poets. Trained in law, but quitting that profession for commerce, he in 1881 published a volume of verse which inaugurated a distinguished career as a poet. He was a warm friend and colleague of D'Annunzio and, like him, an Agnostic—see *Amori ac Silentio*, especially the poem "Ai Convalescenti"—and humanitarian. He owed a deep inspiration to "Percy L'arcangelo" (Shelley).

Debussy, Claude Achille (1862-1918). The famous composer, creator of *L'après-midi d'un faune* and *Pelléas et Mélisande*, and described by some critics as "one of the greatest musicians of his generation," was entirely without religious belief and had a secular funeral. His themes are often taken from the work of such neo-pagans as Mallarmé, Verlaine, and Baudelaire.

Decalogue, The. The chief interest of the Ten Commandments to-day is that the belief in their inspiration, on the

part of all educated Christians and Jews until modern times, illustrates the crass historical ignorance under which the old faith survived. Even if we entertained the more liberal view that they were compiled by, not revealed to, Moses in the thirteenth century B.C., they would be completely devoid of interest. At that time the Hammurabi Code [see] of Babylon, with its profound sense of justice, was six or seven centuries old, and texts inscribed on tomb-walls in Egypt bear witness to a refined moral code 2,000 years earlier. The moral code of the Decalogue is not, as regards human relations, higher than that of primitive peoples, and differs only in clauses, such as Sabbath-keeping, which point to the post-Exilian organization by the priests of the Jahvist religion. At whatever date this crude list of moral prohibitions was first compiled, it shows merely that the Hebrews were one of the last peoples of the ancient world between the Nile and the Persian Gulf to reach the general level of civilization.

Decian Persecution, The. A work embodying the results of recent critical research on the martyrs has still to be written. On this subject J. M. Robertson's *Short History of Christianity* (1902), which allows about 2,000 victims and is very unjust to Roman character, is based upon out-of-date literature and materially erroneous—erring, that is to say, on the side of extreme liberality to the Church writers. The general question will be discussed under **Martyrs**. The persecution under the Emperor Decius, in 250, is of peculiar interest. It is the first of the only two general persecutions of Christians (Decian and Diocletian) which modern authorities admit, and Catholic literature about the martyrs—the "Acts" of the martyrs and works based thereon—ascribes a very large number to the fifteen months of the persecution under Decius. He is supposed to have entertained an obscure hatred which moved him to attempt to "exterminate the Christian religion." Although, as will be shown, the highest Catholic authorities have proved that these "Acts of the Martyrs" (purporting to be contemporary records of their trial and execution) are generally spurious, even responsible Church writers

continue to repeat the mythical horrors of the Decian persecution. Fr. Healy, who writes the article on it in the *Catholic Encyclopedia*, is a professor of ecclesiastical history at the Catholic University of America, and this work is the most pretentious production of what is represented as the highest modern Catholic scholarship. He says that owing to the "appalling amount of laxity and corruption" in the Church of the third century (which is usually represented as redolent of piety and virtue) many forswore their faith, but "these defections, though numerous, were more than counterbalanced by the multitudes who suffered death, exile, confiscation, or torture, in all parts of the Empire." Since there were then at least a million—Fr. Healy would say at least five million—Christians in the Empire, and the decree extended to the whole of it, how many martyrs does this suggest?

Yet we cannot trace fifty individuals who were executed, and most of the evidence of crowds pressing to assert their faith and suffer torture or famine in jail is from a fourth-century literature which reeks with fiction. Fortunately we have a special study by an ecclesiastical writer of this first of the only two general persecutions, *The Decian Persecution* (1897), by J. A. Gregg, who later became the Catholic Bishop of Ossory. He is not as critical as more recent Catholic martyrologists (Delehaye, etc.), yet the above is all that he can claim. He acknowledges that the text of the Emperor's decree is "lost" (suppressed), but even the Christian versions of and references to it make it very doubtful if Decius ordered the execution of Christians who would not sacrifice to the gods. In a feeble discussion of the causes, Gregg mentions that the Christians were accused of having supported the usurper of the purple, Philip, who had preceded Decius, but he does not explain that Philip, the unscrupulous son of an Arab bandit who had the legitimate and admirable Emperor assassinated, was a Christian and was hailed by the Christians; and that Decius, a patriot of the old Roman type, was disgusted at the repeated degradation of the purple by degenerate Oriental

adventurers. He finds, however, after diligent search, that only five Christians of the city of Rome (where Church writers claim a body of 20,000 faithful, 46 priests, and more than 100 other clerics) are known to have been martyred; that even less are positively identifiable in all the rest of Europe; and that in the East and Africa we have few quite reliable accounts of executions. Even on Gregg's uncritical acceptance of some of the evidence, we are left with a vague impression of at the most two or three dozen executions and a few hundred suffering, and in some cases dying, in jail or exile. Yet in face of these few hundred who suffered for the Faith, or a few score who were executed, out of more than a million Christians, the *Catholic Encyclopedia* says that the defections were "more than counterbalanced by the multitudes who suffered," and actually quotes Gregg's work as its authority! The matter is important as an illustration of Catholic procedure even in its "highest scholarship."

Decretals, The Forged. Whatever excuse may be admitted for the fabrication of alleged historical works and the practice of concealing authorship by adopting well-known names in late Jewish and early Christian times, sheer forgery in the interest of religion began definitely in the fourth century, and attained extraordinary dimensions as Christendom passed into a state of almost universal illiteracy and dense ignorance. A vast and weird martyrliterature appeared, and the early history of the Church was embroidered with fiction which is still imposed upon the inexpert. Rome began early in the fifth century to use this art in the consolidation of its power. In the eighth century it produced, as the foundation of its territorial power, the Donation of Constantine [see] and other documents, which are so crude that Catholic scholars recognize them as forgeries. About the middle of the ninth century there appeared a collection of decretals (short decrees) of Popes and canons of Councils of the early Church which weaves fragments of genuine documents into so audacious a tissue of forgery that it has long been

recognized by all as "the Forged Decretals." As the authors put the name of Isidore on the work, it is sometimes called the Isidorean or Pseudo-Isidorean Decretals. It is the general opinion that this forgery did not emanate from Rome, since to a great extent it affirms privileges or immunities of local prelates which Rome would not admit. There was at the time in France one of those flickers of culture (though character was still abominable) which occasionally illumine parts of the Dark Age, and it is thought that the forgeries were executed by French bishops and clerics who used them in their own interest. On other points, however, they gave a spurious foundation for the increasing claims of the Popes, and—this is the only aspect which Catholic historians contest—Nicholas I clearly used them in 865 (*Ep. LXXV*). It is amusing to see how he and the famous Archbishop Hincmar of Rheims use the forgeries against each other while, apparently, conscious that they are forgeries. (See McCabe's *Crises in the History of the Papacy*, 1916, pp. 118–23, and, for a thorough discussion, J. Richterich, *Papst Nikolaus I*, 1903.) Nicholas also (*Ep. XXV*) relies upon other forged decretals which are not in the collection. Later Popes used them freely, and they were the basis of the power of the Papacy in the Middle Ages. Indeed, much of the control which the Pope exercises over his Church to-day is based upon them. (See the *Cambridge Medieval History*, V, 710–12; and there is a good chapter on them in Prof. C. L. Wells's *Age of Charlemagne*, 1898.)

Deffand, Marie Anne de Vichy-Chamrond, Marquise du (1697–1780). She adopted Rationalist views in her convent school at Paris and routed the famous preacher Massillon when he was brought to convert her. In later years her salon, and even a convent in which she eventually boarded, was a meeting-place of the great French Rationalists of the eighteenth century. She was a friend of Horace Walpole as well as of Voltaire. "Il n'y a que le premier pas qui coute" is one of her well-known sayings. A cardinal was telling her how far St. Denis was supposed to have carried his head after he

had been beheaded, and she replied that, "It is the first step that is the real difficulty."

De Gubernatis, Count Angelo, D.-ès-L. (1840–1913), eminent Italian Orientalist. He was professor of Sanscrit at Florence University from 1863 to 1890, and special lecturer at Oxford in 1878. In addition to the title of Count, he received, in recognition of his scholarship, the Red Cross of the Order of Frederic of Württemberg, the Order of the Rose of Brazil, the Gold Medal of the Order of Benemerenti of Rumania, and many other high world-honours. His literary output, including a *Storia Universale della letteratura* in 18 volumes, was enormous, and he founded thirteen reviews in French and Italian. In the preface to his *Dictionnaire International des Écrivains du Monde Latin* (2 vols., 2nd ed., 1905) he says: "Our ideal temple is far vaster than that enclosed by any Church . . . and it does more for the luminous peace and happiness of the world."

Deism. Belief in God and (generally) immortality without belief in revealed religion. This phase in the evolution of European Rationalism was the natural reaction of the awakened intellect to the substitution, by the Reformers, of the Bible for the Church as the basis of Christian belief. The path was opened in the sixteenth century by the Socinians [*see*] and Servetus [*see*], who at once applied the critical spirit of the Reformers to the doctrines of the Trinity and the divinity of Christ, and were as fiercely persecuted by the Protestants as heretics had hitherto been by the Catholics. Their claim, however, that these doctrines were Romish perversions of the teaching of the Gospels gained large numbers of educated supporters, from Italy to Poland, and they built churches of their own before the end of the sixteenth century. They survive in the Unitarians, who spread to England and multiplied rapidly in the seventeenth century. The essence of their position was that they were the true Christians, a Church which would bring back the world to the real Christ and the genuine teaching of the Gospels, and in this they differ radically from the Deists. They were

supernaturalists. But isolated French thinkers began, in the same century, to profess naturalism. Montaigne calls himself a "naturalist" in one of his *Essays* (Bk. III, Ch. XII), which was written about 1588. The alternative term "Deist," to indicate that the sceptic was at least not an Atheist, came into use about the same time. Viret, a Swiss Protestant writer, refers to Deists about that time, Bayle says in his *Dictionary* ("Viret"). The word first occurs in English literature in Bishop Stillingfleet's *Letter to a Deist* (1677), but, to judge from the works of contemporary religious writers, London had for a century had a large number of rebels who were variously known as Socinians, Infidels, Skepticks, Atheists, and even Rationalists [see]. J. M. Robertson's *Short History of Free-thought* (2 vols., 1915) is particularly valuable for this period, which might be called the incubating stage of British Deism.

Lord Herbert of Cherbury [see] is usually described as the founder of the school, though he did not use the word "Deism," and it is generally agreed that he brought his ideas from France. He published his famous work, in Latin (*De Veritate*), in Paris in 1624 (in London in 1633), where he served as British Ambassador for five years. He tells us, it is true, that he had begun to write it in England, but he had spent several years at an earlier date in France and other Continental countries where scepticism was widespread. Lord Herbert disdained Christianity, but otherwise followed a rather mystic philosophy. Hobbes, whom Robertson counts "the next great Freethinking figure in England," was cautious on the religious side, and it was chiefly by the implication of his principles that he encouraged the growth of scepticism; and the religious literature of the seventeenth century, of which Robertson gives an ample account (see especially II, 98), shows that it grew rapidly. One must remember that Unitarianism, which was now well established, provided a comparatively respectable shelter for many who, like Sir Isaac Newton and Locke, would avoid the shower of clerical epithets; while even the leading poets of

the time, Dryden—who attacked Deism, yet, while Catholics claim him, is said by modern experts to have held "some sort of Deism" [see]—and Milton [see], were far from orthodox. Add the writings of Sir Thomas Browne [see]—Robertson misses his most important admissions—and it will be seen that a large part of the most influential literature of the seventeenth century encouraged that growth of "infidelity" which scores of clerical writers bitterly deplored.

It is therefore misleading to confine one's attention, as is customary, to the slender list of Deistic writers and to regard Deism as a peculiar, and in the end futile, aberration of English intellectual life in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. In this respect Sir Leslie Stephen, fine scholar and outspoken Rationalist as he was, rendered a serious disservice by his *History of English Thought in the Eighteenth Century* (2 vols., 4 ed., 1927), which is usually pressed as the standard authority. Robertson's strictures on this are for the most part justified. The Deistic writers were, Stephen says, "a ragged regiment" of little influence. It is an unfortunate description even of the small series of works usually listed as Deistic—Lord Herbert's book, those of the Blounts [see], Toland's *Christianity not Mysteriorious* (1696), and other works, and the larger Deistic literature of the eighteenth century—but it is even more misleading in distracting attention from the general literary ferment, and the heterodoxy, in one degree or other, of many of the leaders of thought. The history of English thought at this period is fully in conformity with the historical law that scepticism grows in all ages in proportion to the spread of enlightenment and the grant of freedom of discussion. Criticism was still very far from free in England when, as late as 1761, a man could be condemned, as Peter Annet [see] was, to the pillory and a year's hard labour for criticizing Christianity. It is in these circumstances illiberal to emphasize the lack of scholarly distinction of the more outspoken Deists (Toland, Chubb, Anthony Collins, Matthew Tindal, Mandeville, Morgan, and Paine) and the caution or

reserve of the more distinguished (Lord Herbert, Blount, the Earl of Shaftesbury, Lord Bolingbroke, etc.). Both types co-operated in bringing on the age when scientists like Halley, poets of the rank of Pope and Byron, Queen Caroline (whom Robertson strangely misses), great statesmen like Walpole, Pitt, and Fox, historians like Hume and Gibbon, economists like Adam Smith, and judges like Lord Kames, could more or less openly profess infidelity. (See the biographical notice of each, and Robertson's *History*, II, pp. 69-117 and 147-213.) By this time Deism was merging into a deeper scepticism—not, as is so often said, because it was a superficial and transient intellectual fashion, but because philosophy and science had been poorly developed until the latter part of the eighteenth century, and the orthodox claims for the Bible and Christianity had first to be refuted. The movement had meantime spread to the American colony, and many of the most eminent men of the time—Franklin, Adams, Jefferson, Washington, etc.—were Deists. (See the notice of each.)

It is a consequence of the literary disdain of the Deists that when, in the nineteenth century, the same ideas—belief in God, but rejection of revelation and of the orthodox view of the Bible and Christianity—became common among educated people and were often embraced by liberal clerics, especially when Modernism began, a distinction between Deism and Theism was fabricated. Deism was supposed to be dead, and the new creed was declared to be materially different from that of Paine and Voltaire. It is sought to give a philosophic solidity to this distinction by asserting that the Deists believed only in a *transcendent* God, while Theists regard him as *immanent*. The distinction will be discussed under *Immanence*, but it may shortly be said here that it is quite unsound. Stephen, while not expressly noticing the question, gives material which completely discredits this apologetic stratagem, as it really is. He shows that the Deists very firmly and quite generally held that God is the moral ruler of men (I, 132, 136, etc.). Many, if not most, of them

believed in a future life with rewards and punishments. None of them said that God had created the world and man and then retired into a blissful indifference to their affairs (which is transcendence). The moral government of men, and especially a belief in reward or punishment after death, implies the orthodox idea of God as "omnipresent and omniscient." The denial of miracles and revelation is common to the old Deists and the new Theists; and the plea that the Theist differs in regarding God as not merely "everywhere," but "dynamically present everywhere," is a piece of verbal embroidery which sounds rather ironic in such an age as ours. Deism was not a special movement which was born and died, but a phase, in which many still linger, in the evolution of humanism. The terms are, however, applied in biographical notices in this work according to preference and present usage. The article in the *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics* is deplorable, and no history of Deism can be recommended.

Dekker, Edward Douwes (1820-87), Dutch writer. A pioneer and venerated figure of Dutch Rationalism. He was discharged from an important civil office in the Dutch East Indies and, returning to Holland and writing under the pseudonym "Multatuli," he published a novel (*Max Havelaar*, 1860) that was discussed throughout the country for its criticisms of religion. The works with which he followed up his success, abounding in a pungent Rationalism which did much for the education of the country, are collected in a 10-volume edition (1892). (See especially his *Ideen*, 7 vols., 1862-79.)

Delacroix, Ferdinand Victor Eugène (1798-1863), French painter. He was the successor of David as the most eminent of French painters in his time and was, like him, an ardent republican and Rationalist. He strongly supported the Revolution against the Catholic monarchy in 1830, taking from it the theme of one of his greatest pictures, "Liberty Leading the People to the Barricades." E. Moreau-Nelaton, his biographer, tells us that he was an assiduous reader of Voltaire and Diderot

and shared the views of the latter. His funeral, a national event, was secular.

Delage, Professor Marie Yves, D.-ès-Sc., M.D. (1854-1920), leading French zoologist. He was professor of comparative zoology, anatomy, and physiology at the Paris Faculty of Sciences from 1885 onward; an Officer of the Academy and of Public Instruction, Chevalier of the Legion of Honour, President of the Zoological Society of France. He received the Darwin Medal and many other high international distinctions. Delage did not write on religion, but disdained it incidentally in his works. Having occasion, in *L'hérédité* (1903), to speak of the belief of Plato and Augustine in a spiritual soul, he drily adds: "We find an analogous idea among many savages" (p. 432).

Delambre, Jean Baptiste Joseph (1749-1822), one of the most distinguished of French astronomers. He was the first to draw up the tables of Uranus, for which he was awarded the prize of the Academy of Sciences, and he conducted the important measurements for the settlement of the metre. Later he was appointed secretary of the Institut and professor of astronomy at the Collège de France. He was a friend and pupil of Lalande [see] and shared his Atheism.

Delcassé, Théophile (1852-1924), French statesman. As Minister of Foreign Affairs 1898-1905, after service in several other ministries, he won a great reputation throughout Europe, and was awarded the highest honours of Russia, Denmark, Belgium, Japan, China, and other countries, as well as France. He cordially supported his Government in breaking the power of the Church and secularizing France.

Deledda, Grazia (1875-1936), Italian writer and Nobel Prize winner. Signora Deledda published a long series of romantic and picturesque, if rather sombre, novels which put her in the front rank of Italian writers and won the Nobel Prize (1926). She is often counted a Catholic, though the *Catholic Encyclopedia* does not venture to claim her; but the analysis of her confused and emotional references to religion which F. de Michelis makes in his study of her works (*Grazia Deledda e il Decadentismo*, 1938) shows that she

had abandoned that creed. In 1926 she became a member of the Italian Academy of the Immortals.

Deluge, The. To many it would hardly seem necessary to-day to make comments on the Genesiac story of the Deluge, but it is accepted in the "scientific" *Catholic Encyclopedia*, and must therefore be regarded as still the belief of fourth-fifths of modern Christians (Catholics, Fundamentalists, and the less educated masses in other Churches). Such beliefs raise problems of social psychology and grave questions about the truthfulness of modern religious literature and the mischief of religious censorship. The American Fundamentalists, whose leader (with whom the present writer has held many public debates) estimates their number at between fifteen and twenty millions, are convinced by their oracles that the geological strata and the fossils they contain are the result and evidence of a universal Flood. In a debate in a prosperous and presumably educated quarter of Los Angeles the present writer had to listen to a claim, endorsed by the audience, that the pastor, who professed to know geology, had found a human boot in Triassic rocks. The majority of Christians in Great Britain similarly believe in a universal, or at least large local, punishment-flood. To the childish features of the story they are insensible, and they are entirely ignorant of the scientific and historical difficulties which began to be urged a century ago. These "simple believers" are the main support of the more reactionary measures of the clergy, and they are more easily converted to rational ways of thinking than the minority who sophisticate the old legends with pseudo-scientific interpretations; nor are they other than grateful when their eyes are opened to the deception which is practised on them.

Apart from scientific difficulties, the disillusion began with the collection of similar stories of a god-sent deluge among lower peoples. One is found among the Polynesians (W. Ellis, *Polynesian Researches*, 1929), others among the Amerindians (H. H. Bancroft, *Native Races of the Pacific States*, 1875-6) and even the Dyaks of Borneo. The Hindus, the Chinese, and the

Greeks (the story of Deucalion building an ark to save a few from the flood which Zeus sent), had the same tradition. Great local inundations which lingered in the tribal memory, and speculation about the anger of the gods at the offences of men, gave rise to the belief in all parts of the world. That the Babylonians had the story was known from Josephus (quoting the Chaldean priest-historian Berosus) long before any tablets were found by the archaeologist, and the fact that the legend spoke of the boat resting (like that of Deucalion) on a mountain-top, and the hero sending out a raven and a dove, ought to have apprised educated folk long ago of the origin of the story in *Genesis*. The tablets telling the Babylonian story began to be known in 1872. It transpired that the Sardanapalus of Greek legend (really Assur-Bani-Pal) was no voluptuary who perished with his harem on a funeral pile, but a vigorous and enlightened monarch, a patron of learning, who made a great library of cuneiform tablets, from the ruins of which we have recovered the Epic of Gilgamesh [see], which includes the story of the Creation and the Deluge. The flood-story seems not to have been an original part of it, but was added later. Experts agree that it goes back to a time before 2000 B.C. and is clearly based upon an actual inundation which was so memorable that it provides a cardinal date in Sumerian chronology. The hero Xisuthros (in later versions Ut Napishtim) is believed to have been a Sumerian king, and most authorities agree with Prof. Langdon that the tradition was converted into a mythical narrative for the glorification of the sun god Marduk. A tablet with a more extensive version was discovered in 1912, and Prof. Langdon writes on it in his *Sumerian Epic of Paradise, the Flood, and the Fall of Man* (1915). This describes a primitive condition of men living in peace with the animals and without sin or disease under the rule of the gods. For some obscure reason the gods were angered, and proposed to destroy the race by a flood, warning the usual virtuous hero to build a boat. When the waters subsided, the survivors were put in charge of a garden with

permission to eat every kind of fruit but one, and they disobeyed and were punished with sickness and shortness of life. But the Babylonian story as it usually runs—the flood, the boat, the chosen family, the raven and dove, and stranding on a mountain—is so obviously the source of the Hebrew legend that it is enough to recommend an inquirer to read the official handbook published by the British Museum (*The Babylonian Story of the Deluge*, 1929, 1s. 6d.). Frazer's *Folk-Lore in the Old Testament* (1918, I, 104–360) and H. Usener's *Die Sintflut Sagen* (1929) cover parallel stories in many lands; and see L. W. King's *Legends of Babylonia and Egypt in Relation to Hebrew Tradition* (1916) and Prof. S. Langdon's *Sumerian Epic* (above).

Demeter. In Greek mythology the sister of Zeus and the daughter of Cronos and Rhea. Some think that *De* is a variant of *Ge*, and translate the name “earth-mother.” Others believe that it is a corruption of the Cretan word for “corn,” and translate it “corn-mother.” As she is further connected with Crete by a legend (in Homer) that she had a lover in that island by whom she begot Ploutos (wealth), one wonders whether she may not have been originally a variant of the goddess—until a late date the only deity—of the Cretans, and if the same cult was not spread through Greece before the Aryans arrived. If that is so, we have a cult of Mother Earth as the first great religion in that half of the area of civilization which stretched from Crete to Mesopotamia. The Greek legend in which she is represented as the mother of Dionysos by Zeus—the harvest following upon the embrace of the earth by the sun or sky-god—represents the usual diplomatic linking of old gods and new by the priests; and some experts hold that a representation of her marriage with Zeus was part of the Eleusinian mysteries. She is, in any case, important in connection with these Mysteries. In the fully developed legend her daughter Persephone is said to have been carried off to the underworld by Pluto, while she was gathering flowers, and in the ensuing quarrel Persephone got the right to spend two-thirds of the

year (all but the winter) in the sunlight. This gave one more cult to the world in which Christianity would presently appear with its death, descent into hell, and resurrection of a God; and the Eleusinian Mysteries [see], with their devout and ascetic features (purification, communion, etc.), were more suitable for Christian imitation than the orgiastic festivals of Attis and Cybele. (See Frazer's *Golden Bough*, Vol. VII, and J. C. Harrison, *Prolegomena to the Study of Greek Religion*, 1903.)

Democracy and the Churches. The suppression of ugly pages of history, which is now so common in our historical literature, although it clearly falsifies our valuation of religious institutions, does not merely relate to early Christian times and the Middle Ages. There is just as scandalous a suppression or perversion of the truth, and for the same purpose of protecting ecclesiastical claims, in the record of modern times, especially the period from about 1790 to 1860. During that period the struggle for what are now regarded as elementary rights of man—freedom of discussion, liberty of conscience, and self-government at least on a limited franchise—was crushed with a barbarity worthy of the Middle Ages. Apart from armed revolts and civil wars, at least 400,000 unarmed men, women, and children were put to death in massacres, on the scaffold, or died in jails or exile in revolting conditions. Of these victims all but a few score perished in Catholic countries (Spain, Portugal, France, Naples, the Papal States, North Italy, and Austria), where the Church co-operated intimately and enthusiastically with the feudal monarchies. There was much brutality in England and Prussia, but there were, apart from armed encounters, few deaths; and in the Catholic countries revolt against the Church was put on the same level as resentment of political feudalism as a ground for the savage reaction. Yet these facts are now so generally suppressed in popular historical literature—indeed, in much that professes to be academic—that we find even liberals sometimes declaiming that the Protestant Churches are as inimical to progress as the Roman, and often entertaining with respect the

assurances of recent Popes and Catholic apologists that the Church blesses the fundamental principles of the modern State, condemns coercion and exploitation, and never interferes in politics!

It was in view of these historical facts that the Catholic historian Lord Acton [see] pronounced the Papal authorities worse than the worst murderers known in history, the Assassins, and, although he did not live to edit the third part of the great work which he drafted, the *Cambridge History*, the most authoritative work of history in the English (if not any other) language, it tells the facts with the candour which he desired (*Cambridge Modern History*, Vol. V). It deepens the irony of the present situation that, while accommodating lesser historians and literary men sustain the audacious claim that religion restrains and condemns violence while its enemies employ it, precisely the opposite, and on a revolting scale, is shown in this standard work of reference. The chapters on Portugal, Spain, the Kingdom of Naples, and the Papal States are deadly, and are based upon the highest contemporary authorities in each field. In the case of Naples, where the savagery lasted from 1793 to 1860 and sank to such depths as cooking and eating the bodies of Liberals under the windows of the royal palace, we have the contemporary account of General Colletta (*History of the Kingdom of Naples*, Engl. trans., 2 vols., 1858), a royalist and Catholic, who tells us that in thirty years, Church and State killed 100,000 unarmed victims, under the most horrible conditions, and Prof. B. Croce has closely examined Colletta's history and found it reliable (*Scritti*, 1912, II, p. 188). The Neapolitan continuer of Colletta's history estimates that there were a further 150,000 victims between 1825 and 1855. These are deaths, leaving out hundreds of thousands who suffered short of death. In Portugal, where we have the facts in the *Historia de la Libertad* (1869) of J. G. de Barros e Cunha, the *Cambridge History* again describes the clerical-royalist savagery. Portuguese authorities estimate that in five years, out of a total population of 2,000,000, about 17,000 were executed (often

barbarously), 17,000 sent to the deadly penal-colonies, and 30,000 packed in horrible jails and dungeons.

For Spain the *Cambridge History* is even more candid about the brutality. Between 1814 and 1860 at least 150,000 Spaniards, chiefly of the middle and upper classes and including large numbers of women, girls, and boys, suffered atrociously, and fully a third of them were executed or died in jails. The Church took a most active part in the massacre, while the rebels (who peacefully demanded a constitutional government and the suppression of certain grave abuses in the Church) did not retaliate when they gained power. Some idea of the evil of the suppression of these facts in education and literature to-day can be gathered from the quite general belief, encouraged by nineteenth-century of our Press and periodical literature during the recent Civil War in Spain, that the people were very apt to turn to atrocities, and the clerical-royalists were not. The historical truth is that there have been nine revolutions in Spain since 1812. In three of these the clerical-royalists recovered power, and committed the above atrocities; in six the people won, and apart from local mob outrages, with a few casualties, there were no reprisals. The *Cambridge History* is equally candid about the brutality of the Pope's officials in the Papal States (Central Italy), where the Government was so foul and oppressive that in 1831 the four leading European Powers sent a rebuke to the Pope and required him to civilize his rule. The Austrian Empire then included North Italy and Hungary, and in these provinces the brutality was almost as bad as in Spain.

It is important to understand that in all these cases the Liberals, as they were called, demanded only rights which are now considered elementary; that the Church, particularly in the Syllabus [see], solemnly denounced their demands; and that the monarchs of Portugal, Spain, and Naples whom it supported were of depraved character and tricked their people by revolting perjury. On a moderate estimate, allowing for exaggeration in the figures quoted above, at least 400,000—this figure is the result

of a very careful analysis by the writer—unarmed men, women, and children were horribly done to death, in more than 99 per cent. of the cases with the full approval of the Roman authorities, and the extinction of so large a proportion of their finest stocks led to the modern degeneration of the Latin countries. France was never so Catholic as these, and it recovered more quickly; but after the death of Robespierre, and again after the fall of Napoleon, there was a White Terror [see] as brutal as the Red Terror, though scarcely any historian now mentions it; and there was a very large amount of cruel persecution under the Catholic kings of the nineteenth century. The tragedy almost turned to comedy when, at the close of the nineteenth century, the Popes, concluding that the age of absolutism was over, began to pose before an admiring world as the unique and disinterested guardians of social justice, and when, seeing in our own time the rise of a new type of absolutist rulers, they entered into, or sought to enter into, alliance with them everywhere (see McCabe's *Papacy in Politics To-day*, cheap ed., 1940). No work on this profoundly important chapter of modern history is available. (The present writer has had one in manuscript since 1936 and could find no publisher.) But the chapter on each country, with the relevant literature, in the *Cambridge Modern History* (Vol. V) is generally satisfactory; and see the articles *French Revolution*; *Naples*; *Papal States*; *Spain*; *White Terror*.

Democracy in the Middle Ages. It is commonly urged in defence of the feudal and Papal tyranny of the Middle Ages that the people were deeply attached to their institutions and yielded a willing docility. On the contrary, a democratic movement against both forms of tyranny began in Rome itself before the "Dark Age" was over (says the *Cambridge Medieval History*), and this had, like the Rationalist school-movement initiated by Abélard, and the vast heretical movement which manifested itself in the Albigensians, Cathari, Lollards, Hussites, etc., to be destroyed by Papal violence. In the eleventh century, when a middle or burgher class had not yet developed, it was the

"nobles"—a vicious and generally illiterate body—who tried to wrest the government of Rome from the Popes. But while this squalid struggle proceeded in the degenerate city of the Popes, a genuine democratic movement arose in the cities of Northern Italy, especially Milan, which was then the richest city in Europe. The power of the anti-Papal Lombard kings had been broken by the Popes, but their superior culture lingered and "had never entirely failed among Italian laymen even when it had sunk to the lowest point among the clergy" (*Camb. Med. Hist.*, V, 361). The democratic party in Milan, which was so largely made up of the people that it was known as "the Patarenes" (rag-dealers), was captured by Pope Gregory VII and his agents and turned into a mob for attacking married priests; but the genuine democratic demand continued, and spread to the other cities of North Italy—a movement favoured by the remoteness of the lawful ruler, the German Emperor. The monk Arnold of Brescia [see] led a similar movement in Rome, and, although he was hanged and his body burnt to oblige the Pope, and the Republic of Rome was suppressed, the Popes had to sustain the struggle—being often driven from the city—for more than a century. The most deadly enemy of the democrats was the strongest and most religious of the Popes, Innocent III; but the movement lasted until the fall of Rienzi in 1354. It had threatened the rule of the Popes for over two centuries; and in the north it had led to the development of the prosperous Republics which, unfortunately, fell under the control of corrupt nobles or rich families. (For the long struggle in Rome see F. Gregorovius, *History of the City of Rome in the Middle Ages*, Engl. trans., 8 vols., 1905, chiefly Vol. V.)

Democritus (460–361 B.C.). One of the two greatest figures (with Epicurus) of the Ionic–Epicurean line of Greek thinkers who broadly anticipated modern thought. He was born at Abdera, in Thrace, where the Greeks had planted a number of colonies. To these many fled from the cities of Ionia when they fell under the tyranny of Persia; hence what is called the philosophy of Demo-

critus was a deepening and expansion of the atomic and evolutionary speculations of the Ionian thinkers [see]. We know very little about him, but all reminiscences of him that lingered in the Greek world agree in describing him as the most respected as well as the most learned man of his age. Of his numerous works on mathematics, physics, ethics, and music only fragments survive. We are therefore not justified in judging the details of his speculations about nature from these fragments; but it is clear that in regarding the universe as compacted from an infinite number of atoms of various types, which come together to form all its contents, including mind and the gods—though in admitting gods he may have been merely evading a clash with popular belief—he was much nearer the truth than Aristotle and Aquinas. They, and even modern anti-Materialist writers, do not fairly state his views. A. W. Benn (*History of Ancient Philosophy*, 1912, p. 30), who gives ten lines to Democritus and fifty pages to Plato and Aristotle, says that the "antiquated rubbish" of Democritus offended "the idea of all-pervading law in the Greek intelligence from which the chance movements and combinations of the atoms were utterly remote." Even the *Encyclopædia Britannica* would have warned him that he is here building upon one of Cicero's libels of the Greek. Democritus insisted that evolution is ruled by law and that chance is "an expression of man's ignorance." Benn later admits that Plato and Aristotle had little influence on the Greek mind, and it was, through the Epicureans and Stoics, the Materialism of Democritus that had the largest and most beneficent sway. Benn, however, acknowledges, as does every other writer on the subject, that Democritus combined Materialism with "an ideal of morality second to none for purity and disinterestedness among those put forward by the philosophers of Greece or any other country" (p. 30). As this would be granted in the case of all distinguished men who rejected the idea of spirit, from Thales, Buddha, and Confucius to Haeckel, Büchner, and Loeb, the point, which is never noticed, would seem to be

vitally relevant to the modern controversy about the relative inspiration of Materialism and Spiritualism.

Demons. Whatever the origin of the belief in incorporeal beings [see *Religion, The Origin of*], we find at almost the lowest level of savage life to-day the conviction that the environment swarms with the spirits (or the savage equivalent of these) of the dead, and they are divided into benevolent and malevolent spirits; the latter generally being the ghosts of the dead who died by violence or were otherwise soured against their fellows. To judge by the surviving lower races, few mental developments have been quite so universal. When the mind rose to higher levels the invisible beings which tormented the living were often conceived as not disembodied spirits alone, but separate orders or classes of creatures (fairies, leprechauns, elves, gnomes, jinns, demons, etc.), which sometimes had bodily shapes of their own; but the belief in crowds of malevolent devils or demons was in any case carried on, together with the belief in gods, to the level of civilization. It was fully developed in the Chinese, Hindu, Mesopotamian, and Egyptian civilizations. The ancestors of the Hebrews seem at first to have been exceptionally free from the superstition, as we have no undisputed traces of demons in pre-Exilic Old Testament writings; and the later redactors of these refrained from inserting, or had no occasion to insert, references to demons, except in a few cases. But during the Exile the Jews were in contact with peoples, both Babylonian and Persian, to whom devils were as familiar as to the Chinese. All afflictions in Babylonian came from devils whom the gods permitted to punish sinners, and in the Persian religion legions of devils wrought evil under their supreme and almost divine leader, Angra Mainyu. So Satan appears in the Hebrew literature, and by the time of Jesus the Jews believed in devils as abundantly as the Babylonians. It has always been a rock of offence to theologians how the Jesus of the Gospels accepted the belief in devils as ingenuously as an Irish peasant does, and the plea that he merely accommodated himself to the

people, or that the God in him knew better, but the human Jesus did not, is a reminiscence of an age of uncritical acceptance. At least four-fifths of modern Christians still accept this sublimated savage belief, and the stoup of "holy water" at the door of a Catholic church is a sort of charm against devils. It is suggested that the command (in Paul, still observed) that a woman shall wear a hat in church is based upon an old superstition that the devils might enter a person by the ears, and the woman, being the weaker vessel, needed to cover them. Catholics, priests and people alike, believe to-day that devils are the real agents of the phenomena of Spiritualist seances, and the solemn farce of "exorcism," or expelling demons from a man or woman, has been quietly performed in London, in such cases, in the present century. For the cult of the Devil in Christian times see *Black Mass, Satanism, and Witches*, and on the general question M. D. Conway's *Demonology and Devil-Lore* (2 vols., 1879) and A. Reville, *The Devil: his Greatness and Decadence* (Engl. trans., 1870).

De Morgan, Professor Augustus (1806-71), mathematician. He was professor of mathematics at London University from 1828 to 1866, and though his publications on his science were numerous and important, Jevons considers that he rendered a still greater service in the reform of logic (article in the *Ency. Brit.* "De Morgan"). Spiritualist writers quote him as one of their "great scientists"; but he clearly states, in the preface to his wife's book on the subject, that he was merely interested in the phenomena, which were then novel. He described himself as an "unattached Christian," meaning that he was a Theist with a high appreciation of Christ. He refused to join even the Unitarian Church.

Denham, Sir James Steuart (1712-80), Scottish economist. Of the Steuart family, but adopting the name of Denham with an inherited estate, he was a member of the Edinburgh Faculty of Advocates who was proscribed for espousing the cause of the Pretender. During exile in France he mastered political economy and wrote the first

work on that science in the English language (*Inquiry into the Principles of Political Economy*, 2 vols., 1767). He is described in one of the letters (p. 510) of Lady Mary Montagu, who knew him well, as "an Atheist," but he believed in an impersonal First Cause of an unknowable nature. (See his *Works*, 1805, Vol. VI, especially "Observations on Dr. Beattie's Essay" and "Critical Remarks on Holbach's *System of Nature*.")

De Potter, Louis Joseph Antoine (1786-1859), Belgian statesman. A member of a noble family of Belgium, he adopted anti-clerical Liberalism, and became one of the leaders of the party. In later years he turned to "rational Socialism" (somewhat on the lines of Robert Owen), and his work for social reform won him "an imperishable name," says the article on him in the *Biographie Nationale de Belgique*. After the Revolution of 1830 he was a member of the Provisional Government. His anti-Christian Deism is expounded in his *Histoire Philosophique, politique, et critique du Christianisme* (8 vols., 1836-7). His son, **Agathon Louis de Potter** (1827-85), sustained his work and wrote *L'économie sociale* (2 vols., 1874) and other influential books.

Deraismes, Maria (1835-94), French writer and first woman Freemason. Mme. Deraismes was one of the founders of the Feminist movement in France and President of the Society for the Improvement of the Condition of Women. Like most of the pioneers of the movement in all countries, she saw that Christianity was responsible for the subjection of women in Europe, and was a militant Atheist and President of various Freethought Societies. She had the distinction of being admitted to the Pesq Lodge of Freemasons.

De Sanctis, Professor Francesco (1818-83), Italian literary critic and statesman. After the Revolution of 1848 he was appointed General Secretary of Public Instruction, and he was imprisoned for three years at the clerical-royalist reaction. Migrating to Switzerland, he became professor of æsthetics and Italian literature at Zurich, and at the establishment of the Kingdom of Italy he served as Minister of Public Instruction:

a ministry which he resumed in 1870 after teaching for a few years in the University of Naples. Of his voluminous writings, which put him in the front rank of Italian letters, he most freely expressed his Rationalism in his *Storia della Letteratura Italiana* (1870). He was a Hegelian Pantheist.

Descartes, René (1596-1650), French philosopher. He was educated by the Jesuits, and professed, all his life, to be an orthodox Catholic. Yet he was grievously persecuted by the orthodox (especially the Jesuits); his most famous books, the *Discours de la Méthode* (1637) and the *Meditationes de Prima Philosophia* (1641), were put on the Index; and twenty years after his death his philosophy was suppressed in all French universities, although a large number of entirely orthodox priests had to be coerced into surrendering it. These cardinal facts of his career, and the fact that Buckle, with whom J. M. Robertson agrees, considers him "the great reformer and liberator of the European intellect"—others say the virtual founder of modern science and philosophy—suggest that we must count him decidedly Rationalistic in the implication of his methods and principles, whether or not it is true that the fate of Galileo and the vindictiveness of the Jesuits prevented him from developing this implication. Unquestionably he led the revolt against the Scholastic or pseudo-Aristotelian philosophy which the Popes had fastened upon Europe. In his *Discourse on Method* he pressed for the severest criticism of all accepted formulæ and the strictest reasoning on facts of experience. His famous saying *Cogito ergo sum* ("I am thinking, therefore I exist") expresses his plan of forming a philosophy of life by eschewing all verbalism and tradition and starting from basic facts. The Puritans (Jansenists) of France, who, unlike the English Puritans, were cultivated men with a special attention to the science of logic, were attracted by his methods; and since the Jesuits, who were again very powerful in France, hated the Jansenists and were the special guardians of the Scholastic philosophy, they hounded Descartes from the country. The Protestants of

Holland, where he settled, were in their turn suspicious of the consequences of his method, and in the last year of his life he accepted an invitation of the eccentric Queen Christina of Sweden—a circumstance which explains the occasional strands of, for the time, sound science in the turgid mysticism of Swedenborg. In science Descartes rendered an equal service by his hostility to verbiage and to slavery to tradition. He accepted the Ionian teaching that the material universe is infinite and was gradually evolved (S. Arrhenius gives a good account of his necessarily crude theory of evolution in his *Life of the Universe*, 1909, pp. 100–10), and, as Huxley repeatedly recalled, he strenuously attacked mysticism in physiology and maintained that life, apart from man's soul (in which he believed on philosophic grounds), was purely mechanical. In mathematics he was not less original and distinguished. Descartes was, in short, a very gifted pioneer of modern thought, but disturbed in his development and hampered in his expression by the fierce hostility of the orthodox, who felt that his principles were far more dangerous than the literary Rationalism of many of his contemporaries. (See, especially, K. Fischer, *Descartes and his School*, Engl. trans., 1890.)

Descent into Hell, The. In spite of the glosses of preachers and divines, educated Christians recite with some hesitation the words of the Apostles' Creed: "He [Christ] descended into Hell." This intriguing clause of what is called the simplest expression of the Christian faith is based chiefly upon the alleged words of Peter in *Acts* (ii, 31), that "his soul was not left in hell" (Hades in the Greek text corresponding to the Hebrew *Sheol*), and upon the statement in *1 Peter* iii, 18 ff., that Christ after death preached to "the spirits in prison." The descent into Hades was accepted literally by the earliest Fathers of the Church (Irenæus, Clement, Tertullian, etc.) and incorporated in the Creed. Later the same Latin word (*infernum*) was used to render both Hades and Gehenna, the latter being the abode of the demons. Catholics accordingly accept the gloss of

Thomas Aquinas, that Christ did not go into the contaminating company of damned sinners, but into "that part of hell" (a sort of health-resort for exiles from heaven) where there is no fire or Devil, and where the company consists of innocent children and quite blameless souls who are excluded from heaven because they inherited the guilt of Adam's terrible sin, yet were never baptized (most of them having lived before the dogma of baptism was invented). Aquinas adds that Christ could not take them with him to heaven, so inexorable is the penalty of their inherited sin. This repulsive farrago of the Scholastic "genius" is still taught in all Catholic seminaries (Hurter's *Theologia Dogmatica*, II, 519–21); and Protestants, who are debarred from such consolation, regard the descent into hell as a mystery or reject it, though it has the same authority as the witnesses they quote for the Resurrection.

It is one of the most remarkable examples of mental paralysis from the tyranny of Scriptural texts, for the moment common sense is consulted the obscurity disappears. The supposed prophecy of Jesus (*Matt.* xii, 40), that he would spend three days "in the heart of the earth," and the few other references, show that the early Christians, in borrowing the story of the Resurrection from contemporary cults (Attis, Adonis, Cybele, etc.), found it intimately connected with a descent into the underworld, and rather lamely took this over. A three days' interval between the commemoration of the death and that of the resurrection of the god was, we saw [see *Attis*], familiar. This was a necessary foreshortening in ritual of the third of the year (the winter-season), during which the vegetation-god had to remain below the earth. The adoption of this descent into the underworld between death and resurrection proves, if further proof were needed, that the founders or compilers of the Legend of Jesus took the material from the popular cults of their time. It shows also that they were men of poor intelligence, something like the "apostles" of the Gospels, for the story as it was told about Attis, Osiris, Persephone, etc., was quite logical in a primitive way, but

it was altogether incongruous when applied to Jesus. To the Christian, or the Jew who was passing into that phase, the underworld was a place of sin and torment; nor had Attis and Persephone been regarded by their worshippers as beings compacted of spirit and body, to say nothing of divine and human natures. It affords a useful insight into the confused making of the new religion, and we hardly wonder that it was a stumbling-block to the educated Greeks and Romans.

Descent of Man, The. [*See Evolution of Man.*]

Deschanel, Paul Eugène Louis, L.-ès-L., L.-en-D. (1856–1922), President of the French Republic. Son of Professor Émile Deschanel of the Paris University, an aggressive Freethinker and anti-clerical, Paul sustained his father's Rationalism and won equal distinction in politics and letters (for which he was admitted to the Academy). He was Minister of the Interior in 1876–7, Vice-President of the Chambre in 1896 and President of it from 1898 to 1902, when it severely checked the power of the Church. In 1920 he succeeded Poincaré as President of the Republic and initiated a wiser and more humane policy, but he resigned some months later.

Design Argument, The. For practically all Theists, until recent years, and still for the overwhelming majority, the chief ground of belief in God is the feeling that the order which we see in nature, especially in the world of life, implies that an infinite intelligence planned or designed the whole and a power so vast as to suggest infinity created it. The second part of the argument has been considered [*see Cosmological Argument*]. The question of creation does not arise until some proof is given that the stuff of the universe is not eternal or—to avoid terms which mean nothing in experience—that it had a beginning of existence [*see*]. The thoughtful Theist is, moreover, beginning to perceive that the idea of creation is either a loose metaphor or is, in the strict sense [*see Creation Stories*], on the level of primitive mentality. Sir Oliver Lodge says that the idea of creation is so absurd that it is “un-

thinkable by any educated person” (*Life and Matter*, 1905, p. 106). The question of design may, however, be considered apart from the question of creation; and, since the majority of educated Theists now recognize that our orderly nature has somehow arisen by evolution from a disorderly chaos of diffused matter, this procedure is necessary. Their contention is, of course, that the evolution was guided in accordance with a design.

The basis of the argument is so simple a matter of experience that it appeals strongly to poorly educated people: a term which must be taken relatively, since even a man trained in mathematics or physics is, from lack of special knowledge, apt to reason superficially outside his own field. The fact of experience is that when we find objects in nature arranged in what we call an orderly fashion—say, stones arranged in a neat triangle or built up in a two-foot wall—we know that an intelligent being has arranged them. The fallacy is, as we shall see, that there is no analogy whatever between inert stones and the units of an organism or even of a crystal, but this could not occur to the primitive mind or to any before the birth of science. Hence the scorn of the Hebrew writer (“The fool hath said, etc.”) and of the “comforters” of Job. When independent thinking began, the Ionian philosophers concluded that the moving atoms of the universe were bound at some time to form the pattern of nature as we know it, but, although Democritus insisted that the evolution was ruled by law, not chance, the speculation, not being sustained by exact knowledge of nature, was unsatisfactory; though we do well to remember that it was much nearer the truth, and more widely approved by such Greeks and Romans as reflected on these matters, than the contrary view of either Plato or Aristotle. Anaxagoras [*see*] endeavoured to make it more acceptable by postulating a Mind (*Nous*) of a material character pervading the whole, and Socrates and Plato converted this into a personal spiritual God, and thus founded the Design Argument. It still appealed only to a minority in the Greek-Roman world, and philosophic

reflection on the bases of Theism was then virtually suspended until, in the thirteenth century, the scepticism that prevailed in the Arab civilization compelled the Scholastics to formulate arguments for the existence of God. Most of these were [see *God, Existence of, and Cosmological Argument*] mere verbal quibbles, which are generally disdained outside Catholic philosophy—Prof. W. James called them “a shuffling and matching of pedantic dictionary-adjectives”—but the rise of the Deistic movement, transferring the emphasis of faith from the Church and the Bible to God, gave a new importance to rational arguments for Theism.

The scientific interpretation of nature was still, until the nineteenth century, so imperfect that there seemed to be no plausible alternative explanation of the order and apparent purposiveness it exhibited; hence the fallacy of trying to impress us with the names of “great thinkers” of the pre-scientific age who believed in God. Meantime, however, a very serious attack upon the validity of the argument itself had begun. Different as were the philosophic systems of Hume and Kant, they agreed in regarding such ideas as “cause” and “order” as purely subjective and incapable of informing us about objective realities. The prestige of philosophers is confined to their own world, and it was, outside academic circles—though Kant had a broader influence than we can now imagine—more than counterbalanced by enthusiasm for the discoveries of science, which at first seemed to give enormous strength to the Design Argument. Astronomy, it is true, had already begun, in the words attributed to Laplace, to “do without that hypothesis,” though popular lectures everywhere still ended with the text, “The heavens declare the glory of God”; but it was chiefly the advances of the biological sciences and natural history that fascinated the inexpert. The “marvellous adaptations” of plants and animals were eagerly taken up by the theologian, and the golden age of Paleyism opened. Paley’s *Natural Theology* was published in 1802.

Upon this complacent world the gentle insistence of Darwin had an explosive

effect. After 2,500 years of fumbling, the mind was at length confronted with a reasonable alternative to the Theistic interpretation of nature, and the historic conflict began. It is difficult to believe that the apologists, and even writers like Sir O. Lodge, who later dismissed this conflict as “frontier skirmishes” or attacks upon the Church by “camp-followers of science,” can be ignorant of the facts. Moreover, this opening of a vista of at least tens of millions of years for organic evolution, and the indication of a mechanism to effect it which is active throughout nature to-day, coincided with a rapid advance of physiology, which began to give a natural explanation of the adaptations of plant and animal structure. The advance is summarized in various articles (*Abiogenesis*; *Astronomy*; *Biochemistry*; *Brain*; *Instinct*, etc.). Astronomy, once the favourite field of the teleologist, or seeker after plan and purpose, is now so godless that even Sir A. Eddington advises apologists to quit it (*Science and the Unseen World*, p. 17), and the biological sciences have so far eliminated mysticism that a high authority like Prof. H. S. Jennings, delivering the Terry Lectures at Harvard and noticing a recent work with the title *Has Science Discovered God?* emphatically answers “No” for the biological group. “The progress of life,” he says, “is not of the kind that would be anticipated if life were following a certain existing pattern, seeking a goal already set, or being guided by an all-knowing and all-powerful being” (*The Universe and Life*, 1933, p. 62).

The Design Argument was always vague, rhetorical, and unable to sustain analysis. How the “dead matter” which the theologian despised carried out a cosmic and most intricate plan no apologist ever made the least suggestion; and the supposed analogy of experience—that “material forces” never arrange stones in a wall or printer’s type in a line of poetry—has no application whatever to the dynamic particles and their affinities which build up organic molecules or the structures built up by these molecules. Whatever obscurities remain, the continuity of the organic world from the lowest unicellulars to the highest plants

and animals, the procession of fossil forms from the most primitive that could be preserved to the ancestors of the forms of to-day, the discovery that we have to allow at least 1,500 million years for the evolution, and our increasing grasp of the mechanism of variation and species-formation, have destroyed the basis of the Design Argument. Further, science has not only vastly enlarged our knowledge of parasites (and the adaptations of a tape-worm, for instance, are quite as "beautiful" as those of a spider), carnivores, and the uglier features of nature's economy, but, in showing from the fossil record that millions of imperfect species have been produced and sacrificed, it affords strong evidence *against* the idea that the process of evolution was intelligently guided. As Prof. Jennings says, it wandered into "a million blind alleys." The evolution of the horse and of man himself strikingly illustrates this. At the same time, the sciences of genetics and physiology have so far mastered the behaviour of living matter, while psychology has discarded such familiar subjects of the teleologist as "instinct" [see], that, in the words of Comte, "science has conducted God to its frontiers"—in the sense that, of the more distinguished experts on those features of nature which were held to disclose Design (biologists, comparative anatomists, physiologists, and psychologists), hardly one in ten now believes in a personal God or any preconceived plan of nature. [See *Culture and Religion*.]

While popular apologists, preachers, literary men, and even some men of science (physicists, etc.), who wander outside their own fields in support of religion, continue to talk about the order and beauty of nature, large numbers of Christian or Theistic writers, and almost all modern philosophers, warn their readers that the argument is dead. The saying of Prof. W. James, that these old arguments for the existence of God now "do little more than gather dust in our libraries" (*Varieties of Religious Experience*, 1902, p. 74) is repeated throughout the better religious literature. "The old proofs of the being of God," says Prof. W. R. Sorley, "have long since fallen into disfavour"

(*Moral Values and the Idea of God*, 1924, p. 299). "No one is now convinced by the traditional arguments for the existence of God," says Prof. Samuel Alexander in *Space, Time, and Deity* (II, 343). They were "thoroughly undermined by Kant's criticism of rational theology," says Prof. D. S. Robinson in *The God of the Liberal Christian* (1926, p. 118). The Catholic writer Dr. F. J. Sheen gives, in his *God and Intelligence in Modern Philosophy* (1925), a large number of such quotations and contends that Catholic writers alone now claim to *prove* the existence of God. How Modernists like Dr. J. A. Leighton can write of the Design and other arguments that "there is now none so intellectually poor as to do them reverence" when they are still the chief grounds of belief for at least three-fourths of the members of the Churches, is not easily explained. Canon Streeter, the leading British apologist, candidly warns his readers that "the existence of God cannot be determined by the kind of reasoning by which we establish an historical fact or a scientific hypothesis" (*The God Who Speaks*, 1936, p. 21); and these words are quoted with approval by Dean Alington in his recent *Can We Believe in God?* (1936). Apologists now often say this. Why God does not make his existence clearer they do not say.

In some apologists we find a pretence that while the Design Argument in its old form must, after supporting the faith of countless millions, be regarded as a fallacy, it remains cogent in a new form. They disdain the "philosophy of gaps"—the practice of bringing in God to explain whatever science cannot (yet) explain—and say that we see Design if we look at nature as a whole. Others claim that we must recognize a direction of evolution when we reflect that it has in the end produced "spiritual personality." The success of the Fundamentalists in the United States has led a few professors—about ten out of 500 answered the appeal of Prof. Osborn—to profess Theistic faith (very rarely Christian belief) in this form. They are mostly physicists like Dr. Millikan [see], who finds God reflected in our "universe of consistency, of orderliness, and of the

beauty that goes with order"—from which we conclude that the distinguished physicist has not had time to read serious literature on the subject—or mathematicians like Prof. Pupin, who has found a new pattern of words, that God is "the integrating principle" in the formation of atoms, molecules, organisms, and social bodies. Prof. E. G. Conklin, the only biologist of distinction in the group, refers us for support, in his *Direction of Human Evolution* (1921), to Prof. L. J. Henderson's *Fitness of Environment* (1913); and on p. 208, and elsewhere, Prof. Henderson expressly says that science has killed the Design Argument and the theory of a cosmic intelligence. Prof. W. J. Moulton (ecclesiastical historian, whose words were nevertheless widely echoed in popular apologetics) is encouraged to give the title *The Certainty of God* (1923) to his book because, he says, science has now declared that the universe is "shot through and through with thought." He refers to the utterances of Sir J. Jeans and Sir A. Eddington, who really say that the universe is merely thought (in the divine mind). The argument that an evolutionary process which (in the course of 1,500 million years) produced the human race *must* have been planned and guided it is hardly necessary to discuss, although it is the chief ground of belief in the recent work of Dean Matthews, *The Purpose of God* (1935). Most people will shudder at the claim that the process of nature, which took so long to produce man as he is, is "rational and sublime." The majority of the apologists who cater for the minority of better-educated Theists rely upon other arguments, for which, and for further literature, see *God, The Existence of*. [See also *Dysteleology*.]

Desmoulins, Benoît Camille (1760–94), French politician. People ignorant of the history of the French Revolution are apt to suppose that Desmoulins was a rough young working man of a violent type who led the crowd in the early days of the Revolution. He had, on the contrary, been educated at the same college as Voltaire (Louis le Grand) and had studied law and practised at the Paris Bar. He wrote pamphlets which

are held to be responsible in large part for the support which the people gave to the reform-politicians, edited *Le vieux Cordelier*, and represented Paris in the Convention; but he protested against excesses and was guillotined by the Robespierre party. He was an Atheist, and, when he was asked his age by the Tribunal, he replied gaily that he was "the same age as the *sans-culotte* Jesus."

Dessaix, Count Joseph Marie (1764–1834), French general. He was educated in the medical schools and practised at Paris, but he entered the military service of the Revolution and afterwards of Napoleon, who made him a general, a Commander of the Legion of Honour, and a count, for his distinguished work. He was known as "Dessaix the Intrepid," and "the Bayard of Savoy." At the Restoration he was imprisoned, and never submitted to the Church and throne; and he commanded the National Guard at the Revolution of 1830.

Destutt de Tracy, Count Antoine Louis Claude (1754–1836), French philosopher. He was a deputy to the States-General in 1789, but he opposed the violence of the Revolutionaries, retired from politics, and took up philosophy, in which he followed his friends Condillac and Cabanis [see], rejecting the idea of a spiritual and immortal soul and all religious doctrines (*Éléments d'idéologie*, 5 V., 1801–15). He was a member of the Institute and the Academy. In his last year his chief pleasure was to have the works of Voltaire read to him.

Determinism. The denial of Free Will, or the position that in the whole world of reality every event is necessarily determined by antecedent material events. The issue was not raised in the Greek world, but it appears, from Lucretius (Book II), that the Epicureans made a lame attempt to reconcile freedom of the will with their Materialism. A fierce controversy arose in the fourth century of the Christian era when the British monk Pelagius (probably Morgan), setting out to restore the dignity of human nature against the contempt of the Fathers for the body and mind (cursed for Adam's sin), fell foul of Augustine on questions of the

curse, predestination, and the need of the will for "grace." In his later years Augustine virtually rejected Free Will, and his ideas were later taken up by the Calvinists. This again gave rise to an acute controversy between champions of "necessity" and those of Freedom, which still raged in the nineteenth century. A good account is given in J. M. Robertson's *Short History of Morals* (1920). The argument that Determinism left no room for moral responsibility and would lead to a great increase of crime was debated with a solemnity which, in view of the severe isolation of philosophers and their discussions from life, and the fact that crime was decreasing rapidly, now provokes a smile. From the beginning of the last century such social and educational experiments as those of Robert Owen, whose fundamental principle was that "man's character is made for him, not by him," at New Lanark showed the surprising virtue of the Determinist principle in the training of character. The enormous reduction of crime in countries like England and France, in which religious influence had been restricted to a fourth or a fifth of the nation [see *Crime and Religion*], the notable success of the treatment of criminals on purely Materialistic principles in Russia and Mexico, and the fact that the majority of the self-sacrificing pioneers of reform in the last century were Determinists (Atheists), dispense us from returning to the old controversy. It is of importance only in showing the hollowness of religious controversy and rhetoric. Praise, blame, and punishment are not now luxuries of moral sentiment, but part of the social environment which determines conduct.

In the meantime psychology has simplified the situation by excluding the supposed freedom of the will from serious discussion. Before the end of the last century Sully and other psychologists treated it as an illusion, and in recent scientific literature hardly one psychologist in ten condescends even to mention it in his manual. It is an ironic culmination of so long and passionate a controversy. How the illusion of freedom arises will be considered elsewhere [see *Free Will*], and in

the article on *Will* we shall see that in increasing numbers psychologists ignore even this, and leave it to novelists or to charlatans who offer recipes for strengthening the will. Among the experts on the nature of man, a belief in Free Will is now almost confined to the small and dwindling group, rather philosophers than psychologists (see the discussion of the matter in Prof. J. Ward's *Realm of Ends*, 1911, one of the last serious defences of freedom), who still believe that the "mind" is a spiritual reality. Bertrand Russell has a useful discussion of the subject in his *Philosophical Essays* (1910), and Chapman Cohen (who identifies Determinism with Materialism) has a small work *Determinism or Free Will* (1912). The eccentric attempt of Sir A. Eddington to find new evidence of freedom in the world of electrons, which was easy for a pious Quaker who believed that electrons and atoms are merely ideas in the mind of God, will be considered under *Indeterminism*.

Deuteronomy. The word means "the Second Law" (or second giving of the law), and the book, which closes the Pentateuch, is described by the orthodox as the "fifth book of Moses." It claims to be such, and we need not stress the fact that it includes an account of the death and burial of the supposed author. In serious Biblical scholarship it is believed to be "the book of the law of Moses" which "Ezra" brought to Jerusalem from Babylon in the fifth century. The claim is often read—since the Ezra theory plainly makes it a fabrication by scheming priests—that it is "the book of the law" of 2 *Kings*, xxii. The high priest Hilkiah is there said to have found the precious book in some lumber-room of the Temple. The circumstances dispose us to connect the story with the caustic saying of the contemporary prophet Jeremiah (viii, 8) that "the pen of the scribes writes lies" (the real translation). That so sacred a book (to the Hebrew mind) should have passed out of all memory of the nation for ages is hardly probable, if possible; and when the story further runs that the scribes read the book aloud twice in a day—it contains 30,000 words—it becomes ridiculous. Less uncritical experts think

that part of the book was read, but do not agree which part. The book is clearly one element of the scheme of the priestly party after the Exile to strengthen their authority and impose a fraudulent version of early Hebrew history upon a people which, owing to the long exile, had lost touch with its traditions.

Devil, The. [See Demons.]

Dewey, Prof. John, Ph.D., LL.D. (b. 1859), American philosopher. Professor of philosophy at, in succession, Minnesota, Michigan, Chicago, and Columbia Universities, and generally conceded to be the leading thinker and finest educationist in America. He is not less devoted to social idealism. Though an Honorary Associate of the R.P.A., Prof. Dewey advocates Humanism [see], a development of Pragmatism which eschews the mystic leanings of Prof. W. James, yet denies the supreme right of reason in human thought. In *The Influence of Darwinism on Philosophy* (1910) he says that he is not interested in "an intelligence that shaped things once for all, but the intelligence which things are even now shaping" (p. 15), and he endorses the finding of social psychology that there is properly no fixed "human nature," but a behaviour moulded by environment (in the broad sense). In recent years he has admitted or advocated the use of the term "God," but only as a name for the relation of the ideal of conduct to man's capacity. This very academic proposal—Prof. Dewey's works are all difficult to follow and none are translated into any European Continental language—met little acceptance among other social and educational experts, while the Churches disdained it. (See his *Humanism in Human Nature and Conduct*, 1933.)

De Worms, Henry, First Baron Pirbright, F.R.S. (1840–1903), Jewish statesman. He practised for some years at the London Bar, but quitted law for politics and became Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Trade (1885–8) and Under-Secretary for the Colonies (1888–92), for which he was raised to the peerage. He was the first Jew to be admitted to the Privy Council. In early life he made known his severance from the Jewish faith by marrying against the laws of the Synagogue, and he gives

expression to his Rationalist views in his *The Earth and its Mechanism* (1862) and other works.

Dialectical Materialism. A system in which the Communists claim to improve upon Materialism and to provide a philosophy which combines the scientific elements of this with a theory of history (economic determination) and their economic and political theory. It is sometimes erroneously said that Karl Marx studied under Hegel—he was only thirteen years old when Hegel died—and borrowed the frame or dialectic of his philosophy. It is true that Marx studied under a Hegelian professor at Berlin and was later saved from the paradoxes of that very spiritual system by adopting the Materialism of Feuerbach [see], but the curious blend of Hegelian phrases, Materialism, and Socialist economics, came much later. Marx repeatedly expresses great scorn of German philosophy, and there is no trace of Dialectical Materialism in *The Communist Manifesto* (1848). Lenin says, in his *Teachings of Karl Marx*, that Engels was the author, and claims that it is "richer and more comprehensive" than ordinary Materialism. All writers of the school claim that the Materialism of Haeckel, Pavlov, etc., is not "dynamic." The word "dialectic" must not be taken in its ordinary meaning, but as indicating a world-process by thesis, antithesis, and synthesis, which is in Hegel a process of the evolution of the Absolute (spiritual reality). Critics object that the claim to be a philosophy can be justified only by an unusual use of the word, and that the theory is rather strained in its attempt to combine scientific Materialism, historical Materialism, and advanced economics, in one system. For recent expositions see J. Macmurray, *Aspects of Dialectical Materialism* (1934); V. V. Adoratsky, *Dialectical Materialism* (1934); J. B. S. Haldane, *The Marxist Philosophy and the Sciences* (1938).

Diana. A very ancient Italian goddess with a shrine at Nemi which provides the starting-point and the title of Frazer's *Golden Bough*. According to Strabo (V, 239) the new priest had to obtain office by slaying his predecessor and breaking off a bough. The cult

seems to have been pre-Roman and the deity another version of the old Mother-Earth or vegetation goddess (as in Crete). In time Diana was identified with the Greek Artemis, and later contributed to the Christian cult of Mary. The chief festival was on August 13th, when "the mistress of the mountains and the forests," the protectress of animals (hence Diana the huntress) and the harvest, was honoured by torchlight in the woods. Frazer shows that the Church converted this very popular festival into the Catholic Feast of the Assumption of the Virgin. The cult had already been drastically modified from what was probably at first a glorification of fertility and maternity. At the great temple of Diana (built on the site of a temple to the Asiatic Mother-Earth) at Ephesus, the female attendants were vowed to chastity.

Diaspora. [See Dispersal, The.]

Diatesseron, The. An attempted harmony of the four Gospels—the word means "through the four"—which purports to have been written by a Syrian who was converted to Christianity about the middle of the second century. Unfortunately it is known only in a Latin version of the sixth century and an Arabic translation of the eleventh, so that the (often) confident references to it as a witness to the date of the four Gospels are not justified.

Diaz, Porfirio (1830–1915), President of the Republic of Mexico. He was educated in a Catholic seminary, but abandoned theological studies for law and became the leader of the anti-clerical Liberals and a general in the army of the Revolution. He was President of the Republic 1877–80 and 1884–1910, and author of the anti-clerical laws which have been applied in recent years. There were complaints of despotism, but until more radical thought spread, in the last twenty years, the name of Diaz was the most honoured in Mexican history.

Dickinson, Prof. Goldsworthy Lowes (1862–1932), economist. He taught for many years in the London School of Economics and Social Science and was greatly esteemed for his high personality and social idealism. His works on ancient Greece emphasized that in all

the good we do we stretch hands "across the abyss of the Middle Ages to clasp those of the Greeks." "I do not think that a religion which ought properly to be called Christian can adequately represent the attitude of an intelligent and candid modern man," he wrote (*Hibbert Journal*, April 1908, p. 515). He professed a vague Theism, but rejected immortality (*Religion and Immortality*, 1911). There is a memoir by R. Fry and J. T. Sheppard (1933).

Didache, The. A small Greek work the title of which means "The Teaching," that is much quoted in Biblical controversy as "The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles." The manuscript was discovered in 1875, and the interest of it claimed by conservative scholars is that, while the work refers to the Church and some of its rites and rules, it seems to have been written before the end of the first century. The general view of experts is that it consists of two parts of very different date. The first part, a collection of moral counsels, is believed to be a Jewish document modified by Christians, and may belong to the first century. The second part, which is definitely Christian, is dated some time after 120; but discussion of it is so conjectural that no importance for the history of the early Church can be assigned to it.

Diderot, Denis (1713–84), the greatest of the Encyclopædists. He was educated by the Jesuits, who recognized his brilliant gifts and tried to secure him for their Society, but his father rescued him. After leaving college he lived for years in poverty, supporting himself by teaching and writing, so that he might devote his life to study. His first work, *Essai sur le mérite et la vertu* (1745), was orthodox, but the reading of Bayle's *Dictionary* made him a sceptic, and his next book, *Pensées Philosophiques* (1746), was burned by the hangman. He was charged with Atheism and imprisoned for a year for his *Lettres sur les aveugles* (1749), and in the same year he began his great work on the *Dictionnaire Encyclopédique*. He had proposed to translate into French Chambers's *Encyclopædia* [see], but so many of the ablest writers of Paris rallied to him that he decided upon the monumental new work.

His range of knowledge was marvellous, but he was always simple, temperate, and generous. To relieve his poverty, Catherine of Russia bought his library (leaving the use of it to him as long as he lived); but he declined an invitation to settle at her Court. His writings were collected and published by Naigeon (15 vols., 1798).

Diffusion Theory, The. The theory that a very large number of the articles, customs, institutions, etc., for which independent evolution in different regions is claimed were really spread or diffused from one region to another. No one denies that there was much diffusion of culture, and the few English and American anthropologists who have adopted the theory do not question that the evolution occurred somewhere. It is not sufficiently known that the Austrian school of anthropology which gave birth to the theory was a group of Catholic (especially Jesuit) missionaries, and that their aim was to discredit the science of the evolution of religion and trace it to the diffusion and corruption of a primitive revelation. See Prof. Father Schmidt's *Origin and Growth of Religion* (1931)—a ponderous and completely unscientific collection of facts and authorities. 'The late Sir G. Elliot Smith adopted the theory and mainly applied it to Mexican culture (*The Diffusion of Culture*, 1933), which he sought to trace, through southern Asia, to Egypt. The review of his book in *Nature* observed that "he cannot complain that [because] he is disregarded." Fr. Schmidt boasts of the wide and rapid spread of his ideas and then quotes two theologians, one Dutch medical man, and three American anthropologists, one of them falsely. Lord Raglan strongly urges the theory in *How Came Civilization?* 1939.

Dilke, Sir Charles Wentworth, Second Baronet, LL.D. (1843–1911), statesman. He was called to the Bar in 1866, but never practised, and he became a leader of the Radicals in Parliament. In 1869 he succeeded his father as baronet and owner of the *Athenæum* and *Notes and Queries*, and in 1874 he published an anti-clerical novel, *The Fall of Prince Florestan*. As President of the Local Government Board (1882–5) he won a

high repute among progressives, and he was intimate with and shared the opinions of Gambetta and the aggressive French anti-clericals. His brother, **Ashton Wentworth Dilke** (1850–83), owner and editor of the *Weekly Dispatch* in its most Radical days, was M.P. for Newcastle (1880–3) and warmly supported Bradlaugh, whose views he shared (*Charles Bradlaugh*, by Mrs. Bradlaugh-Bonner, II, 347).

Diocletian Persecution, The. The second of the only two general persecutions of Christians in the Roman Empire admitted by modern historians. After the first general (and brief) persecution—the Decian [see], in 250—the Church in most parts of the Empire enjoyed peace for fifty-three years and made considerable progress. Bishop Eusebius, in explaining why God permitted the new persecution (303–5), says that the peace led to a general corruption, and paints a sombre picture of the state of the clergy everywhere by the end of the third century (*Eccles. Hist.*, VIII, 1). Diocletian (284–305) was the ablest and finest Roman Emperor since Hadrian, and he allowed remarkable freedom to Christians for nearly twenty years. They were permitted to build a large church near his palace at Nicomedia, and his wife and daughter joined the sect. The Christian orator Lactantius, who lived at Nicomedia and was employed by the Court, tells his usual untruthful stories about the change of the Emperor's mood in his *Deaths of the Persecutors*, but reveals, incidentally, that the numerous Christian officials of the Court were insolent, on religious grounds, to the Emperor (making the sign of the cross at the sacrifices) and his mother, and that when Diocletian, whose life-aim was the restoration of the Empire to its old strength, ordered the destruction of their chapel, they tore down his edict and were suspected of having set fire to the palace. The Christian religion being still illicit in Roman law, Diocletian, who, though of humble origin, had a strong feeling of imperial dignity, issued a series of decrees ordering that the churches be destroyed and the copies of the Scriptures given up, and that all must offer sacrifice (burn a few

grains of incense) or produce an official certificate that they had done so. Until modern times Christian literature counted a mass of martyrs under Diocletian that ran to something like 40,000, and Rome claimed a large share of these heroes. It is impossible to estimate how many were executed—these were largely zealots who demanded death—in the Empire, though the documents passed by modern experts [see *Martyrs*] suggest only a few hundred, but in Rome itself the apostasy was extraordinary. The Pope led the betrayal, and Diocletian's wife, Prisca (who nevertheless appears as three different lady-martyrs in the pious fiction), and daughter promptly quitted the Church. Pope Marcellinus is still "Saint and Martyr" in Catholic official literature, but the chief modern Catholic historian, Mgr. Duchesne, proves that he died in bed, and the official *Papal Chronicle* admits that he abjured the faith. Duchesne (*History of the Christian Church*, 3 vols., 1904) laboriously finds about a score of genuine martyrs in the whole Empire, including three at Rome, but the leading (and strictly orthodox) Catholic authority on martyrs, the Jesuit Fr. Delehaye, supported by his colleagues, does not find a single genuine contemporary record of a martyrdom at Rome (Prof. Ehrhard, *Die altchristliche Literatur*, 1900, 556). We must remember that within ten years Constantine gave the Christians freedom, and they had full opportunity to write their records. The story of the persecution, like that of the Decian persecution, shows the appalling growth of what is politely called "pious fiction" in the Church after the year 305, and the superficial faith and low character of the overwhelming majority. There were at least 20,000 Christians at Rome, yet, allowing for a few hundred who concealed themselves, all but a handful offered the pagan sacrifice, or bought fraudulent certificates that they had done so.

Dio Chrysostom (about A.D. 50–117), Greek moralist. He settled as a teacher of rhetoric in Rome and won such repute for his oratory—the name means Dio of the Golden Mouth—that the

Emperor Trajan made a friend of him and invited him to share his chariot. About eighty of his Orations, which seem to have been delivered in a hall (possibly the Women's Senate or Club) in the Forum, and some fragments survive, and an English translation has recently (1932) been published in America. In two of these Orations he makes an eloquent and convincing attack upon slavery as an institution: a condemnation, delivered before a body of rich or middle-class Romans, at the time when religious writers still describe the Romans as cruel, callous slave-drivers, and not echoed by any Christian Father, Pope, or writer during the next fifteen centuries [see *Slavery*]. The plea that at least Dio owed his courage and his noble idealism to Stoicism in its religious form cannot be granted. Dio criticized all philosophical systems, and the experts are not agreed that he was a Stoic except in the broad sense that most of the cultivated Greeks and Romans followed a humanitarian, non-religious blend of Stoicism and Epicureanism.

Dionysos. A Greek deity of post-Homeric times, not a member of the Olympian family. It is generally agreed that he was a masculine variant of the primitive vegetation or fertility deity in Thrace, adopted by the Phrygians, and by them passed on to the Greeks. He was particularly associated with the vine and wine, which must have seemed the most divine of the fruits of the earth, and Bacchus is a Thracian name for him in that connection. In Thrace his festival was orgiastic, as harvest festivals are apt to be in wine-growing regions—compare Zola's summary of the vintage-time in France, "des filles grosses et des garçons ivres"—but the idea that the god took possession of the worshippers gave a more solemn form to the festival in Greece. Even this, however, was suppressed by the Romans (186 B.C.) soon after its introduction from Greece. Besides contributing to the Christian rite of communion (receiving the god in wine), the cult of Dionysos was one of several which lent elements to the legend of the birth of Jesus. About mid-winter it was customary in Greece to celebrate his birth by a representation

of him as a babe in a basket-cradle or manger.

Dispersal, The. The phrase, or its Greek equivalent, the *Diaspora*, is specially applied to the dispersal of the Jews over the Greek-Roman world, and this is of primary importance in rebutting the claim that the Hebrew race was unique either in the possession of a revelation, as Catholics and Fundamentalists say, or as endowed with "a genius for morality," as Matthew Arnold and some other Victorian Rationalists said and most Modernists repeat. There is the extenuating circumstance, in the case of older writers, that the ethical idealism and occasional monotheism of the Egyptians and Babylonians, long before the Hebrews were civilized, were not then known as we know them to-day. It is now surprising to find these suggestions repeated. Down to the end of the eighth century B.C. the only moral writings the Hebrews possessed were the coarsely-phrased prophecies, with a half-savage ethical code, of Amos, Hosea, Micah, and the First Isaiah [see notice of each and Prophets]. To that time their contacts did not extend beyond the Syrians and the Philistines (possibly Cretan refugees), against whose influence the prophets reacted, especially in attacking the new wealth. The fall of the Northern Kingdom, about 720, and the occupation of a large part of Samaria by foreigners, helped to break the stubborn isolation of the Hebrews, and the later angry quarrels of pro-Assyrians and pro-Egyptians suggest that travel or migration to those greater civilizations had begun. A new and higher note comes into their literature with the Babylonian Exile and the influence of Babylonian culture; and though Jewish and Biblical writers are strangely reluctant to admit Persian influence, from the time of Cyrus it is clear in the post-Exilic literature, which means the Old Testament as we have it, since the entire collection of books was then "redacted." A definite belief in a future life, with blessedness for the good and punishment for the wicked, and in a world of angels and demons, appears. After the eastern expedition of Alexander and the founding of

Alexandria, to which comparatively near city (and to Antioch) the Jews would be increasingly attracted, Greek influence begins; but it was chiefly the extension of the *Pax Romana* over the entire civilized world, making the trade routes safe and more profitable, which led to streams of emigration and the establishment of Jewish colonies abroad, particularly in Egypt; and this had the same cultural effect as when the early Greeks settled in Ionia. The Mediterranean was now the heart of the world, shipping had reached its acme of comfort and efficiency, and the Jews streamed out from the ports of Palestine and Syria as well as along the great trading land-routes to Syria and Mesopotamia. After the revolt of the year 70, and the fall of Jerusalem, the Romans scattered the Jews in larger numbers; but it is the peaceful dispersal of the earlier centuries that has most cultural significance. [See *Hebrews and Jews for literature.*]

Dissection, The Papal check on. [See *Anatomy and Medicine.*]

Divorce, The Roman Church and. The boast of Catholic writers that their Church rendered a valuable service to civilization by elevating marriage, and that religious influence is therefore required for its protection to-day, refers mainly to the suppression of divorce. How the Church declared marriage a "sacrament" in the Middle Ages, and whether this had any salutary effect on sexual morals, as well as the real reasons for, and the consequences of, its creation and multiplication of impediments to marriage, will be considered under *Marriage and Christianity*. Its boast that it suppressed divorce and made marriage indissoluble has, apart from the question whether this is socially desirable, an ironic aspect of which its apologists seem to be insensible. Instead of this triumph leading civilization to a new height in the cultural scale, as they imagine, it is a reversion to the most primitive condition of society or of pre-social savage life. "Marriage is indissoluble," says Prof. L. T. Hobhouse, a high authority who is so little disposed to criticize that he must have been unconscious of the irony of his words, "amongst the

Andamanese, some Papuans of New Guinea, at Watubela, at Lampong, in Sumatra, among the Igorrotes and Italones of the Philippines, the Veddahs of Ceylon, and in the Roman Church" (*Morals in Evolution*, 1929, p. 148). In this cold and correct classification the Papal Church is associated with the very lowest peoples that are known to science. But the history of the development is even more ironic.

We have no evidence [see **Family ; Marriage ; Rome**] that in the Roman world of the fourth century, in which the Church began to influence legislation, the concession of divorce on definite grounds had any evil consequences. Apologists who quote St. Jerome retailing a popular rumour about the wedding of a Roman woman who had had twenty-one husbands to a man who had had twenty wives carefully conceal the same Jerome's far darker characterization of the Christian community [see **Jerome**]. It is a vague report of a freak case; while in the extant letters of the Prefect Symmachus and his friends, contemporaries of the monk, we have, as all modern historians admit, an admirable picture of pagan character and social life. The point is in any case irrelevant, because the Church did not suppress the right and practice of divorce until seven or eight centuries later. The attempts which, under pressure from the bishops, the Christian Emperors made constitute "a miserable chapter in the history of law," says Prof. Muirhead (*Historical Introduction to the Private Law of Rome*, 1899, p. 356); which is hardly surprising, since they were based upon the general contempt even of marriage by the early Fathers [see **Marriage**]. Theodosius, the most docile of the Emperors, passed laws to discourage divorce which were far less just than those of the Babylonian code of 2,300 years earlier. They were ignored, and in the last days of the Western Empire (449) Theodosius II and Valentinian III assigned no less than ten legal grounds of divorce. In the East, Justinian (or the pagan jurist Trebonian, who compiled the Justinian Code) gave the husband seven and the wife six grounds of divorce; and the law of divorce has remained to this day fairly

liberal in countries (including Russia until the Revolution) which the Greek Church ruled.

In Roman Catholic countries the law of divorce continued to be liberal, in spite of local excesses of clerical puritans, and in most cases it allowed five or six grounds. In the ninth century a strong Pope began to interfere with the divorces of princes and nobles, but the development was lost in the appalling degradation that fell upon the Papacy itself and lasted about a century and a half. People practised divorce everywhere and generally regarded it and marriage as a purely social and secular concern. When the Puritans gained power in the eleventh century [see **Celibacy and Gregory VII**] they conducted a fierce, often truculent, struggle to impose celibacy upon the clergy and to bring the marriages of the laity under clerical control. Provincial synods and Popes again began to quash the divorces of princes and nobles, and the Forged Decretals [see] gave them a new weapon. The Canon Law was elaborated, though the law of indissolubility was not definitely established until the Council of Trent, in the sixteenth century. We find Pope Celestine III (1191-8) permitting women to remarry in the case of desertion by the husband (Migne, CCVI, 1255). However, the Church now controlled marriage and condemned divorce; and the notorious condition of sexual morals during the next few centuries is a sufficient comment on the boast of the apologist. [See **Celibacy ; Chivalry ; Middle Ages**, etc.]. Vice in all forms, natural and unnatural, and prostitution, were amazingly open and flagrant.

But the new indissolubility of marriage itself was a mockery, and this was very largely due to the Church. It created impediments to marriage, or conditions which made the marriage null and void from the start; and the task of discovering that these had been violated became at once a most profitable occupation for the clergy and provided a substitute for divorce. The degrees of kindred within which one could not validly marry were at one time seven, but were eventually fixed at four. Since kinship was counted, in ecclesiastical law, not only

by blood (consanguinity), but by godparenthood in baptism, and by any sexual intercourse, it was generally easy to find a ground of nullity for spouses who wished to remarry, or for men who would repudiate their wives. Another easy ground was to discover that one of the parties to the marriage had not *internally* consented in repeating "I will": a ground that is still recognized and profitable in the Roman Church, as we shall see. There was also the allegation, often after years of wedlock, that the wife had physical defects, or was in some anatomical fashion repulsive, and even bishops were at times ordered to examine them. The matrimonial relations of princes and Popes in the Middle Ages would form a most piquant and remarkable volume. Our Queen Eleanor, for instance, was first married to (St.) Louis IX of France. She despised his coyness, and he heard of her infidelities; so the clergy found, in 1252 (in what is called the beautiful thirteenth century), that they were not really married because they were related through her great-great-grandmother and his great-great-grandfather. It is in this sense that Prof. Luchaire, the highest authority on France at this period, says, of the ladies of the knightly class, that "each had at least three or four husbands" (*Social France at the Time of Philip Augustus*, 1912, p. 351). As girls were married frequently at twelve, and boys at fourteen, and the marriages of children of five and upward were common enough, the question of real internal consent opened another golden vein; and, as witnesses and priest were not essential and a youth could marry a girl in a wood, the question whether, in saying "I will," the boy or girl meant actual marriage on the spot, or a promise of future marriage, opened another rich vein. One of the highest and most impartial authorities, Dr. Howard, says that "with regard to an institution upon which in so high a degree the welfare of society depends anarchy was practically sanctioned by the Canon Law" (*A History of Matrimonial Institutions*, 1904, I, 324)—a remarkable commentary on the present fashion of permitting Catholics to claim everywhere that their

Church ennobled marriage and is the supreme guardian of social health.

This anarchy continued, or grew worse, until the Reformation. The extension of the Papal financial policy by Pope John XXII (1316-24) and his successors made Rome more grasping than ever, and marriage more unstable. Of the 65,000 letters of John which are preserved in the Vatican Archives, a very high proportion are business letters about the cost of dispensations and nullity decrees. When Catholics boast of Pope Clement's refusal of a nullity decree to Henry VIII, concealing that it was a political matter [see *Catherine of Aragon*], one should retort with the career of Henry's sister and other noble dames. Margaret, a loose woman, got her marriage annulled in 1525 on the fantastic ground that her first husband, James IV, had *not* been killed at Flodden. She married a noble who had got his marriage annulled (by the very Pope who refused the request of Henry VIII), and then, tiring of him, demanded a nullity decree because she had committed adultery with him before the marriage! (See H. Graham, *A Group of Scottish Women*, 1908, for these and other cases.) All this was at the level of royalty and nobility, where wealth abounded. What marriage was, on the lines of the degrees of kindred impediment, in rural communities, with the loose morals of the time, one can imagine. Even Catholic history naïvely tells how the first Jesuit to reach Ireland (1560) found an extraordinary corruption of clergy and laity and had to give more than a thousand dispensations from irregular marriages in a year.

How the Reformers, though grievously perplexed by the contradictory statements on divorce of the Gospels, and the very different doctrine of the Old Testament, prepared the way for progress in most Protestant countries—England remained until the nineteenth century in the mediæval mess on account of its "English Catholicism"—need not be told here; and in the article on **Marriage** we shall consider the amazing social consequences of the hybrid religion which the English Church set up. The genuinely Protestant countries, having admitted the principle of divorce,

slowly enlarged the facilities and put the institution back on its human and social basis: the Catholic countries which retained the Canon Law retained also the mediæval licence of morals which apologists persuaded folk to regard as due to the "hot blood" of the Latins. How Papal law to-day conflicts with civil law, and how the Vatican continues to give (or sell) divorces to the rich in the guise of nullity decrees, will be stated under **Marriage**. (Dr. G. E. Howard, *A History of Matrimonial Institutions*, 2 vols., 1904; S. B. Kitchin, *A History of Divorce*, 1912; McCabe, *The Influence of the Church on Marriage and Divorce*, 1916.)

Dixie, Lady Florence Caroline (1857–1905), Scottish humanitarian. Daughter of the seventh Marquis of Queensberry, she showed remarkable precocity as a child, writing poetry (*Songs of a Child*, 1901) at the age of ten and rejecting Christian teaching. Bulwer Lytton wrote an admiring poem on her. In youth she had a passion for unconventional travel—she was war correspondent of the *Morning Post* during the Zulu War in 1879—and sport, but before the end of the century she adopted strong humanitarian views (*Horrors of Sport*, 1891) and devoted herself to Rationalist and humanitarian work (personal knowledge). She lost her life by contracting a deadly infection on an errand of mercy to a poor child.

Dobell, Bertram (1842–1914), poet and publisher. He had little education, and began to earn his living at an early age; but he was an omnivorous reader and, opening a bookshop, became one of the best-known sellers of rare books in London. He also wrote poetry and published a number of works, including the poetry of James Thomson, which might not otherwise have reached the public. His Rationalism breaks out repeatedly in his *Rosemary and Pansies* (1904).

Dogma. A word now used for any emphatic or pontifical statement of opinion or formulated creed of a sect. In the Roman Church it means a statement of doctrine formulated by an Œcumenical (General) Council of the Church before the declaration of the Pope's infallibility (1871), or by the Pope since that date. Attempts to show

that the "infallible" Pope has erred are generally futile. The dogma of infallibility, in 1871, was drawn up with an eye to the well-known doctrinal blunders of some of the earlier Popes. To be regarded as an infallible or binding dogma, a Papal declaration on doctrine has to say that it is not a personal expression, but an utterance *ex cathedra* (from the Chair of Peter) or formally claiming to be official and infallible. The numerous blunders of Popes since 1871 are lightly regarded by Catholics, as they have never assumed this character. Against Protestants the Roman apologist claims the advantage for his Church of having "a living infallible guide" on all problems, but the guide has not, since 1871, made a single statement in the solemn form of a dogma *ex cathedra*, and other statements of the Popes are not binding.

Dominican Monks, The. An Order of friars (which means brothers, not monks [see] in the strict sense) founded in 1215 by the Spanish priest Domingo (or St. Dominic) de Guzman. The establishment of the body is evidence alike of the corruption of the older monastic orders, which made a new departure necessary, and of the immense growth of the revolt against Rome—a feature which is overlooked by writers of our time who describe the appearance of Dominic and Francis and their followers as a symptom of the profound piety of the thirteenth century. Dominic had long tried, without success, to convert the Albigensians [see], and he was one of the chief persons to urge the Pope to launch a military crusade against them. His Order was from the start tainted with this inhuman fanaticism against heretics, and his followers, in white robe with a black cloak, observing a modification of the Augustinian Rule, were the worst agents of the Inquisition until their rivals the Franciscans disputed the monopoly. As their Latin name is *Dominicani*, it was a joke of the Middle Ages to call them the *Domini canes* ("hounds of the Lord"). Like the later Jesuits, they captured chairs at the universities and won such ornaments as Thomas Aquinas and Albert the Great. Albert records that corruption spread among them (as in

the Franciscan Order [see]) long before the end of the thirteenth century. They crossed to England in 1222, but, partly no doubt because England never admitted the Inquisition, they never had the same popularity as the older monks and rival friars. They are unofficially known as "the preaching friars," and the Franciscans as "the mendicant friars." The corruption of the Order is generally said to have been corrected at the Counter-Reformation, but we have an extraordinary picture of their degradation in Italy in the eighteenth century. The learned and virtuous Bishop of Pistoia, Scipio de Ricci, was directed by the Grand Duke of Tuscany to reform his duchy, especially Florence. Ricci found his fiercest opponents in the Dominican monks (who, among other things, used to sleep in the dormitories of the nuns under their charge) and their loose-living General at Rome (*Memoirs of Scipio de Ricci*, Engl. trans., 1829). Their life to-day is a tedious and half-hearted observance of their antiquated rules, alleviated in England by undertaking the usual pleasant duties of parish priests. Dominic founded also an Order of nuns.

Domitian Persecution, The. Many historians have hesitated to admit the claim of two persecutions in the first century, under Nero and Domitian. Since the latter Emperor was insane with jealousy and rage, and the city of Rome "teemed with funerals," Roman historians say, there is little reason to doubt that Christians were included among his victims. The letter of the Roman Christians to the Corinthians [see], the genuineness of which few now question, has every mark of having been written just after the death of Domitian, or about 96, and speaks of having been delayed owing to recent persecution. Dio Chrysostom [see] had to flee from Rome. We have, however, no authentic records of the martyrdom of Roman Christians at that (or any other) date.

Donation of Constantine, The. None of the journalistic writers of Great Britain who are wont to illumine contemporary events with historical reminiscences ventured to recall the origin of the Pope's royal power in Italy or the corrupt administration of the Papal

States [see] at the time of the Concordat with Mussolini, when the Vatican received a consolation prize of £18,000,000 for the loss of its territory. The first charter of this territory is one of the most fraudulent in history, and the preliminary developments are painful reading. Gregory I [see], a Pope of great piety and still greater business capacity, won the first extensive domains for the Papacy by persuading the rich that (as he believed) the end of the world was at hand. These scattered estates were lost in the dark age that followed, and the Lombards, who soon developed the best culture in Europe and despised Rome, settled in Central Italy. Pope Zachary (741-52) then secured a powerful patron by urging the majordomo of the Frank palace to seize the throne, and Zachary's successor, Stephen II, demanded that, in return, Pippin the Frank should conquer the Lombards for him. A curious document, the Fantuzzian Fragment, then appeared, describing how the Emperor Constantine had, when his outrages compelled him to leave Rome, given Central Italy (or most of it) to the Pope. When the Lombards recovered it, and Pippin refused to move, the Pope sent him a letter forged in the name of St. Peter—it may still be read (Migne Collection, *Ep. V*), and doubts about the intention to deceive the Frank are ridiculous—which brought Pippin hurriedly to Italy, and the Provinces were regained. While Rome, during the eighth century, was occupied with the murderous intrigues of its clerics and nobles, the Lombards again spread over Central Italy and created the finest and most cultivated cities in Europe (Florence, Pisa, etc.). Pope Hadrian, in 774, summoned Charlemagne to destroy their civilization, and at Rome, when he had done this, the Pope produced the document which is known as the Donation of Constantine, assigning Central Italy to the Popes. Charlemagne, a rough, sensual, and unlettered man (like all the Franks), endorsed it. The official *Pontifical Chronicle* describes the extent of territory, and the Pope quotes the forged Donation of Constantine—no one now claims it to have been genuine—in a letter (IX in

Migne) to Charlemagne. A supporting document of the time, the *Acts of St. Sylvester* (the Pope to whom Constantine is supposed to have left the territory), is equally admitted to be a sheer forgery. The most thorough study is Prof. T. Lindner's *Die sogenannten Schenkungen Pippins, Karls des Grossen, und Otto's I an die Päpste* (1896). The appalling cost to Europe of the forgery and the corruption of the Papal rule will be discussed under *Papal States*.

Donkin, Sir Horatio Bryan, M.D., F.R.C.P. (1845–1927), physician. He was, in succession, physician and lecturer at Westminster Hospital, physician to the East London Hospital for Children, lecturer at the London School of Medicine for Women, examiner at the Royal College of Physicians, H.M. Commissioner of Prisons and medical adviser to the Prison Commission. One of the leading alienists of his day, he sat on the Royal Commission for the Control of the Feeble-Minded, and in 1910 he delivered the Harveian Oration. Sir Bryan was a member of the R.P.A. and a keen critic of all forms of obscurantism. He helped Sir E. Ray Lankester in exposing the famous medium Slade.

Douglas, Sir John Sholto, eighth Marquis of Queensberry (1846–1900), politician. After some years of military service, he succeeded his father in the House of Lords as elected representative peer for Scotland. In 1880 the Scottish peers refused to re-elect him on account of his avowed Rationalism and his warm support of Bradlaugh. In 1882 the Marquis made a public protest, in a theatre, against what he regarded as the caricature of a Freethinker in Tennyson's *Promise of May*.

Douglas, Stephen Arnold (1813–61), famous American orator and statesman. A lawyer who rose to the rank of State Attorney for Illinois in 1835, Secretary of State and Judge of the Supreme Court in 1841. In the House of Representatives, and later in the Senate, he was one of the most distinguished speakers and an ardent champion of religious liberty. He was a Theist, but, as the *Philadelphia Press* said, in its obituary notice (June 8, 1861), he "never identified himself with any

Church." A. Johnson confirms this in the chief biography, *Stephen Arnold Douglas* (1908, p. 263).

Dowden, Prof. Edward, LL.D., D.C.L. (1843–1913), Irish literary critic. He was born at Cork, educated at Trinity College, and professor of English literature at Dublin. A brilliant student, Dowden was soon called to be the first Taylorian Lecturer at Oxford, and, four years later, Clark Lecturer at Cambridge. His *Life of Shelley* (2 vols., 1886) became a classic, and it rendered great service by its high appreciation of the beneficent social influence of the great French Rationalists, who were then—if they are not still—generally decried. His own Rationalism is best seen in his *Studies in Literature* (1878, pp. 116–21). He rejects heaven and hell, and doubts if there is any future life, and he defines his God as "an inscrutable Power," which may be necessary as "a natural rather than as a miraculous or traditional foundation for morality."

Draper, Prof. John William, M.D., LL.D. (1811–82), American chemist. He was educated at London University College in the days when it still enjoyed the Rationalist spirit which had created it, but he emigrated to America and graduated in medicine at Pennsylvania University. A scholar of remarkable versatility, he taught chemistry and physiology at New York University and did valuable work in astronomy and microscopy—he was the first to photograph the moon and to adapt the camera to the microscope—and got the Rumford Medal (1875) for his studies in heat and light. Draper believed in God and immortality, yet his *History of the Conflict between Science and Religion* (cheap ed., 1927) was one of the most valuable Rationalist works published in America. His *History of the Intellectual Development of Europe* (1862) also rendered great service to Rationalism, especially by pointing out that it was the Spanish Arabs who really led to the recovery of civilization.

Dreiser, Theodore (1871–1946), American author. The distinguished novelist was of Polish extraction and had his elementary education in Warsaw. He became a journalist in America and

edited several magazines, but the realistic power of his novel, *Sister Carrie* (1900), and its successors, put him in the front rank of American authors. He was a pitiless critic of modern civilization, but his bitterness sprang from humanitarian feeling, and all his stories reflect his scorn of creeds and Churches. In the florilegium *The Wisdom of Life* (1938, Watts and Co.) these words of his are fitly quoted: "Assure a man that he has a soul, and then frighten him with old wives' tales as to what is to become afterwards, and you have hooked a fish, a mental slave" (p. 81).

Dresden, Edmond (died 1903), philanthropist. A man of unknown origin and life who left almost his entire fortune of £340,000 to the National Lifeboat Institution and directed that the following inscription should be cut on his tombstone: "Here lie the remains of Edmond Dresden, who believed in no religion but that of being charitable to his fellows, man and woman, both in word and deed."

Drews, Arthur, Ph.D. (b. 1865), German writer. Author of *The Christ Myth* (Engl. trans., 1910), *Witnesses to the Historicity of Jesus* (Engl. trans., 1912), and other works of the mythological school. He is not a historian, but a teacher of philosophy (from 1898 on) in the Karlsruhe Technical High School. He is, apart from the question of Christ, a Pantheist (*Religion als Selbstbewusstsein Gottes*, 1908).

Driesch, Prof. Hans Adolf Edward, Ph.D., LL.D. (b. 1867), German philosopher. He is quoted in religious literature as one of the "distinguished men of science" who are on the side of the angels. Though opposed to Materialism and contending for a modified Vitalism (or Neo-Vitalism, as he says), he is nearer to Agnosticism than Theism. In his Gifford Lectures (1907-8) he rejects the idea of soul and defines God as an unknowable Absolute Reality (*The Problem of Individuality*, 1914). In connection with his anti-Materialist views it should be understood that he was never a "man of science," as apologists say, but professor of philosophy at Heidelberg University.

Drummond, The Rt. Hon. Sir William, F.R.S., D.C.L. (1770-1828), diploma-

tist. He entered Parliament in 1795, and was admitted to the Privy Council and sent as Minister Plenipotentiary to Naples in 1801. Later he was British Minister at Constantinople. He found time in his distinguished diplomatic career to write a number of philosophical works and a Deistic criticism of the Old Testament, *Œdipus Judaicus* (1811). Shelley, who knew him well, described him as "an adversary of Christianity" (Dowden's *Life*, II, 290).

Drunkennes and Religion. Like crime and vice, drunkenness is represented as one of the results of the decay of religion and of a consequent relaxation of the control of the passions. It is shown in other articles [*Chivalry*; *Crime and Religion*; *Middle Ages*; etc.] that this rhetorical claim is blatantly opposed to the historical and statistical facts as regards vice and crime, and this is true also as regards drunkenness. In all sections of society, priestly and monastic as well as lay, intemperance was a joke throughout the Middle Ages and until the nineteenth century, but it is possible to give definite figures only for the last century and a half. The London magistrate, P. Colquhoun (*Moral State of the Metropolis*, etc.), who, with the police as his informants, made careful studies of the condition of London in the first decade of the nineteenth century, tells us that in 1806 there were in London 5,000 public-houses to 200,000 workers (few of whom earned more than a pound a week), and they sold 158,000,000 pints of ale and enormous quantities of gin a year. Workers with "good wages" (20s. to 30s.) drank twelve to sixteen pints a day. The consumption of milk (heavily watered) was then, he says, one-tenth of a pint per person per day. The cheapest tea was 8s. a pound and out of reach of the workers, while ale was 3d. a quart. A Parliamentary Report on the condition of the factory workers of the north, which was published in 1832 (and is available at the British Museum), reported equally squalid conditions in the manufacturing towns, boys of ten drinking and cursing in the taverns, and girls of fourteen becoming mothers. Cruikshank's famous temperance pictures aroused a feeling for reform, which

was supported by the humanitarian Rationalists (Owen, Bentham, etc.); yet, when Bill after Bill (1839, 1844, 1860, 1872, etc.) was brought before Parliament in the interest of temperance, "only two out of six-and-twenty Right Reverend Prelates would sacrifice their dinner and their regard for their bellies to attend and vote," Lord Brougham angrily exclaimed (quoted by the Christian Socialist Joseph Clayton in his *Bishops as Legislators*, 1906). The clergy themselves were, Cardinal Newman recalls in his *Apologia*, divided into "one-bottle, two-bottle, and three-bottle men" (usually of port); and the ordinary gentry and military officers commonly got drunk every night. The gradual improvement of this state of things in the course of a century has coincided step by step with a decay of Church influence. Even in the last forty years we have seen, and police statistics confirm, a notable decrease of drunkenness on the streets and an increase of temperance in all classes.

Dryden, John (1631-1700), poet. In his *Short History of Freethought*, II, 93-4, Robertson gives, on the authority of Dr. Verrall (*Lectures on Dryden*, 1914), some evidence that Dryden was a Deist, though he adds that "there is no decisive evidence that he was ever pronouncedly heterodox." In fact, Dryden became a Roman Catholic before he wrote *The Hind and the Panther* (1687), and, although he was buried in Westminster Abbey, he remained in that Church.

Drysdale, Charles Robert, M.D., M.R.C.P., F.R.C.S. (1829-1907), founder of the Malthusian League. He was physician to the North London Consumption Hospital, and later to the Metropolitan Hospital. Dr. Drysdale was, in spite of his professional position, an outspoken Rationalist, but he was chiefly devoted to the establishment of the League: a work subsequently carried on by his son, Dr. Charles Drysdale, an electrical engineer and inventor of distinction, equally Rationalistic.

Dualism. The opposite of Monism, or the theory that reality is in part spiritual (the mind, etc.) and in part material.

Du Bois-Reymond, Prof. Emil (1818-1896), German physiologist. From Haeckel's severe criticisms and apologetic references to him as an opponent of Materialism many erroneously infer that he was opposed to Rationalism. He was, in fact, an Agnostic, and opposed what he regarded as the too positive position of Monism. He was in youth educated for the Church, but he abandoned the creed and began a series of experiments on animal electricity which led to his becoming one of the greatest German physiologists of the second half of the nineteenth century, professor of physiology at Berlin University, and Perpetual Secretary of the Academy of Sciences. He was at first aggressively anti-religious (*Voltaire*, 1868, *La Mettrie*, 1875, etc.), but changed to a temperate Agnosticism (*Die Sieben Welträthsel*, 1880). The title of this work (*The Seven World-Riddles*) inspired the title of Haeckel's famous book (in German *The World-Riddles*).

Duclaux, Agnes Mary Francis (1857-1903), writer. An English lady (Agnes Robinson, of Leamington) who, in 1888, married the distinguished French-Jewish Orientalist Darmesteter [see], and after his death the Director of the Pasteur Institute, E. Duclaux. Her salon was one of the most brilliant attractions of Rationalist scholars at Paris in the days of Renan, of whom she wrote a life.

Duel, and the Church, The. One of the immoral practices actually introduced into European life after the adoption of Christianity. It was due to the Teutonic nations which displaced the Romans, and was encouraged as one form of the ordeal by the clergy—a grim comment on the familiar claim that Christianity tamed the passions of the barbarians. Hallam calls it "a monstrous birth of ferocity and superstition." Women often fought their own cases (sometimes against men), and abbots and bishops had swordsmen in their employment especially for the purpose of settling quarrels about the ownership of the estates they were wont to annex. Priests themselves fought duels so frequently that in 1165 Pope Alexander II, instead of suppressing the practice, ordered that a priest who lost

part of a finger in a duel must not say Mass. The Age of Chivalry deepened the evil, women spurring on the men like viragoes and sometimes themselves entering the lists. The feebleness of ecclesiastical opposition, Catholic and Protestant, may be gathered from the fact that the duel survived until the nineteenth century. A Bill to abolish it was thrown out of Parliament in 1712, and as late as 1830 leading London newspapers carried, prominently, advertisements of manuals of the art of duelling. Voltaire warmly opposed the duel in France, and Napoleon suppressed it; but the clerical-royalists restored it.

Dühring, Prof. Eugen Karl (1833–1901), German philosopher. A lawyer who turned to philosophy and taught it at Berlin University. He became an outspoken Positivist (*Der Wert des Lebens*, 1865) and was dismissed. In later writings, philosophical and economic, he is more Materialistic, and is classed by Eisler, in his *Dictionary of Philosophers*, as “a Positivist akin to Materialism.” He was “almost Lucretian in his anger against religion” (*Ency. Brit.*), and his criticism of Darwinism merely sought to disprove the necessity of struggle.

Dujardin, Édouard (b. 1861), French writer. Before he took up comparative religion, in 1900, and became one of the chief writers denying the historicity of Jesus, he had a high reputation in France as a literary man. He founded the *Revue Wagnerienne* and the *Revue Indépendante*, published several novels, and wrote dramas of the Symbolical School. He was an intimate friend of George Moore, who often speaks of him in *Hail and Farewell*. Since 1900 he has been engaged upon a series of works on the history of Judaism and the origin of Christianity, of which two, *The Source of the Christian Tradition* (1911) and *Ancient History of the God Jesus* (1938), are available in English. He contends that Jesus, or Joshua, was an ancient Palestinian (pre-Hebrew) god whose cult persisted until he was adopted as the figure-head of the social revolutionary movement which became Christianity.

Dumas, Alexandre (“Dumas fils,”

1824–95), French novelist and dramatist. A natural son of the elder Dumas (who had lived a Freethinker and died a Catholic) who took up his father's literary career. His second novel, *La dame aux Camélias*, especially when it was dramatized in 1852, made his reputation and inaugurated an era of realism in the French theatre. His dramas, novels, and essays fill eleven volumes (1890–3). Dumas, a severe moralist and thinker, was a Deist with veins of mysticism (P. Bourget, *Nouveaux essais de psychologie contemporaine*, 1886, pp. 64–78).

Du Maurier, George Louis Palmella Busson (1834–96), novelist. Born and educated (first in chemistry, then art) in Paris, he settled in England in 1860, joining the staff of *Punch*, and illustrated books. *Peter Ibbetson* (1892) tells the story of his early years, and *Trilby* (1894) had an immense circulation. His biographer, M. Wood, says that he was a Theist, but rejected Christianity and a future life (*George Du Maurier*, 1913, pp. 144 and 165).

Dunant, Jean Henri (1828–1910), Swiss Nobel Prize winner. His book *Un souvenir de Solferino* (1862) so vividly described the sufferings of the wounded that it led to the Geneva Conference of 1864, which founded the Red Cross. He was one of the most ardent apostles of peace and internationalism, and was awarded the Peace Prize in 1901. His biographer, M. Gumpert (*J. H. Dunant*, 1939), quotes a letter which he wrote late in life: “The two great enemies of humanity are the Church and the State. . . . You know that I hate State Churches, but just as little do I love the Baptists and all the other 'ists in the world” (p. 268). He is described as a Theist, but he said: “I wish to be carried to my grave like a dog, without a single one of your ceremonies, which I do not recognize” (p. 295).

Duncan, Prof. David, M.A., D.Sc., LL.D. (1839–1923), Scottish educationist. He is well known as Herbert Spencer's private secretary (1867–70) and compiler of the four volumes of the *Descriptive Sociology*. He went to India, and was professor of logic and moral philosophy at the Presidency College, Madras (1870–84), Principal of

the College (1884-92), Director of Public Instruction, and member of the Legislative Council, and Vice-Chancellor of Madras University. He shared Spencer's Agnosticism, and wrote a valuable *Life and Letters of Herbert Spencer* (1908).

Dupont de Nemours, Pierre Samuel (1739-1817), famous French economist. He studied medicine, but quitted it for political economy and vigorously attacked the blunders and evils of the French regime, and his *Physiocratie* (2 vols., 1868) founded what is known as the Physiocratic School in economics. He accepted the Revolution and sat in the Council of the Elders, but the later excesses disgusted him, and he went to America, where he had much influence on Jefferson. He was a Deist (*La philosophie de l'univers*, 1796), and a man of equal distinction in character and learning.

Dupuis, Prof. Charles François (1742-1809), French literary man. Dupuis was a Catholic priest and professor of rhetoric who left the Church and devoted himself to astronomy. His *Mémoire sur l'origine des constellations* (1781) and *Origine de tous les cultes* (3 vols., 1895) founded the solar or astro-mythical school of religion. The suggestion that he was a hasty or superficial thinker is incorrect. He was professor of Latin oratory at the Collège de France, and a brilliant savant. Accepting the Revolution in its sober original form, he sat in the Council of Five Hundred, and was at one time President of the Legislative Assembly; but the excesses of the Terror, from which he saved many victims, were deeply opposed to his humanitarian ideals.

Durkheim, Prof. Émile (1858-1917), French sociologist. After teaching philosophy in provincial colleges he devoted himself to sociology, and was professor of social science at Bordeaux from 1886 to 1902. He then succeeded Buisson as professor of the science of education at Paris University. Durkheim is much discussed for his theory of the influence of social forces on the evolution of religion (*Les formes élémentaires de la vie religieuse*, 1912). All creeds, he says, are doomed, but religion in an ethical sense will survive.

Duruy, Prof. Jean Victor (1811-94), French historian. A professor of history at the Paris Polytechnic and (1863-9) Minister of Education. The clergy compelled him to resign because of his plans of reform, especially in the education of girls, and he devoted himself to the writing of the historical works *Histoire des romains* (7 vols., 1879-85) and *Histoire des Grecs* (2 vols., 1879-83), which made him one of the most eminent French historians of the time. He was raised to the Senate and the Institute under the Republic.

Dysteleology. Not merely the negation, but the opposite, of the teleological view (which claims an end (*telos*) or purpose in nature): a term proposed by Prof. Haeckel to denote the fact that there is a great deal in nature which *excludes* the idea of design or purpose. Since the better-educated teleologists now repudiate "the theology of gaps," or the practice of finding supernatural action in those phenomena which science is not yet able to explain—a practice which clearly puts belief in God at the mercy of the further progress of science—and ask us to consider nature as a whole, we have to retort that no Theist ever does regard the whole of nature; just as when he says that he accepts evolution, he excludes the evolution of the mind. The teleologist refuses to consider, or makes futile comments on, the disorder, ugliness, waste, and apparent unintelligence that are found throughout nature, especially in the evolutionary past. These are at the most declared to be mysterious, but, as Prof. H. S. Jennings, one of the most distinguished and most impartial of American biologists, says [*see Design*], they exclude the idea of plan or guidance; and in the answers to Leuba's questionnaire on the beliefs of scientific men [*see Culture and Religion*] it was found, although teachers in sectarian institutions (other than Catholic) were included, that only 16 per cent. of the greater biologists of America believed in God, while 59.3 per cent. "disbelieved," and only 14 per cent. were Agnostic.

The first feature of the evolutionary process that impresses biologists in this way is its erratic course and the vast

waste involved. The teleologist urges that we must confine our attention to the end-product, man, but as W. H. Mallock (who died a Catholic) wrote: "Whatever be God's future, we cannot forget his past." An evolution that takes about 1,000 million years to produce a primitive type of fish, 500 million further years to produce an ape-man, and still 20 million years to convert this into the superficially civilized man of to-day, inclines us more to dysteleology than to teleology. The fish-world, during millions of years, branches out into a myriad types (most of which perish) before it produces a land-animal: the horse is the one type fitted to survive of dozens of species of horse-like creatures which appear: modern man is the outcome of a struggle of types that are doomed to perish. This feature of nature, which we trace throughout the whole of its past, is intelligible only when we exclude plan and guidance, and it is then fully intelligible.

The fact that carnivorism has been one of the most important elements of the Natural Selection which shaped new types is another feature that suggests dysteleology. There is no need to exaggerate. It is probable that there is no consciousness below the level of the fish, and therefore there was no consciousness of pain during more than half the earth's story. But from the days when dragons "tore each other in the slime," to the still more repulsive clash of modern armies, there have been hundreds of millions of years of suffering. Wallace and others tried to soften this picture of "Nature red in tooth and claw" by claiming that peaceful social evolution played a larger part. Until the end of the Mesozoic it played a very small part, and, where it existed (sponges, corals, etc.), it generally left the species at very primitive levels of life. Even in the Tertiary Period gregarious animals (beavers, deer, wolves, monkeys, etc.) remained unprogressive, while man's ancestors were probably not social. For the real efficacy of social evolution, see article under that title, but Wallace's theory (in the interest of Theism) tends to obscure a more important fact. It is that the highest type, man, is the

outcome of at least 20 million years of a life generally sheltered from carnivorism and struggle, and there are grounds to think that this is true of the earlier ancestors as far back as the Eocene Period (possibly 80 or more million years). Why was the appalling carnivorous struggle necessary in the rest of nature?

The struggle with the carnivore is only one, if the chief, of the agencies which give animals anxiety and suffering. We need not stress the convulsions and accidents of nature, but suffering that is due to parasites is obviously relevant. If there was design or guidance in the whole plan, this extends to the monstrous growth of parasitism which began early in the record. We can trace bacteria in the Carboniferous, and the immense worm-world, which provides so many deadly parasites, was developed much earlier. It is true that in many cases we have reason to believe that parasitic worms were once normal-living organisms. It follows that the "direction" of evolution provided them with their elaborate apparatus and enormous fertility—some lay 100,000,000 eggs—just when animals became capable of feeling pain. (See Prof. E. Gunther's *Darwinism and the Problems of Life*, 1906, pp. 262-87.) Another deadly chapter would describe the broad world of poisonous animals and plants. We cannot lose sight of these things, which would mean closing our eyes to half of nature and its past, to contemplate the final stage. Human history would be an ironic record if it were written on these lines. Modern history is quite godless, and (see Leuba's results) only a small minority of historians believe in God. At the best it must seem to the teleologist a very depressing mystery why this fifteen-hundred-million-year process, with all its repugnant features, was chosen as the mechanism to bring about a world in which the optimist can only hope that man will some day triumph over the legacy of evil in his nature (owing to this "directed" process) and mitigate the evils of his environment. From the Naturalist or Rationalist point of view, which excludes plan, purpose, or direction, nature and its past are fully intelligible.

E.

Earth, Age of the. [See *Age of the Earth.*]

Eaton, Daniel (1752–1814), bookseller. He was educated by the Jesuits in the Catholic College of St. Omer, but abandoned the Church and devoted his life to selling Rationalist and other rebellious literature in the dark days of the Revolution and the Napoleonic reaction. In 1793 he was prosecuted for selling Paine's *Rights of Man*, and again in 1794 and 1812. He translated the Atheist works of Fréret and Helvétius, and his shop, which he called The Ratiocinatory, rendered fine and courageous service in the early years of the century.

Ecclesiastes. One of the books of the Old Testament which makes the Fundamentalist-Catholic idea of the inspiration of the Bible humorous. Although the work as we have it has been altered by orthodox Jews, it is clearly sceptical (iii, 19-22, etc.) about the belief in a future life which had been generally accepted in Judaism, and, while there is in fact more wisdom in it than in any other book of the Old Testament, its cynicism about life is neither Jewish nor religious. The original, of which Prof. M. Jastrow has published a translation with a valuable introduction (1919), is, he says, the work of "a free lance in religion" and is as cynical about a future bliss as the Egyptian *Song of the Harper* [see] or Omar Khayyam (to whom in many respects the author is akin). On the claim of some experts that the original (obtained by sheering off the pious interpolations in a different style) shows "an irreligious spirit" Prof. Jastrow says "perhaps" (p. 192). He obviously agrees. Prof. S. A. Cook points out that we have a Babylonian poem of the third century B.C. which might have been the inspiration of the writer (*The Old Testament*, 1936, p. 85). Experts generally agree that it was written by an Alexandrian Jew about 200 B.C. or a little earlier. The word "Ecclesiastes," like "Kohleth"—it is sometimes called the Book of Kohleth—means one who addresses an assembly (*ecclesia*), and the irony is increased by translating this

"the Preacher." The book is a finely-written blend of elderly cynicism and common sense: a significant outcome of the evolution of thought and decay of creeds, especially at Alexandria, in the last three centuries of the old era.

Ecclesiasticus. One of the "wisdom books" of the Old Testament which, though it is more religious than *Ecclesiastes*, is excluded from the Protestant Bible because it was not in the Palestinian canon of the Jews. Like *Ecclesiastes*, it is believed to have been written by an Alexandrian Jew of the third century B.C. who was very far from orthodox—"a law-despising Hellenist," Graetz says. It excludes belief in devils and angels—if not immortality—and the Messianic hope. Fragments discovered between 1886 and 1900 of a manuscript of it in Hebrew suggest that it was written in that language. The title it gives itself, "The Wisdom of Jesus, son of Sirach," is not taken seriously.

Echegaray, Eizaguerre José (1833–1916), Spanish Nobel Prize winner. A Spanish scholar and literary man who played a prominent part in anti-clerical politics. He was a professor of mathematics who became Minister of Education, then of Finance, in the Liberal Government 1867–74. With the return to power of the clerical-royalists he took up letters and became the leading dramatist of Spain. He was very popular for thirty years and received the Nobel Prize for Literature in 1904. (See A. Zacher, *Don José Echegaray*, 1892.)

Eckermann, Johann Peter (1792–1854), Goethe's "Boswell." The son of a working man, he contrived to get a course of aesthetics at Göttingen University and attracted Goethe's attention by his poems. He was employed as secretary, and his *Gespräche mit Goethe* (2 vols., 1837) are valuable biographical evidence. The Grand Duke of Weimar made him a Councillor and Librarian. He shared Goethe's liberal Pantheism.

Economic Determination of History. The. A Socialist theory that all

historical developments are determined by the economic conditions prevailing at the time. This is much narrower than the Materialistic Determination of History [see] which is generally accepted, and it is confined to advanced Socialist writers. (See N. T. Bukharin, *Historical Materialism*, 1926, and books listed under *Dialectical Materialism*.)

Ectoplasm. A physiological term absurdly borrowed by Spiritualists for the material which a spirit is supposed to remove from a medium's body to build up a body for itself. The word means the "outer" (*ekto*) layer of protoplasm of a cell, and, apart from the miracle of removing it and building up a body in a few minutes, the medium's body would obviously collapse. The fact that a few men of science like Richet, who did not believe in spirits, thought this a natural power of mediums recommends discrimination in considering the opinions of scientific men outside their proper fields of research.

Eddington, Sir Arthur Stanley, F.R.S. (1882-1944), astronomer. Sir Arthur was Plumerian Professor of Astronomy and Director of the Observatory at Cambridge. He had the Gold Medal of the Royal Society and a number of well-earned honours. He was a man of high character, a member of the Society of Friends, and a master of astronomy and physics. The immense popularity of his works in recent years (*Science and the Unseen World*, 1929; *The Expanding Universe*, 1933; *The Philosophy of Physical Science*, 1939, etc.) would, however, have been far less, and the Churches would have had to refrain from helping the circulation as they did, if he had made it clear to his readers that he did not believe in the existence of a material universe—an attitude which is as deadly to Christology as to Materialism—and held that electrons and stars are just ideas in the mind of God. He frankly admitted this in an interview with the late Dr. Sullivan (*Observer*, Dec. 21, 1930). His work is marred also by entirely false statements about the earlier state of science in regard to the nature of atoms [see *Atomism*] and the failure to warn the general educated public, for whom he wrote, that his views on such things as

indeterminism or the breakdown of the law of causality are rejected by practically all physicists, who severely criticize his works. In a special article in *Nature* (May 8, 1937) Dr. H. Dingle makes a searching criticism of such works as those of Jeans and Eddington, complaining that "we now have in the scientific world itself the wholesale publication of spineless rhetoric, the irrationality of which is obscured by a smoke-screen of mathematical symbols" (p. 784). In his *Swarthmore Lectures to Quakers, Science and the Unseen World* (1929), Eddington explains that he regards proof of the existence of God as superfluous: that you know it as you know the existence of a friend.

Eden, The Garden of. The universal acceptance of this childish legend until modern times is another illustration of the paralysing effect upon the intellect of the old creed. Little more than a hundred years ago there was quite a serious discussion among travellers and geographers as to the site of Eden, and Encyclopædias are still apt to treat the story with an amusing respect. The Greek parallel legend of Elysium, or the Elysian Fields, the Garden of the Gods to which heroes were admitted, and the Hindu story of a primitive happiness [see *Fall*] were not considered relevant. The growth of the critical spirit and a tardy sensitiveness to the brutality of the Fall-story discredited the legend even in the Churches in the last century, but it was not until recent years that what seems to be the Mesopotamian original of the Hebrew story was found. As late as 1918 Dr. King, of the British Museum, said, in his *Legends of Babylonia and Egypt in relation to Hebrew Tradition*, that no parallel to the *Genesis* story had been discovered, but Prof. S. Langdon had already (*Sumerian Epic of Paradise, the Flood and the Fall of Man*, 1915) described a tablet, found in 1912, in which the legend figures a thousand years before the supposed age of *Genesis*. The first race of men, it is said, lived in a paradise ruled by the gods, but for some unknown reason the gods became angry with them and sent a flood to destroy them. The familiar good man was warned and escaped in a boat. He was

then put in charge of a garden, with orders to refrain from eating the fruit of one tree, and he disobeyed and men were condemned to sickness and brevity of life for all time. [See Fall and Flood.] Dr. King thinks that the discovery of a boundary-stone in Southern Babylonia has fixed the site (p. 136).

Edict of Nantes, The. An edict published in France by Henri IV, in 1598, giving a very large measure of freedom to the Protestants or Huguenots [see]. Henry was himself a "converted" Huguenot. The gay monarch said, apropos of his conversion as a condition of ascending the throne, that "Paris was worth a Mass." The edict was in any case a wise piece of statesmanship to put an end to civil war. The Huguenots received freedom of conscience and worship, four universities, full civil rights, and the right to build new churches except in Paris and its environs. The clergy and the Vatican were angry, but the Edict held for more than eighty years. Richelieu destroyed the fortified cities of the Huguenots in the interest of national unity, but left them religious freedom. Mazarin followed his example, and it is piquant to reflect that the Church could not get the power to enforce its intolerance until one of the most corrupt of French kings of modern times, Louis XIV, came to maturity. From 1661 onward the Edict was more and more openly dishonoured. Children were torn from Huguenot parents and the clergy were permitted to use various kinds of coercion. In 1685 Louis revoked the Edict. It is necessary, and not a little disgusting, to connect this, as few historians now do, with the life of "the Grand Monarch" [see]. His twenty years of profligacy were over—his last acknowledged mistress had died in pitiful circumstances in 1680—his health ruined, his Court disgraced in Europe by amazing disclosures (1679–81) of noble complicity in murder, Black Masses [see], and general corruption. The enigmatic Mme. de Maintenon (whom he married) and the Jesuits now induced him to atone for his sins—to the ruin of France. It is said that 400,000 of the best citizens of France, of every class, left the country; and England, the Nether-

lands, and Switzerland were enriched with new industries. France, until then the greatest Power in Europe, as it had escaped the Thirty Years War, sank into the semi-bankruptcy which prepared the way for the Revolution.

Edison, Thomas Alva, D.Sc., LL.D., Ph.D. (1847–1931), inventor. Edison had little schooling, but such a passion for books that he read Gibbon's *Decline and Fall* and Hume's *History of England* before he was ten, and at the age of twelve determined to read, foot by foot, the whole contents of the Detroit Public Library. He read fifteen feet of books, including Newton's *Principia* and Burton's *Anatomy of Melancholy*. He sold newspapers for a living, studied chemistry and mathematics, and got a job as a telegraph operator which set him on the lines of his great career. He was an outspoken Agnostic all his life, though in his late (and feebler) years he, like Lombrosor dallied with Spiritualism.

Education, The Churches and. The legend that Christianity "gave the world schools," which is still repeated even by apologists who consider themselves above the popular class, is, like similar claims in regard to slavery, philanthropy, purity, etc., the exact opposite of the historical facts as they are recorded in every manual of the history of education published since the middle of the last century. Indeed, the Roman system of free education had been described repeatedly since the classical revival of the fifteenth century, and even in Christian circles every biography of Augustine of Hippo had described how he found free pagan schools, primary and secondary, even in the smaller towns of Africa. In earlier civilizations a good deal of schooling had been provided for boys (occasionally girls) of the middle class, as we find in Egyptian and Babylonian remains, but they all, including Greece, regarded the education of the workers as superfluous. Under the influence of the Stoic-Epicureans, long before bishops had the least influence, the Roman Emperors created a system of schools, maintained by the municipalities, for all freeborn children. By the fourth century the "ladder of education" (free to

all) stretched, in all parts of the Empire, from the simple primary school, often in the open air, through secondary schools to a sort of university at Rome (and in a few other cities). See the details in Laurie's *Historical Survey of Pre-Christian Education* (1900) or any modern manual. These schools, in which the text-books were, naturally, Pagan literature, were offensive and dangerous to the Church, and the fact that in so intellectually busy a city as Alexandria the Christians opened a few small schools rather reminds us of the fable of the fly on the chariot-wheel when we are asked to regard this as the beginning of education.

The Fathers were, in fact, overwhelmingly opposed to education and expressed a contempt for profane knowledge. "After Jesus Christ," said Tertullian, "all curiosity is superfluous." In the last century a French priest, the Abbé Gaume, contending that the classics ought to be excluded from every Catholic college, quoted a long series of such sentiments from the works of the Fathers (*Le ver rongeur des sociétés modernes* 1851). Even Augustine, in his later years, joined in the chorus, and the murder of Hypatia and the closing of the great school at Alexandria, followed later by the closing of the schools at Athens by Justinian, are well-known facts. The work of the apologists is, in fact, so clumsily conducted that instead of pleading, as they might, that after the fall of the Empire it was economically impossible to maintain the vast system of schools, Christian writers give their readers the curious impression that it was just at this time that schools began to multiply. It is a commonplace of historical manuals that the Roman schools perished almost without trace. "With few exceptions they had disappeared by the sixth century," says Dr. W. Boyd, who is by no means anti-clerical, in his *History of Western Education* (1921, p. 100). Dr. Boyd thinks that schools survived best in Christian Gaul, but Denk, who makes a special study of schools in this region in his *Geschichte des Gallo-Frankischen Unterrichts* (1892), shows that you could count them on your fingers. The Ostrogothic monarch,

Theodoric [see] and his daughter Amalasuntha had made a noble effort to save civilization and restore education, but the Popes intrigued with their enemies and ruined it. We find Gregory I ("the Great") rebuking a French bishop for the "horrible crime" of opening a school (*Ep.* LIV, Migne Collection); and instead of this the chief Papal historian of this period, Mgr. Mann, quotes a "work of Gregory" which the Benedictine editors themselves declare spurious.

On a balanced view of education in the Dark Age—the facts are now given quite consistently in every detailed manual—we see an appalling intellectual collapse. The Roman workers (excluding slaves) had all had free education, but in the impoverished new Europe, in which 90 to 95 per cent. were now serfs, almost none, apart from priests and monks, had education; and many priests could not read the Mass, while the bulk of the monks were illiterate and sensual idlers [see *Monks*]. Here and there, at one period or another, a bishop like Isidore of Seville gave his clergy some culture. Here and there an abbot feebly illumined his district for a time; but of the much-vaunted zeal of the British and Irish monks in the first century of their Christian fervour, Prof. Boyd observes that "in pre-Christian times education flourished in Ireland and other Catholic countries," so that the apostles of Christianity were compelled to adopt "the cultural interests and educational work of the Druids" (p. 112). He would, of course, not question that this early Celtic zeal did much work for a time in Britain and France, but this work is often wrongly represented as a broad educational development. Little was taught except theology, and the pupils were nearly all—to some extent sons of the nobles were included—monks or clerics. The work of Charlemagne, on the other hand, is now recognized as of very little significance. Stimulated during his first visit to Italy by the high culture of the anti-Papal Lombards [see], he ordered all his bishops and abbots to open schools. Few did, and the scheme was abandoned as soon as he died [see *Charlemagne*]. Rome itself remained

so backward that we have legal documents of the tenth century which ladies of the highest noble family have signed with a mark because they could not write their names (Gregorovius, *History of the City of Rome*, III, 258).

The myth of the monks and classical literature has been exposed elsewhere (*Classics, The Monks and the*), and just as, or even more, reckless is the Catholic boast, based upon the egregious work of Montalembert, of the libraries of the monks. On dubious evidence they claim that there were monasteries in the later Middle Ages with 6,000 or 7,000 volumes—we know that in the thirteenth century the library at Canterbury, presumably one of the best in England, had only 1,800 (*Catholic Encyclopædia*)—whereas by the ninth century the Spanish Arabs had myriads of libraries of beautifully bound books, superbly housed, rising to the royal library of at least 400,000. [See *Libraries*.] Such was the height of the nominally Moslem, but very largely sceptical, culture of the Arabs and Persians from Portugal to Baluchistan. It was this culture and the provision of schools for nearly all children—see the works of Prof. Ballesteros and Prof. Ribera—that at last inspired a school-movement in Christendom. We find it beginning in the south of France in the tenth century, when the education of Gerbert [see] and his Arab schooling plainly show the inspiration; and the spread of this school-movement over the whole of the south of France in the eleventh century was the dawn of the age of wandering scholars and universities. [See *Abélard and Universities*.]

In Italy the movement was later, and it began in the south, close to Arab Sicily, while Rome still lagged behind the other cities. It is, further, a matter of history that this school-movement, which is considered one of the glories of the Middle Ages, was at first very largely independent of the Church and as broad in its curriculum as the state of learning permitted; and that the Church suppressed the free colleges, eliminated the teaching of science, and turned most of the universities into theological cockpits for crowds of monks and clerics.

In the next phase we meet claims that the Reformers on the one hand, and the Jesuits on the other, gave a great impetus to education. Both sides concentrated on the religious issue, the Jesuit education in particular being a narrow and poisonous system for making sons of the wealthy and the nobles hate Protestantism. In point of fact, however, and although we should expect the invention of printing and the manufacture of paper to stimulate education, the references to new Protestant and Jesuit schools and colleges are very misleading. The figures of illiteracy [see] in the various countries of Europe at the beginning of the nineteenth century make a mockery of all educational claims for earlier dates. The French Revolution had directed Talleyrand to draft a fine scheme, which we have, of universal free education, and the ideal was passed on to Switzerland, Spain, and Italy. Napoleon had here in part maintained the revolutionary ideal; but, after his fall, Catholic countries—and again the Pope's dominions were the worst—sank back into a lamentable condition, while Rationalists like Pestalozzi, Froebel, Robert Owen, and Bentham worked for universal education.

It is enough to tell the development in England. The demands of the humanitarians opened the eyes of all to the disgraceful situation, and a Quaker, Lancaster, supported by the Atheists Owen, Place, and Bentham, founded a system of undenominational schools; to which the Church of England, in its own interests, reacted by opening a large number of very primitive schools of its own for the children of the workers. But the bishops fiercely resisted for thirty years the grant of any national subsidy, and for forty further years obstructed the demand for a national system. See the details in Holman's *English National Education* (1898) or any other history. At the beginning of the nineteenth century 90 per cent. of the people were still illiterate in England—which fully discredits all pre-Reformation or post-Reformation claims. Fifty per cent. were still illiterate when Parliament was permitted to make an annual grant of £20,000 (and £70,000

for the royal stables) in 1833. The bishops walked in procession from the House to the Palace to protest against the establishment of a national system, and their hostility was not broken until 1870. The same fierce struggle against the clergy had to be waged in nearly every country before the modern system—which we now regard as indispensable to civilization—could be established. See articles in the *Encyclopedia of Education* (5 vols., 1912), issued by Columbia University, or any modern manual of the history of education. *A Student's History of Education* by Pres. Graves (1936) has the weakness of much recent American history, generalizing (favourably to Catholics) on small achievements in the Middle Ages, and it is poor in exact detail.

Edwards, John Passmore (1823–1911), philanthropist. Educated in a village school, he read assiduously and became a journalist and a lecturer on behalf of peace and temperance. He was able to buy the *Building News* in 1862, and in 1876 he established the London daily, the *Echo*, and edited it until 1896. His paper was conducted on more idealist lines than any other, and his philanthropy was remarkable. He founded seventy Passmore Edwards Institutes and aided others. In his autobiography, *A Few Footprints* (1906), he says that he "owed more to Emerson than to any other writer or teacher" (p. 18). He was a Spencerian Agnostic (personal knowledge) and took a helpful interest in the early stages of the R.P.A.

Egoism. The elaboration of a social foundation for ethics, relating the individual welfare vitally to that of the community, has discredited the charge that religion alone could inspire altruism—if it may properly be called altruism when a religious person looks for an eternal reward for good deeds to others. The old antithesis of egoism—some now prefer to speak of an "enlightened (or socially conceived) egoism"—and altruism is unsound in experience and psychology, or is valid only in the case of exceptional types of character. There is an element of each in all people, and that Rationalists have a very notable share of real altruism is shown by the fact that of the self-

sacrificing pioneers of modern reform-movements the majority were Rationalists at a time when Rationalists were a small minority of the community. [See **Democracy**; **Philanthropy**; **Scepticism**; and **Social Progress**.]

Egypt, Morals in Ancient. Modern archæological research has altered our conception of the character of the ancient Egyptians. It was at one time customary to say that the Egyptians were a sombrely religious and severe people, while the Babylonians were superficially religious and very licentious. This estimate of Egypt, which did not restrain apologists from claiming that the Hebrews (a thousand years later) taught the world pure religion and morality, or that the pagan world lay in darkness and the shadow of death until the light of Christianity penetrated it, was due to the fact that we knew little more than ruins of temples and tombs of kings and nobles. People forgot that temples survived by their massiveness, and that the dry sand of the desert preserved the dead, while the life of the cities had crumbled into dust. We now have an immensely larger collection of remains, from children's toys to love-stories and paintings of daily life, and we see that, while the early kings affected solemnity to guard their supposed divine status, the great mass of the people were as merry as any in modern times. Inscriptions on the walls of the oldest tombs and texts in the Chapter of Protestations in the Book of the Dead [see] show that the Egyptians had, at least by 3000 B.C., a code of morals that compares with the Hebrew decalogue, if not the early Prophets, as a modern town compares with a Bantu kraal. Pleasant moral treatises for the middle class, of which the *Prisse Papyrus* [see] preserves two, compare in ethical sentiment with the writings of Maeterlinck and are monotheistic or purely humanitarian. The chief of these, the *Maxims of Ptah-hotep*, dates from long before the supposed age of Moses. Prof. Amélineau, one of the chief experts on this subject, dates it about 3000 B.C., or more than 2,000 years before the crudities of Amos and Hosea (*Essai sur l'évolution historique et philosophique des idées morales dans*

l'Égypte ancienne, 1895). He gives also ample material from earlier tomb-inscriptions, hymns, etc. A second leading expert, Prof. Erman (*Life in Ancient Egypt*, 1894) dates the *Maxims of Ptah-hotep* about 2700 B.C. Erman describes the common life about the middle of the second millennium B.C., about which we have considerable information, as very gay and sexually rather loose. The popular stories (from papyri stored in graves), love-poetry, etc., certainly indicate a freer life than any remains suggest in the case of Babylon, but the general evidence (summarized in the works of Breasted, Hall, Peet, Maspero, etc.) does not indicate a level of morals materially different from that of Europe to-day. The freedom and gaiety of the love-songs may be judged by the *Song of Solomon* in the Bible, which is almost certainly a collection of Egyptian wedding songs (as the Potiphar story is taken from the Egyptian *Tale of Two Brothers*) slightly altered. For the last phase Herodotus, who travelled in Egypt, tells (II, 60) of seeing women behave on festivals as the police would not now permit, and a fragment of Athenaeus imputes great freedom to Egyptian women. Diodorus Siculus, on the other hand, warns us against the "fables" of Herodotus (I, 81) and says that Egyptian law was very severe on sexual offences. In fine, the common practice of holding up "the wanton Cleopatra" as a type is stupid. She was of pure Macedonian blood, not Egyptian, and most authorities regard her conduct—she was as nearly married to Cæsar as Roman law permitted—as based upon an anxious patriotism. That she was a famous beauty and very licentious is sheer legend (Weigall's *Life and Times of Cleopatra*, 1914). On the other hand, while the Alexandria of the Ptolemies had a very free and luxurious life, it offered also spectacles of asceticism in the temples or community-houses of the cults of Isis and Serapis [see] and certain Jewish sects like the Essenes and Therapeuts, which actually inspired the austerities of the later Fathers of the Desert. The more we learn about Egypt in its best days the closer we find it to ourselves in its ideals and its imperfect realization of them.

Egypt, Scepticism in Ancient. The conventional but discredited idea that the Egyptians were exceptionally religious and moral was closely connected with their belief in immortality. Most of the experts now find that until about the year 1400 the priests taught that the kings alone, or kings and nobles, were immortal. We are not well informed about life in the Old Kingdom (3400–2700), but if, as some believe, the moral treatises mentioned in the last article go back to that period we have clear evidence that the middle or official class rejected the Egyptian gods, and the counsels of such writers as Ptah-hotep are so purely humanist that their references to "God" have no deep significance. Some do not refer to any divinity, and Prof. Peet quotes one exclaiming: "If I knew where God is I would certainly make an offering to him." Whatever be the date of these Rationalistic moralists, it is not doubted that in the fifteenth and fourteenth centuries B.C., when Egyptian civilization reached its height, there was a notable spread of scepticism. Prof. A. Erman, one of the highest authorities, emphasizes, in his sumptuous work on Egyptian religion (*Die Religion der Aegypten*, 1934), that the reign of Amenhotep III was decidedly Egypt's Golden Age, and he calls it "the Age of Heresy." Sir Wallis Budge, who rarely favours Rationalism, observes that "a God more or less made no difference to Amenhotep III," and "he was as willing to worship himself as Amen" (*History of Egypt*, 8 vols., 1902). Professor Breasted also calls this the Age of Heretics and points out that if it is true that the priests at this period extended the belief in immortality and judgment after death to the common people, it made no difference to their morals; and in his *Development of Religion and Thought in Ancient Egypt* (1912) he describes even the famous reform of religion by Ikhn-aten, the son of Amenhotep III, as a Rationalist enterprise. We have tomb inscriptions which show that the latter monarch's liberalism was shared by his courtiers. But in the *Song of the Harper* [see], of which several papyri have been found, we have a deeper scepticism. Literary men

still refer to the Mummy at the Feast [see] as proof of the religious solemnity of the Egyptians. In point of fact, even Herodotus, who records this, tells us that it was not a dead body, but a painted model, that was taken round the room and guests were exhorted to "drink and enjoy yourself" while you were alive. He seems to refer to the *Song of the Harper*, which was sung (to the harp) at these very gay banquets. It is openly sceptical about a future life and may be summed up in the familiar words: "Let us eat and drink and be merry, for to-morrow we die." In one of the best studies of this poem Prof. W. Max Müller (*Die Liebespoesie der alten Aegypten*, 1899), who translates it in full, says that the priests repeatedly tried to suppress it because of its "atheistic joy in life." He traces this cheerful defiance of what is considered the most solemn religious conviction of the Egyptians back to at least 2300 B.C. That there was general scepticism in Alexandria is shown elsewhere, but this was essentially a Greek civilization, the Egyptian minority having a small isolated quarter in the city.

Einstein, Prof. Albert, Ph.D. (b. 1879), mathematician and Nobel Prize winner. A German Jew who taught physics at Zurich, then at Prague, and in 1913 was appointed Director of the Kaiser Wilhelm Physical Institute at Berlin. His famous discoveries in mathematics were honoured with the Nobel Prize for physics, in 1922, and honorary degrees from fourteen universities. Since his flight to America, in 1933, from the brutality of the Nazis he has been a Life Member of the Princeton Institute for advanced study. In a speech about his beliefs which was put on phonographic record before he left Berlin he does not mention God, but speaks of "the sense of the mysterious" which is "at the root of religion and beauty." To a challenge by a rabbi he replied (April 1929): "I believe in Spinoza's God . . . not in a God who concerns himself about the fates and actions of human beings." Catholic prelates in the United States denounced him, with their usual crudeness, to the public as an Atheist, and he replied that he believes in a "great Power," the

source of order and beauty. Agnostic is the accurate description of his opinion, but he has never made any serious study of religious issues.

Eire, The Church in. The apparently stubborn attachment of the Irish people to the Roman Church has its roots not only in geography—like Poland, Ireland lies on the fringe of European civilization and is largely sheltered from the stimulating clash of cultures which is the main principle of progress—but also in history. It was remote from the ferment of Reformation days, and the fact that England, which it had learned to hate, accepted Protestantism hardened its religious isolation and caused it to lend an ear, until the latter part of the nineteenth century, to the grossest clerical libels of Protestants. The spirit of the French Revolution naturally found a response in Dublin, and there was a considerable spread of Deistic scepticism. [See Emmet; Ensor; O'Brien; O'Connor, etc.] The priests, however, continued to share both the patriotism (or hatred of England) and the ignorant and easy-going sensuousness of the people, and docility to Rome was preserved. In the latter part of the century the British Government repeatedly and secretly made agreements—the official life of Leo XIII, by Mgr. T'Serclaes (1894), describes this—with the ecclesiastical authorities and the Vatican, by which the people were checked in their revolt against Great Britain as payment for concessions to the Church; and this was facilitated by the inevitable poverty of the country, which has almost no mineral resources, and by the vast emigration. In 1801 the population of Ireland was 5,500,000, and by natural growth of population it ought now to be more than 20,000,000, mostly Catholics. The actual population of Eire is 2,965,854 (and 1,279,197 in Northern Ireland). The missing 16,000,000—for the Irish birth-rate is high, the priests heavily condemning birth control—make up the bulk of the Roman Church in Great Britain, the United States, and Australia, and provide a rich world for the intrigues of local politicians and the Vatican.

The bargains of Rome with the British authorities became clear to the

Irish—compare Leo XIII's Encyclical *Sape Nos*—and considerable anti-Roman feeling was roused; especially as the greatest of Irish leaders, Parnell, was a Protestant (or sceptic). But the clergy found it possible, on account of the isolation of Ireland, to retain control of the schools and keep the bulk of the people so backward that they could even dupe them with modern miracles. The *Irish Times* of July 24, 1938, published a letter by an esteemed parish priest, C. W. Corbett, stating that he had positively traced the supposed apparition of the Virgin at Knock, in 1879, to the trickery of a drunken rogue and had informed the Archbishop, who refused to move. He was induced to tell this in 1938 because there had recently been a fresh attempt to get up a new miraculous apparition with a lantern and slides, and the clergy (who had made large sums by Knock) supported it. With the opening of the present century discontent spread once more, Mr. Michael McCarthy's *Priests and People in Ireland* (1902), which exposed the extortions of the clergy, running to ten editions (72,000 copies). The Sinn Féin Movement was at first an anti-clerical, mainly middle-class, organization, which the Church captured, and the Irish Republican Army was in large part Atheistic. De Valera, an adventurous Irish-American, won power by truckling to the clergy, and in return for a mediæval censorship and other repressive laws, the Vatican condemned the I.R.A. The Papacy, however, played a double game, as usual. The *Irish Press* tells in an editorial of May 26, 1933, that the plan of the Easter Rebellion against England (1916) was taken secretly beforehand to Rome to receive the Pope's blessing.

There is a large amount of scepticism among the people to-day, the present writer is informed from Eire, but 3,000 priests, 563 monasteries and convents, and 349 schools conducted by nuns, form a powerful Fascist system. The hierarchy works with the English hierarchy, under control of the Vatican, and the 300,000 who have migrated to England in recent years—the *Irish Times* actually gave official Irish figures which were higher than those given in the House of Commons—swell the Catholic

body in England and sustain the fiction of Catholic progress. The *Freeman's Journal* stated in 1902 that of 1,750,000 Catholics in Great Britain, only 100,000 were of English blood. It is much the same to-day. It is believed by many that one of the chief reasons why De Valera does not insist on complete independence is that the Church, fearing to check immigration to England and the employment of Irish in the British Civil Service (for which Irish colleges specially prepare youths), forbids it.

Catholic literature boasts that Eire, being an almost purely Catholic country, exhibits the real influence of the Church in the exceptional chastity of Irish women. It would be singular if, when the men are drunken, quarrelsome, and hot-blooded above the average, and in view of the fact that pre-Christian Ireland was very licentious (see A. Nutt, *Legends of the Holy Grail*, 1902), this were true of the girls and women, but proof has been given repeatedly by exasperated English Roman Catholics that it has been the custom for decades to send pregnant Irish girls to Great Britain. Father Nugent, the famous Liverpool preacher and worker among the poor, said this emphatically (*Catholic Times*, July 16 and 23, 1897, and April 7, 1898). In the *Scotsman* (March 28, 1897) a Procurator Fiscal proved this for Glasgow, and the *Tablet* (Sept. 30, 1911) gives Catholic proof of it for Newcastle. The general morals and insobriety of the Irish population of these cities supports the charge, but even the Irish dailies to-day show how hollow the boast of purity is. In an editorial of the *Irish Times* for June 12, 1937, entitled "Saints and Sinners," the boast was severely rebuked, and it was stated that at the current County Clare Assizes the Judge observed that, of eleven cases he had to try, seven were of indecent assault on girls under seventeen. In the article on the Cross it is explained that so little is Puritanism a tradition of Irish rural districts that the keystone of the door-arch of churches was, until the last century, often a very obscene carving of a woman, known as Sheila-na-gig. Hannay gives a photograph of one in his *Sex and Symbolism in Religion*, 2 vols., 1922, and

the article "Phallicism," by Hartland, in the *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics* tells the facts.

Eisler, Rudolph, Ph.D. (b. 1873), Austrian philosopher. He was secretary of the Vienna Sociological Society and editor of the Philosophico-Sociological Library. Eisler's dictionaries of philosophers and philosophy (*Philosophen-Lexikon*, 1912, and *Handwörterbuch der Philosophie*, 1913) are of great value. His own Monistic views are given in his *Leib und Seele* (1906) and other works.

Eleatic School, The. [See Greece, Scepticism in Ancient.]

Eleusinian Mysteries, The. One of the greatest festivals of ancient Greece and one that probably had considerable influence on the early development of Christianity. It was clearly a sublimation of an ancient and probably orgiastic festival in honour of the Mother-Earth goddess and her fruits, but in historic times it was celebrated with strict religious solemnity—Alcibiades and others were prosecuted for profaning the Mysteries—as an ascetic preparation. "Mystery" [see] was to the Greeks merely something about which one must not talk, and the secret of the Mysteries at Eleusis (about twelve miles from Athens) was so well kept that the Christian Fathers never learned it from their converts, and modern scholars engage in endless controversy or conjectures about it. They agree that the "initiates" did not receive some esoteric wisdom—all claims of secret ancient wisdom are now discredited—but witnessed some sort of pageant representing the myth of Demeter [see] mourning the loss of her daughter Persephone, who had to spend a third of the year in the underworld with Pluto (the winter disappearance of vegetation). It is not entirely agreed if the birth of Dionysos was added to the pageant. The festival, which was held at the end of summer, lasted ten days, and those who were to be initiated annually must be pure of crime and practise a fast in honour of Demeter's nine-day fast. In the end they had a communion-service of sesame-cakes and drink. The libels of the festival by Christian leaders are rejected as opposed

to all our knowledge. It was a deeply religious, if still partly obscure, celebration, and it seems to have particularly impressed the idea of immortality upon the initiated. P. Foucart's *Les Mystères d'Eleusis* (1914), which is always recommended, is superseded by Prof. G. Méautis's book, *Les Mystères d'Eleusis* (1934), but there is a fair account in any good encyclopædia, and a lengthy summary in Rohde's *Psyche* (Engl. trans., 1925, pp. 217–50).

Elot, Prof. Charles William, A.M., M.D., LL.D., Ph.D. (1834–1926), American educator. He was a professor of analytical chemistry at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology 1865–9 and President of Harvard University 1869–1909, in which capacity he was regarded as one of the foremost of American scholars. He had higher world-honours (Order of the Rising Sun of Japan, Royal Prussian Order of the Crown, Officer of the Legion of Honour and the Crown of Italy, member of the French Institut and the British Academy, etc.) than any contemporary. In his work *The Happy Life* (1896) he thinks some religion necessary, but the Christian religion impossible. The account of him in *Four American Leaders* (1907) explains that he was reared in Boston Unitarianism, but left it for the philosophy of Emerson, or belief in an "all-sustaining soul of the universe" (p. 123).

Elot, George. [See Cross, Mary Ann.]

Elizabeth, Queen. One of the various enigmas about Elizabeth which still perplex historians is the question of her views on religion. The circumstances of the time caused a considerable spread of scepticism—see G. T. Buckley's *Atheism in the English Renaissance* (1932), though Buckley takes the word "Atheist" too narrowly—and the religious writers (liberally quoted in Robertson's *Short History of Free-thought*) complained bitterly of the growth of Atheism and infidelity. The Jesuit Parsons accused Sir Walter Raleigh of keeping "a School of Atheism," and the Privy Council moved against Marlowe [see], its chief member. While Elizabeth, who had no interest in culture, cannot be supposed to have

been influenced by Renaissance literature, the ferocity of the rival Christian Churches and the licentiousness of an age—"so brave and beautiful and blackguardly," Robert Lynd calls it—that talked passionately about theology seem, acting upon Elizabeth's coarse and virile mind, to have made her cynical and sceptical. Prof. Pollard says, in his *Political History of England* (1910, VI, 180), that "it can hardly be doubted that she was sceptical or indifferent." Green (*Short History of the English People*, Ch. VIII, § 3) thinks that "no [other] woman ever lived who was so totally destitute of the sentiment of religion"; and J. J. Tayler shows, in his *Retrospect of Religious Life in England* (1845), that there was a good deal of scepticism in her Court. Her persecution of Catholics was not religious in motive. She held to a policy of toleration until the Catholics began to plot against her. The suggestion of some that her "virginity" implies religious belief is frivolous and is excluded by the boisterous vulgarity of her character. An application to her case of our modern knowledge of the glands might solve that problem.

Ellero, Prof. Pietro (1833-1914), eminent Italian jurist. He was professor of penal law at Bologna University, 1861-1914, Councillor of the Roman Court of Cassation, and Senator. The most famous Italian jurist of his time, he was nevertheless so outspoken a Rationalist and humanitarian that the Vatican put several of his books on the Index.

Elliot, Hugh Samuel Rogers (1881-1920), writer on science. After completing his studies at Eton and Cambridge, he served in the South African War, and, at the close, took up science at the Royal College of Science and University College. As editor of the *Annual Register*, until his death, he gave that admirable survey a tradition of candour and completeness. He translated Lamarck's *Philosophie Zoologique* (1914), edited *The Letters of J. S. Mill* (1910), and wrote severe criticisms of Bergson and other sophists. Elliot rejected the title Agnostic and called his philosophy Scientific Materialism (*Modern Science and Materialism*, 1919),

but in his psychology he was rather on the Idealist lines of Hume.

Elliotson, Prof. John, M.D., F.R.S. (1791-1868), physician. He was the professor of the practice of medicine at the University College, London, from 1831, when it retained the secularist spirit in which it was founded. Later he was President of the Royal Medical and Chirurgical Societies and was the chief founder of University College Hospital. Although he was much occupied with phrenology (which was then widely discussed) and mesmerism—he founded a Mesmeric Hospital in 1849—Dr. Elliotson was one of the most esteemed medical authorities of his time (*Dict. Nat. Biog.*) and a pronounced Materialist (see introduction to Engleduc's *Cerebral Physiology*). Thackeray dedicated *Pendennis* to him.

Ellis, Henry Havelock, L.S.A. (1859-1939), psychologist. He was trained in St. Thomas's Hospital, but emigrated to Australia and was a teacher there from 1875 to 1879. He qualified in medicine on his return and practised for a time, gradually concentrating upon the scientific and psychological study of sex, on which he became one of the leading authorities in the world. His chief work was *The Psychology of Sex* (7 vols., 1905-38). Ellis, whose Rationalist views are found chiefly in his *Affirmations* (1897) and *My Life* (1940), was a man of idealist and impressive character.

Ellis, William (1800-81), philanthropist. He began work as a clerk at the age of fourteen and rose to the position of chief manager of the Indemnity Marine Insurance Company. Under the inspiration of the works of J. S. Mill, whose Idealist Agnosticism he shared, he founded nine Birkbeck Schools—one of which survives in the William Ellis School in North London—at his own expense and wrote textbooks for them. He had so high a reputation that he at one time gave lessons to the royal children at Buckingham Palace, but he was a friend of G. J. Holyoake and helped in a wide range of social reforms.

Elohist. The first step in Biblical Criticism [see Astruc] was the discovery in *Genesis* of a blend of the work of two Hebrew writers of very different date.

The older (evident in *Gen.* ii, 4 ff.) uses the word "Jahveh" for God, the later (evident in *Gen.* i) "Elohim," which are usually translated "Lord" and "God," respectively, in English. For convenience the unknown writers were therefore called Jahvist and Elohist. Later analysis has revealed a more complex stratification extending not only through *Genesis*, but through the entire Pentateuch and also *Joshua*. The original Elohist of Astruc is now identified with a writer or group of writers of post-Exilic days whose work is known as the Priestly Code (or document [see]), the term "Elohist" (E) being now reserved for another stratum of narrative (*Gen.* xx, etc.). The final editing was done so crudely that in *Exodus* (vi, 3), God declares that he was not known to the Hebrews as Jahveh until the time of Moses, yet he is called from the beginning by that name.

Elphinstone, the Hon. Mountstuart (1779-1859), statesman. He entered the Indian Civil Service and eventually became Governor of Bombay (1819-27), one of the most enlightened and most conscientious of our Indian administrators. The article on him in the *Dictionary of National Biography* ingenuously says: "It is remarkable that a man so sceptical, retiring, unselfish and modest should be one of the chief founders of the Anglo-Indian Empire." His biographer, Sir T. E. Colebrooke, quotes a eulogy of Pope's "Universal Prayer" which he wrote, and shows that he was a Deist (*Life of M. Elphinstone*, 1884, p. 410). He refused all the honours offered him at his retirement.

Embryonic Argument for Evolution, The. [See Biogenetic Law.]

Emergent Evolution. A phrase invented by Principal Lloyd Morgan in 1923. It means that when the organism reached a certain stage of somatic development the animal mind "emerged," and that when the ape-man in turn reached a certain stage of evolution the human mind "emerged," in each case in correlation with brain development, mind and brain being two aspects of one and the same reality, as in Spinoza's philosophy. A few biologists of mystic views, like Sir A. Thompson

and Dr. H. F. Osborn, adopted this or some similar way of reconciling religion and science; and it is upon this that the hierarchy of the Anglo-American Church relied when, at the Lambeth Conference, they declared that the Church of England and the Protestant Episcopal Church of America accept the whole teaching of evolution, and that science is coming to take up "views more favourable to religion." The evolution of mind is denied by most Christian writers and leaders, including Bishop Barnes. Dr. Inge, on the other hand, sees no problem because he takes the Idealist view of matter. In so far as they deny the evolution of mind, the Churches still defy science, for all authorities on prehistoric man see that there is as much evidence for the evolution of mind as (if not more than) for the evolution of the human body. Scientific writers perceive also that such a denial implies very crude ideas of the evolution of the brain itself. Prof. A. D. Shull puts the real objection to Lloyd Morgan's theory in his *Evolution* (1936—one of the best recent works) and he quotes Prof. Northrop saying: "Man asks for a specific solution to a complex problem and he is given a verbal sedative." [See *Mind*.]

Emerson, Ralph Waldo, LL.D. (1803-82), American moralist. After graduating at Harvard and teaching for a few years, he joined the Unitarian ministry, but abandoned it six years later to form, in opposition to orthodox Unitarianism, the group of Transcendentalists: a company of high-minded writers and thinkers, of intense ethical idealism, who gathered about him. Emerson, one of the finest American writers of his time, never called himself a Transcendentalist and had no idea of forming a school or founding a sect. He carefully avoided dogmatism or finality in opinions, and it was through the ethical note of his essays and lectures and their beautiful literary style that he had a remarkable influence for good in England (where he lectured in 1847) and America. His position in regard to religion, which was not closely reasoned but was congruous to the state of thought at that time, was that he replaced the Unitarian God by a vaguely Pantheistic

Over-Soul and rejected the idea of personal immortality.

Emerson, William (1701–82), mathematician. His work *Fluxions* (1749), and other contributions to mathematical science, put him in the first rank in his field and he was invited to join the Royal Society, but declined. He has a high place in the history of mathematics. The article on him in the *Encyclopædia Britannica* says that there is no foundation for the statement of Carlyle and others that he was a sceptic, but his clerical biographer, the Rev. W. Bowe, candidly admits that he rejected Christianity (*Some Account of the Life of W. Emerson*, 1793, pp. xi–xii).

Emmet, Robert (1778–1803), Irish patriot. After a brilliant course at Trinity College, Dublin, he joined in the rebellion and was compelled to fly to France. There he adopted the current Deism. Returning to Ireland in 1803, he organized a rebellion and was arrested and condemned to death. On the way to the scaffold he refused the services of a priest, saying that he was "an infidel by conviction" (Maxwell's *History of the Irish Rebellion*, 1845).

Emotion and Reason. The definition of Rationalism as a movement to secure the supremacy of Reason is sometimes crudely interpreted as an attempt to restrict emotion as much as possible. The obvious meaning is that *beliefs in regard to religion*, to which alone the word refers, ought to be based upon knowledge and reasoning instead of upon emotional or social grounds, authority, or tradition. The antithesis of reason and emotion is largely based upon the antiquated psychology of "faculties" or the semi-scientific psychology which succeeded it. In modern psychology the nature of emotion as a facet of human behaviour is still much disputed. The James-Lange theory, which was generally accepted, is that emotion is a "commotion" that occurs in the viscera and is announced in the cortex or consciousness. Experiments by Prof. Cannon, in removing the cortex of animals, suggest that the seat is rather in the thalamus, but scientific controversy lies outside the scope of this work. All admit that in ordinary life the emotional reaction is in fact more

influential than reason or intelligence in the formation of opinions, but hold—against Dewey and the modern Humanists, who reject the dictatorship of reason as an ideal—that this is a prolific source of unsoundness of convictions or of false judgments. It is clear that since religious beliefs are statements of objective fact (that God exists, immortality, the social efficacy or truth of Christianity, etc.), a man may find satisfaction in beliefs based upon emotion (often disguised as "intuition"), but he has no guarantee that they are true or correspond to reality, and to this only an exceptional type of mind is indifferent. To say that Rationalism in this sense tends to "starve the emotions" is absurd and is fully refuted by the lives of nearly all the great Rationalists included in the present work, especially the very numerous pioneers of reform. Emotion is itself the stimulus to engage in an attempt to secure the supremacy of reason in forming opinions, and the discipline which this involves is useful in forming every class of convictions—one of the clearest requirements of our age. The proper field of emotion—family, personal and social life, art, etc.—is as broad as ever. Reason is the searchlight in human progress, but emotion is the equally essential dynamo for movement along the path which reason indicates.

Empedocles. [See Greece, Scepticism in Ancient.]

Empiricism. The claim that knowledge of realities is possible only through experience or the reception and interpretation in intelligence of the data of the senses. In philosophical controversy, which is now mainly of historical interest, *empirical* knowledge is opposed to *rational*, or knowledge obtained without the mediation of the senses. In the earlier stages of the development of science, especially after the appearance of Locke's *Essay Concerning Human Understanding* (1690), the issue between the two schools was warmly discussed. In its Latin form the Lockean principle (*Nihil est in intellectu quod non fuerit prius in sensu*, meaning "There is nothing in the intellect which did not reach it through the senses," became famous, and Leibnitz's retort,

"Except the intellect itself," was soon seen to be a piece of sophistry, since one might as well say "the senses themselves" instead of "intellect." The root of the whole matter was the question whether the mind is a spiritual reality and may have a perceptive faculty (or intuition) apart from its co-operation with the senses. Since this remained the common belief of philosophers, they continued to hold that there are "innate" (inborn, or not acquired through the senses) or *a priori* ideas: Euclid's axioms, for instance, moral principles, or intellectual first principles. Plato and Aristotle had set science astray by this kind of reasoning, and the modern pioneers of science stoutly contended that all knowledge of realities must be *a posteriori*, or derived by induction or deduction from empirically ascertained facts (observation and experiment). Philosophy is now divided, and in all other fields the empirical principle is established. Science and history, which comprise the great bulk of our knowledge of realities beyond ordinary observation, have vindicated Locke. Ethics has generally discarded innate ideas and become empirical or scientific; and modern psychology does not even trouble to mention the old apparatus of intuitions and innate or *a priori* ideas.

Encyclopædias. Apart from the tenth-century Lexicon of the Greek Suidas, the first to compile encyclopædias, or alphabetically arranged summaries of all knowledge, were the Arabs of Spain and the Persians, who, having an abundant supply of paper and bound books, wrote encyclopædias of forty or fifty volumes. (See A. Mieli, *La science arabe*, 1938, pp. 150-4.) The practice died with them, but was revived in the seventeenth century, when Bayle issued his famous *Dictionnaire*, and other French and German writers followed. The modern type began with the Cyclopædia of Ephraim Chambers [see] in 1728, which survives in *Chambers's Encyclopædia*. Diderot proposed to translate this into French, but found such brilliant collaborators that he turned instead to the larger and more Rationalistic plan of the *Dictionnaire Encyclopédique*, 1751-72. The rapid progress

of knowledge made it necessary for the French to replace it by *La Grande Encyclopédie* (31 vols., 1887, etc.), and this remained the chief work of reference in France until 1935, when they began to issue an *Encyclopédie Française*, not in the usual alphabetical form, but in "rational" divisions of knowledge. It is incomplete and unwieldy, except for specialists. The Spaniards of South America brought out a handsome and generally reliable *Enciclopedia Universal Illustrada* in 70 volumes (1906-33); and part of Mussolini's effort to impress the world—while he deeply injured university culture generally—was to subsidize an ambitious *Enciclopedia Italiana* (35 vols., 1929-37), which in many respects compares favourably with the *Britannica*.

The *Encyclopædia Britannica* (first published in 1768) is the outstanding work of its kind, and as late as the Eleventh Edition (1909) had a world-repute for reliability. The present (Fourteenth) edition, published in 1928, was the next complete re-publication of the work. Before it appeared it was stated, in the *Annual Report of the Westminster Catholic Federation* (February, 1928, p. 18), that Catholics had been invited or permitted to have a peculiar share in the work. "The revision of the *Encyclopædia Britannica*," this central organ of Catholic propaganda boasted, "was undertaken with a view to eliminating matter which was objectionable from a Catholic point of view . . . the whole of the twenty-eight volumes were examined." Since Catholic propagandists notoriously find all historical and other truth "objectionable" which enlightens people about their Church, the new edition was eagerly scanned. On August 9, 1929, what is called the Agony Column of *The Times* displayed prominently an unusually long and remarkable message to the public from the Westminster Catholic Federation. It complained of a "misunderstanding" and disclaimed "any influence whatever upon the editing of the *Encyclopædia*." There was "no vestige of foundation" for that statement. They had made suggestions about articles dealing with "historical, doctrinal, or theological aspects of the Church" and had done

nothing beyond "drawing attention to certain errors of date and other facts regarding the teaching and discipline of the Catholic Church." Dozens of articles in this work will show the reader that this is an entirely false account of the alterations, favourable to Catholic propaganda, in the present edition of the *Britannica*. Any person who has a doubt about the surreptitious influence of the Catholic Church on journalism, literature, and public instruction generally should compare articles in the new edition—especially where an anonymous X replaces the old fashion of initials as signature—and the previous editions. The new *Encyclopædia Americana* (30 vols., 1937, etc.) shows the same influence and is disappointingly conservative and conventional. For the *Catholic Encyclopædia* itself see article under that title. The *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics* (12 vols., 1908–21) is a work of great value, though it is overloaded with ethnology and is gravely misinforming in many articles (especially on Rationalist issues) written by professors of theology or by Catholic priests. The *Encyclopædia Biblica* (4 vols., 1909) is a fine summary of very liberal theological scholarship—one of its two editors, Dr. J. Black, was an Agnostic (personal knowledge)—and a cheap edition was brought out by the R.P.A., but in many details it is now outdated.

End and Means. It is currently charged against the Jesuits that their theologians have taught that "the end justifies the means." Pascal's *Provincial Letters* (1656) started the charge and gave a number of quotations and facts in illustration of the unscrupulousness of their teaching: a charge which was substantially endorsed by Pope Clement XIV in suppressing the Society of Jesus in 1773. [See *Jesuits*.] It must be understood, however, that no Jesuit theologian ever explicitly wrote that the end justifies the means. The German ex-Jesuit, Count Hoensbroech, was challenged to produce such a text, and when he took the Catholic challenger, who refused to pay, to court (1903) he lost the case. "Whatever we may think of the morality manifested in these cases," the court said, Count

Hoensbroech had not produced a quotation of the formula in so many words. See his *Fourteen Years a Jesuit* (1911, II, 320–7) and, for a full account, his *Der Zweck beheilligt die Mittel* (1904). He relied on such teaching as that a man may commit a lesser sin in place of a worse—a priest might have a mistress, for instance, instead of apostatizing; a servant may steal if he is underpaid (or thinks so); a king may be assassinated if he persecutes the Church; and so on. The sound attitude is to say that, as hundreds of articles in this work show, the Catholic clergy and writers, especially the Jesuits, have always acted on the principle and do so to-day, so it is immaterial whether they ever publicly professed it. Much of the teaching of their theologians, however, approximates to it. In a manual used in seminaries all over the world Father Lehmkuhl lays it down that "the morality of an act depends above all upon the end" (*Theologia Moralis*, 1888, i, 32), and the doctrine of Mental Reservation [see], which even the *Catholic Encyclopædia* defends, comes under the same head, since it is chiefly used in the interest of the Church.

End of Life, The. [See *Purpose*.]

End of the World, The. The expectation of this in the New Testament, which the Jesus of the Gospels clearly shared if any texts are to be taken as evidence, was a reflection of Persian belief. Among many ancient peoples we find a belief in a series of ages ending in cosmic disasters [see *Catastrophic Theory*], but in the ancient Persian religion [see] this occupied the position of a fundamental dogma. The God, Ahura Mazda, was in time to triumph over the Spirit of Evil and Darkness, destroy the world, and judge all men. The conquest of Persia by Alexander, and the later extension of Roman rule over Persia, had brought these ideas to Syria and Greece. The Stoics (Cicero, *De Natura Deorum*, II, 46, and Seneca, *Quest. Nat.* III, 28, etc.) expected a destruction of the world by fire, but at a fabulously remote date, while the ascetic individualism of the teaching ascribed to Jesus and emphatically taught by Paul is largely inspired by an expectation that the end is near. This individualism makes it

absurd to seek a social morality in the New Testament, and it in large part explains why the replacement of the fruitful social morality of the Stoic-Epicureans by the ideas of the Christian Fathers assisted the collapse of civilization. The expectation was abandoned in the demoralization which fell upon the Church in the second century, but occasionally revived—at the Fall of Rome, in the days of Pope Gregory I, and at the mystic year 1000. The modern theory of an end of the world, which now means an end of the material universe, began about the middle of the last century with Clausius, the discoverer of the mechanical theory of heat, not with Sir J. Jeans, as is often said. Impressed by the fact that mechanical energy is converted into heat, a large part of which is never reconverted, he argued that a time must come when all energy would exist in the form of heat and all life and activity (other than the vibration of molecules) would cease. Other physicists rejected this theory of Entropy ("turning-in") as it was called; and when Lord Kelvin, Prof. J. Ward, and others revived it (in the interest of religion) late in the century, Sir Oliver Lodge (in his *Romanes Lecture*, 1903) and other physicists pointed out that to generalize for the whole universe from what we see occurring on earth is unscientific: that there may very well be regeneration of energy in the abysses of space. This answered in advance the new form which Sir J. Jeans gave to the theory a few years later—that the atoms of matter are destroyed in the stars, or converted into energy, and that there must come a stage in which all matter would cease to exist.

Since it seemed to follow from this that the material universe had a definite beginning in time, and the idea was therefore favourable to Christian teaching, the theory was welcomed throughout the Churches, and under their influence acclaimed in the Press as the latest teaching of science. That this perversion of public instruction should continue almost unrebuked in Great Britain for years was all the more scandalous seeing that (1) the successive works of Jeans [see] were severely criticized in

Nature; (2) it had been pointed out for years that it is unscientific to say that because we do not see a reconversion of energy in our corner of the universe there is no such process elsewhere; (3) physicists of the new semi-mystic school (Jeans, Eddington, Whetham, etc.) hold that matter has already been "resolved into energy"; and (4) they hold that both matter and energy are only ideas in the mind. Further, a large number, if not the majority, of the more distinguished astronomers abroad hold that atoms are not broken up but more probably created in the stars, and that matter is not at all confined to the stars. Dr. E. Shaplow (*Flights from Chaos*, 1930) estimates that there is more matter in the universe outside the stars than in them. What is generally agreed is that life must some day cease (possibly thousands of millions of years hence) on our planets and they may return to the sun, and that the stars will in time (millions of millions of years) be extinct. But important elements of their evolution are still obscure, and figures are very speculative, while the restorative processes in the universe, which astronomers see no reason to doubt, are still more obscure. Science sees no ground to think, if it were conceivable, that there will be an end of the universe (or super-universe), whatever be the fate of individual stars or galaxies. [See also *Age of the Stars*.]

Energy. The discussion of the relation of the New Physics to Materialism, which elicited a jubilant literature from about 1910 to 1930, was in large part based upon a misunderstanding or misrepresentation. It was initiated by failure to notice the change in the definition of the word "energy." In the last century, and in most manuals of physics until recently (and in many still), energy was defined as "the capacity to do work": the capacity of one material body to move another. It was an abstract term. The meaning was quietly but rapidly changed so that it came to denote a concrete reality—something that could exist without matter (which many declared to be a fiction or illusion) or into which matter could be converted. The elaboration of the New Physics was so much in the hands of mathematicians,

who, as Einstein has repeatedly said, are concerned with formulae, not with questions of reality, that the change was hardly observed. Physicists, on the other hand, declared that all that they could discover in the sub-atomic world was movement or radiation, and they were apt to say that energy (already modified in definition) was the only reality they knew: as if movement or radiation were conceivable apart from a body which moves or emits (or forms) waves. The change causes no confusion in physics, but an appreciation of it deflates half the rhetoric about revolutions in science. It was not even entirely a modern idea that energy is the ultimate reality. Prof. Ostwald, Haeckel's colleague in the German Monistic movement and a distinguished chemist, made that his basic principle before the end of the last century. [See *Atoms*.] Of recent standard works on physics, Loeb and Adams, in their *Development of Physical Thought* (1933), define the electron as "a unit of matter which carries a negative charge," and Sir W. J. Pope defines it, in his *Matter and Energy* (1923), as "an elementary unit of matter."

Engels, Friedrich (1820-95), German Socialist leader. After leaving the university Engels managed the Manchester branch of his father's business for some years. On his return to Germany he published a radical book (*Die Lage der so-gennanten arbeitenden Klassen in England*) which showed a warm indignation at the condition of the workers in England, which was still foul. He associated with Marx and took part in the Revolution of 1848. At its failure he returned to England and spent most of the rest of his life there. He is regarded as the co-founder of German and international Socialism. Belfort Bax, who knew him, calls him "the devout Atheist" (*Reminiscences*, p. 51).

England, Religion in. [See *Great Britain*.]

Ensor, George, B.A. (1769-1843), Irish Deist. Ensor published a number of political works, though he took no active part in politics. He was an outspoken Deist and issued a *Review of the Miracles, Prophecies, and Mysteries of the Old and New Testaments and the*

Morality and Consolations of the Christian Religion (1814).

Entropy. [See *End of the World*.]

Enuma Elish. [See *Gilgamesh, The Epic of*.]

Environment, The Influence of. In biology the environment is the world or the external conditions in which an organism lives; in psychology it has been customary to regard the organism itself as part of the environment of the mind. But the modern development of psychology [see] as the science of behaviour modifies the distinction. It was generally agreed, until the end of the last century, that by causing a struggle for life and survival of the fittest—the fittest to survive in any given conditions—the environment was the outstanding agency of evolution. [See *Darwinism*.] The founding of the science of Genetics [see] led many to over-emphasize the part of heredity at the cost of environment, but, as explained in the above articles, the general attitude now is to regard the two as co-operating factors. The new science of Social Psychology [see] tends to increase again the emphasis on environment. While geneticists like Karl Pearson used to say that no amount of education could alter the proportion of good or evil which was settled in the zygote (fertilized ovum) of a human being, social psychologists and Behaviourists generally say that behaviour is shaped entirely by environment—home, school, church, club, reading, etc.—and appeal to recent experiments on identical twins [see] in support of this. How far defects in the hereditary outfit of glands and other organs can thus be overcome remains to be seen. As Prof. T. H. Morgan, a leading geneticist, warns his colleagues (*The Theory of the Gene*, 1925), we do not yet know "how much the environment is responsible for" in human behaviour. (See also Prof. L. Hogben, *Nature and Nurture*, 2 ed., 1939.) History has made notable progress by interpreting nations and their development in the light of their environment, as Buckle long ago suggested, and as was urged by Lord Meston in his address to the Geography Section of the British Association in 1934. Toynbee's *Study of History* (6 vols., 1935 and later) lays

great stress on environment, and its action is particularly studied in the works of Prof. Huntington.

Epictetus (about A.D. 50-100), Greek moralist. A Phrygian slave who remained in so lowly a condition that the years of his birth and death are not recorded; yet he came to be regarded as one of the most idealistic of moral teachers. He lived in Rome until the sanguinary reign of Domitian, and he seems to have developed his ethic in exile. The *Encheiridion* ("Manual"), which bears his name, was probably compiled by a pupil, who also collected and preserved his discourses. Short-hand was almost as familiar in the Roman world as it is now, so that the reports of the speeches and conversations of Epictetus are on a very different level of reliability from those attributed to Jesus in the Gospels. His ethic is so austere that, while most apologists claimed that the ethic of Jesus was unique, or far superior to that of any other ancient moralist, the few who could, or did, read Epictetus contended, rather wildly (in view of the dates), that he had learned Christian teaching. He not only, like most moralists, gave a Golden Rule ("What you would avoid suffering yourself seek not to inflict upon others"), but urged the same less practical counsels (voluntary poverty, asceticism, passive resistance, and all that it is customary to call a "sublime idealism") as Jesus. His exaggerations of the Stoic ethic were due to the fact that he belonged to the religious section of the school, but his entire ethic is of great interest because it—compare also Philo, Apollonius, Seneca, Plutarch, etc.—illustrates the general diffusion in the Roman world of the moral teaching which is so wearisomely declared to be a unique feature of the Gospels. There is an English translation of the *Discourses* by P. E. Matheson (1915).

Epicurus (341-270 B.C.), Greek philosopher. He was born at Samos, off the coast of Asia Minor, and is thus linked from the first with the Ionic School, the teaching of which he expanded and improved; but he spent most of his life, after eighteen, at Athens. There he opened a school to which men came from all parts of Greece and the colo-

nies. Of the 300 works which he wrote (he seems to have had a remarkable range of knowledge), only fragments survive, and it has therefore been possible to libel him in all ages. His contemporary in Athens, Zeno, the founder of Stoicism, is said to have begun the practice, though it is noteworthy that the Stoic, Seneca, calls his teaching "a holy and proper doctrine." Augustine called it, almost brutally and quite falsely, "a philosophy of swine," and until the seventeenth century that characterization was universally admitted, and is familiar in religious and general literature to-day. The ancient authorities are agreed that Epicurus was a man of very simple and temperate life, providing cakes and water for his guests—a little wine and cheese on festivals—and that these included, against Athenian custom, women and slaves. What he seems to have chiefly learned from Asia Minor is the Lydian [see] doctrine of friendliness to all. Even the more refined charge, that he recommended a tranquil and passionless individual life instead of social idealism, cannot be sustained. Benn says this, and then quotes his words: "Vain is the discourse of that philosopher by whom no human suffering is healed." Ueberweg repeats the libel in his *History of Philosophy* (1875, I, 211), yet quotes (from Plutarch) his saying: "It is more pleasant to do than to receive good." Equally false is the statement that Zeno stood for virtue—his code of sex-morals was far from Pauline—and Epicurus for pleasure. What we may say is that public life had sunk so low in Athens, at the time, that Epicurus advised his friends to avoid it; but in a better age, as we shall see, his teaching had a remarkably beneficent social influence. Though apparently a master of such science as existed, and important as the author who transmitted this science to Lucretius and posterity, he considered it of value only as an antidote to superstition. He is said to have admitted gods in some remote region, who were quite indifferent to man's affairs, but this was probably his way of evading a clash with the ignorant people. All that we know of his system suggests that he was an Atheist and Materialist,

like Zeno. (See C. Bailey's *Epicurus*, a translation of the biographical sketch of the philosopher by Diogenes Laertius and of the extant fragments of his writings and letters, 1926.)

The schools of Plato and Aristotle had never had a wide following and had left Greek philosophy [see] under the control of the Sceptics. (See Benn, *History of Ancient Philosophy*, 1912, p. 107, Ueberweg, *History of Philosophy*, I, 211, Zeller, and all authorities.) After the death of Zeno the Stoic school itself broke, under pressure of the Sceptics and the Epicureans, into a right or religious wing (a small minority) and a left or humanist wing. The Ionian school, which had so far been faithfully developed and now took the form of Epicureanism, was more fortunate. R. D. Hicks (*Stoic and Epicurean*, 1910) says that no other school—he overlooks the Confucians—was ever so united. It “outlived most others” (Zeller) and, alone or in combination with the new Stoicism, was the great inspiration of the Greek-Roman world in its best days. Though a fresh and complete study is very desirable, it is now generally agreed that this Epicureanism, which the cruder critics call a philosophy of swine, and the more refined a purely individualist creed, proved a notable inspiration of social idealism in the Roman Empire [see]. Ueberweg, who endorses the latter criticism, goes on to say (I, 211) that it “aided in softening down the asperity and exclusiveness of ancient manners and in cultivating the social virtues,” and that it “performed a work whose merit should not be underestimated.” Dr. J. Oaksmith admirably describes the blending of Epicureanism and a Stoicism purged of mystic elements from 250 B.C. onward, and quotes with approval Seneca's praise of “the noble and humane simplicity of the Epicurean ideal of life” and its efficacy (*The Religion of Plutarch*, 1902, p. 39). When Prof. Gilbert Murray says that “all the principal kings in existence in the generations following Zeno professed themselves Stoics” (*The Stoic Philosophy*, 1915, p. 41) it must be understood in this sense. Of the two finest series of monarchs, judged by their contribution to civilization, the

Ptolemies of Alexandria might be described as Epicureans, but were assuredly not Stoics; and of the Antonine or so-called Stoic Emperors of Rome, the second series, only Marcus Aurelius was a Stoic, while the greatest, Hadrian [see], actively promoted the philosophy of Epicurus.

Epidemics in the Middle Ages. What is called the Castle of Sant'Angelo (Holy Angel) at Rome is an historic memorial of the tragedy of the substitution of the individualist and otherworldly ethic of Christianity for the social ethic of the Romans. The building is really the tomb of the Emperor Hadrian, who had presided over an Empire of 100,000,000 people at the greatest height that civilization had reached in 3,500 years of history. Five centuries later the tomb, now converted into a Christian monument, rose above a city that had sunk from 1,000,000 to 40,000 people and from a brilliant height to squalor, poverty, and dense ignorance. The statue of an angel, commemorating the supposed miraculous arrest of a plague by angels in the days of Gregory I, is a symbol of the appalling social retrogression. The cultivated region round Rome had become a poisonous swamp, and the pious Pope, who was eager to destroy what was left of Roman culture, used the very worst measures (crowded churches, processions, etc.) to combat the infection that crept into the city. The normal death-rate in Europe had become so high that populations which now treble in a century took four centuries to double—England rose from two to four millions between 1066 (Domesday Book) and 1500—and ghastly epidemics swept periodically over the Continent. In tenth-century France (when Arab medical and sanitary science was at its height) there were forty-eight famines and epidemics in seventy-three years. The Black Death (1348–51), which was probably bubonic plague, is estimated to have had 25,000,000 victims, besides the horrible sufferings of millions who recovered, or about two-thirds of the population of Europe. The “mummy pills” which many took as a preventive were made from the bodies of people who had died of the plague. Epidemic

hysteria (the Flagellants, the Dancing Mania, etc.) added, when pestilence ceased, to the horrors. (See Hecker's *Epidemics of the Middle Ages*, Engl. trans., 1844, and G. G. Coulton, *The Black Death*, 1929.)

Erasmus, Desiderius (1466–1536). He was probably the son of a Dutch priest by a niece who kept house for him, but when he became a classical scholar he changed the name he got from his father, Gheraerd, to Desiderius Erasmus. Although he was ordained a priest and entered a monastery of the Augustinians—a good biography of his early life would afford a grim picture of the state of the Church on the eve of the Reformation—he preferred to travel in France, England, and Italy, and his brilliant scholarship and wit won friends everywhere. For a time he was professor of Greek at Oxford University. He despised both Rome and Lutheranism, but had “no inclination to die for the truth,” he said. He loved comfort (usually at the expense of a friend or patron) and had rather a cynical and Rabelaisian outlook upon life; though this and his discretion about the truth will not surprise any who know the age and the state of the Church. The Catholics burned his fine edition of the Greek New Testament, yet tolerated the grossest licence, and the Reformers were sour against the Humanist culture which Erasmus loved. While he did much to ensure the success of the Reformation—he has been described as “the man who laid the egg that Luther hatched”—Luther detested him. Many passages in his writings (complete ed., 10 vols., 1603–6) show that in a free age he would have professed advanced scepticism. In his *Praise of Folly* he says: “As the Christian Church was founded in blood, confirmed by blood, and advanced by blood, so now in like manner . . . the Popes take to the sword.” In one of his letters (in which there are scorching indictments of the morals of the monks and clergy) he says that “the monarchy of the Popes at Rome, as it is now, is a pestilence to Christendom, but I do not know if it is expedient to touch this sore openly.” We must remember that his mature years cover the period of deepest Papal

degradation—the pontificates of Alexander VI, Julius II, and Leo X. His caustic writings had a wide circulation and a large share in the liberation of Europe, and it is much to his credit that he wrote the first and a very eloquent and learned attack on war (*Plancius Pacis*, 1517). (See P. S. Allen, *The Age of Erasmus*, 1904, and Prof. Huizinga, *Erasmus*, 1924. J. J. Mangan's biography of him (2 vols., 1927) is, though well documented, Catholic and frequently unreliable.)

Erastianism. The demand that the Church must be subordinated to the State. It takes its name from a Swiss theologian, Thomas Erastus, but chiefly applies to a party in the Church of England in the seventeenth century.

Ericsson, John (1803–89), American inventor. After serving for some years as engineer in the Swedish army he moved to England, where he perfected the invention of the steam-propeller for ships. The conservatism of British shipbuilders drove him to America, and he won an international reputation as an engineer and inventor. It was he who constructed the monitors which played an important part in the Civil War. New York State erected a statue to him, and his remains were taken back to his native Sweden in a U.S. cruiser. Ingersoll, who was intimate with Ericsson, describes him as “one of the profoundest Agnostics I ever knew” (*Works*, VII, p. 319).

Erigena, John Scotus (about 815–77), philosopher. An Irish scholar—the description “Scot” was then applied to both Scottish and Irish on the Continent—who lived in the days when the Celts still retained the zeal for knowledge which they had learned from the Druids [see Eire.] He clearly read Greek, but the tradition that he knew Arabic (at a time when there was no Arabic culture in Spain or Italy) is most probably false. John, who lived in France, seems to have had considerable ability and to have been regarded with deep suspicion by the ecclesiastical authorities, who condemned him several times. His chief work, *De Divisione Naturae*, is mystic and apparently based on Neo-Platonism, but is generally considered Pantheistic. He stoutly contended that

reason takes precedence of authority and must be free to speculate, but, though he made a deep impression on his age—one of profound ignorance, it must be said—his work ended in futility, the Irish, as well as Christendom generally, sinking into the abyss of the Iron Age.

Eschatology. The theological science or discussion of "the last (*eschata*) things": death, the after-life, and the end of the world. The Semites had no interest in these matters until the Egyptians and Persians influenced them. From the later Jews the preoccupation passed to Christianity, the Roman Church adding the doctrine of purgatory to those of heaven and hell, and the Reformers rejecting it. This section of theology is in a more rapid state of disintegration than any other. Bishop Barnes makes jokes about "the three-storey picture of the next world," and Dr. Inge observes that "the topic is mainly reserved for letters of condolence and then handled very gingerly." [*See Immortality.*]

Escherny, Count François Louis d' (1733–1815), Swiss writer. A member of a wealthy noble family who, travelling in France, met Rousseau and other famous French Rationalists and was converted to Deism. His *Lacunes de la Philosophie* (1783) was much esteemed. He accepted the Revolution in its sober beginnings, but was later repelled by the Terror.

Esmun. [*See Redeemer Gods.*]

Espronceda, José de (1808–42), Spanish poet. Growing up in the early days of the fight against reaction, he began to write rebellious poetry at the age of fourteen. Imprisoned and then driven to France, he took part in the Revolution of 1830, returned to Spain, and was again exiled, and fought in the revolutionary movement of 1840. In his later years his poetry was popular throughout Spain and is often Deistic (*Cancion del Pirato*, etc.). He fought the Church all his life.

Essenes, The. A Jewish sect which was born of the remarkable ferment of ideas in the few centuries before Christ, when the imperialist-military movements led to a very wide mingling of cultures. The meaning of the name and the early history of the sect are unknown. Some

regard them as an extreme development of the more ascetic of the Pharisees: others suggest the impact on Jewish religion of Buddhist, Persian, or Pythagorean elements. Prof. Guignebert shows that there is good ground to assume the influence of Pythagorean ideas at Alexandria, where the sect seems to have arisen in the second century B.C. Others trace their very ascetic ideas to Persia. They are mentioned by Philo, Pliny, and Hippolytus, who gives us the detail that (like the disciples in the Gospels) they were forbidden to own two cloaks or two pairs of shoes (*Refutation of all Heresies*, IX, 18). The amplest account of them is in Josephus (*Jewish War*, Bk. II, Ch. VIII, § 2–14), who, many think, may have at one time belonged to the sect. What he tells us of their doctrines and practices has a singular resemblance to the manner of life which the Jesus of the Gospels recommends. While Philo says that they lived in monasteries in Judæa—on the fringe looking towards Persia—which some experts think improbable, it is certain that, after two years' initiation and baptism (which suggests something like monasteries), they went about Judæa in pairs, healing the sick and exhorting men to virtue. They were vowed to celibacy and poverty, carried no money or change of garments, and had to avoid oaths. Their preaching laid great stress on peace and justice. De Quincey contended from this description that the early Christians were Essenes, and the fact that, while they must have been a prominent feature of the religious life of Judæa, they are never mentioned in the Gospels raises a suspicion that the Christians of the second generation tried to suppress knowledge of them. The assumption that Jesus was an Essenian monk who got the added incentive of a belief in the approaching end of the world [*see Persian Religion*] offers a plausible theory of the nucleus of the Gospel story for those who admit such a nucleus. In any case the narrative of Josephus shows that ascetic ideas, the preaching of justice, peace, and charity, and all the other elements of the Christian ethic, were widely diffused in the ancient world long before the age assigned for

the birth of Jesus; for no historian questions that the Essenian sect goes back to at least 100 B.C. George Moore's literary drama, *The Apostle* (1911), in which Jesus and Paul (who slays Jesus for letting people think he had died on the cross) are Essenian monks, and his later *Brook Kerith* (1916), were based upon the above details supplied to him by the present writer. Prof. Guignebert's *Jewish World in the Times of Jesus* (1939) has a section on the Essenes (Bk. III, Ch. III).

Eternity, The Idea of. Much time has been wasted in discussing whether the universe is or is not eternal and infinite. The phrase "eternal iron laws of Nature," which is sometimes quoted, is from Goethe's *Faust* and enjoys the poetical licence. All that we know in science is that nothing points to a beginning [see] or an end [see] of the basic material of the universe, whatever forms it may assume in the course of its evolution; and the arguments which were framed to prove the contrary in the scholastic philosophy, and are still urged by Catholic writers, are recognized to be verbal gymnastics. The idea of eternity is really negative. Every experience is of something limited in space and time, and we may imagine or conceive the limits removed, but the resultant idea is not one to be discussed in connection with realities. The imagination cannot picture reality as a whole without limits or with limits.

Ether. In Greek philosophy the word was used to denote a rarer or more subtle form of matter, and when Huyghens established the undulatory theory of light it was revived as the name of the material medium in which the "waves" occurred. Radiant heat, electricity, gravitation, etc., were during the nineteenth century added to its effects, and by the end of the century works on ether, especially Sir O. Lodge's *Ether of Space*, purported to describe it in considerable detail. It is this ether of some authors of half a century ago which physicists have discarded, but the word is still very commonly used for the fundamental form of material reality, the continuum of the Relativists—Einstein says that there is no objection to calling this ether—the vehicle of

electric waves. "Among leading scientists to-day," says Sir A. Eddington, "I think about half assert that the ether exists and the other half deny its existence; but as a matter of fact both parties mean exactly the same thing" (*Science and the Unseen World*, 1929, p. 42). Prof. C. G. Darwin (*New Conceptions of Matter*, 1931) thinks it "a convenient noun to describe the properties of space." Dr. Millikan also admits it. The jibe of literary men and apologists that it is just one more error of nineteenth-century science that has been discarded is based, as usual, upon ignorance of the subject. The suggestion made by Lodge, and taken up by a few desperate apologists, that it may be the parent-reality from which both matter and spirit have evolved is absurd. There is a contradiction in terms between the definition of matter and that of spirit. That it is the basic reality in which elements of matter (electrons, protons, etc.) form is as probable as it was fifty years ago.

Ethical Movement, The. A small group of societies in England, America—in America they are known as the Ethical Culture Movement—and (in pre-Nazi days) Germany. The South Place Ethical Society was the starting-point of the movement in England. The South Place Chapel (now demolished) was built in 1824 for the Unitarian preacher W. J. Fox, who later severed it from the Unitarian body and rejected the official creed. Dr. M. D. Conway [see] guided its further development into a purely humanitarian congregation, recognizing religion only as a cultivation of the moral ideal. It is well endowed and survives in the South Place Institute in Red Lion Square, London. Dr. Stanton Coit later founded a number of smaller societies which were united in a Union of Ethical Societies. Only two or three of these survive. (See G. Spiller, *The Ethical Movement in Great Britain*, 1934.) Dr. F. Adler [see] independently established a society for Ethical Culture in New York in 1876. Others were founded in various American cities, and they still have, collectively, several thousand members. Ethical societies aim to co-operate with, not to oppose, the Churches.

Ethics. The science of the nature and correct formulation of moral principles. In the older civilizations and the earlier Greek (Ionian) schools there was no perception of a need for such science. The majority took the rules of life from their religions; the thoughtful minority from the counsels, on social grounds, of moralists like Ptah-Hotep, Thales, Buddha, or Kung-fu-tse. The sceptical Greek schools recommended probability (really experience) as the ground of conduct, and Plato, starting from the searching inquiries of Socrates into men's moral differences, relied upon the soul's intuition of the idea of the good. Aristotle, as part of his great scheme of giving a scientific form and basis to all knowledge, speculative and practical, founded the science of ethics (*ta ethica*, or "modes of conduct"), just as his *Politics* discussed the concerns of the citizen (*polites*) as such, and his *Physics* the contents of Nature (*physis*). He rejected Plato's "Ideas" and intuitions, but did not substitute any definite theory of morals. The Stoics appealed to the Law of Nature, and the Epicureans to human welfare; but it was a blend of their teaching, or a purely social conception of moral law and idealism, that prevailed in the Greek-Roman world.

The comparative liberation of thought, and especially the rapid spread of scepticism about the Christian basis of ethics, after the Reformation led to a more serious and scientific attempt to find a basis of ethics. Many Deists [see] were content with the Theistic basis and continued to hold that God watched the conduct of men and after death rewarded the good and punished the wicked. This, however, raised and did not settle the question *which* acts are good or evil, and *why*; and in the course of the seventeenth century a scientific basis of conduct was claimed by what came to be called Utilitarianism. None of the innumerable writers on the subject seem to be aware that in the Middle Ages the acute Irish friar and searching critic of Aquinas, Duns Scotus, conscious that there must be some reason why God condemned certain acts as evil, concluded that this

was on account of their inherent social harmfulness; and Dante [see] is more utilitarian than transcendental in his classification of sins. Details of the long struggle, from Hobbes and Locke to the end of the nineteenth century, must be read in J. M. Robertson's *Short History of Morals* (1920). The rapid collapse of the Christian creed in the second half of the last century prompted theologians to fasten eagerly upon the moral issue and claim that in Agnosticism and Atheism there was no possible ground for inculcating moral principles; and the attempt of Kant to return to intuition, or ideas which precede and are independent of experience, broke down in philosophy. At the same time the extension of the principle of evolution to moral ideas greatly favoured the naturalist view of ethics. At the lowest level of savage life it was found that conduct is remarkably conformable to moral law, yet there is no perception of moral obligation—"They do not recognize virtue but they do not practise vice," Prof. Haddon says—and at the next higher level there is no connection of the vague sense of moral obligation with religion. The savage acts on custom, and the very numerous aberrations of his moral sense in different peoples are best understood on a theory of a natural development of a sense of social law occasionally distorted by superstition (human sacrifices, etc.) or material conditions (infanticide, killing the aged, polyandry, etc.). The progress of archaeology in turn forced scholars to realize, as they ought to have done from classical literature alone, that it was entirely false that Christianity brought to the world any new and higher moral sentiments [see *Babylonia*; *Egypt*; *Gospels*; *Greece*; *Rome*; etc.], and with the increasing freedom of literature, until the Churches began to organize a censorship in recent years, it was shown that the properly Christian period of history, about 500 to 1800 or 1850, was, as regards the majority, one of the worst in history, particularly in respect of the virtue of which the Churches most stoutly claimed the monopoly; while, as far as our knowledge goes, no historic religion shows so lamentable a record of vice in its higher representatives (Popes

prelates, priests, monks, and nuns) as Christianity does.

The fact, in fine, that from 1870 onward the level of character rose in every modernized and secularized civilization [see *Crime* ; *Drunkenness* ; *Law* ; *Philanthropy* ; etc.] in proportion as religious influence waned deprived the age-old controversy of practical importance. From two-thirds to four-fifths of the population of the leading civilizations neither come under any religious influence nor know anything about scientific or philosophic discussions of ethics. The ease, however, with which a small corrupt minority have in our own time availed themselves of the powerful means provided by science (radio, Press, cheap literature, etc.) to pervert the moral sentiments of almost entire nations shows how important it is that there should be agreement upon the nature and fundamental principle of the law of conduct. Most people concede that such an agreement cannot be reached on the lines of the old creeds or even of Theism; nor does there seem to be any prospect of a wide acceptance of intuitionist principles. Prof. W. R. Sorley, one of the chief representatives of the school of philosophic ethics (*Moral Values and the Idea of God*, 1924), claims that to vindicate the soundness of intuitive ethics we have only to regard the moral judgments of "all who judge correctly"; which is much the same as saying, all who judge as moral philosophers like himself, with highly sophisticated minds, judge. Such writers ignore the fact that nine-tenths of our psychologists—the experts on the nature of mind—to-day refuse to recognize a faculty of intuition [see]. Experts of the new science of ethics sometimes use such titles as *The New Morality* (Prof. Durant Drake, etc.), whereas there is in it nothing new except a clarification of sex-clauses; or introduce superfluous theories about the origin of the moral feeling. Prof. Westermarck (*The Origin and Development of the Moral Ideas*, 2 vols., 2nd ed., 1924) feebly argues, somewhat on the lines of Schopenhauer, that the starting-point was emotional; though his work is invaluable in its material about savages. On this aspect see also L. T.

Hobhouse, *Morals in Evolution* (1929). Prof. Carveth Read weakens his *Natural and Social Morals* (1909), a fine philosophic elaboration of the social theory, by attributing gregarious life to the earliest humans. Others, following Professor Höffding, advocate a "religion of values"; which encourages vagueness or mysticism as to the basis of moral principles and cannot hope to appeal to more than a refined minority. Recent literature, in which ethics is treated as a science, independent of philosophy or religion, proceeds entirely on the theory that social welfare in the broadest sense—Utilitarianism [see] is apt to suggest too narrow a basis—is the sole sanction of the precepts of justice, temperance, honesty, veracity, honour, and peace, and this has the advantage of appealing to facts within the experience of all. It is further endorsed by the Churches themselves when they plead that a moral deterioration caused (they say) by scepticism would bring about social ruin.

Eucharist, The. In the Anglican Church this is the name for the Communion Service, but in the Roman Church, since early times, it means the host or wafer which is swallowed in communion, preserved in the gaily painted safe (tabernacle) in the centre of the altar, and exhibited to the public in a gold-plated stand (monstrance) during certain services. The modern Catholic does not obtrude his weird belief in this matter. It is a dogma of the Church that at the consecration of the wafer during Mass the paste or flour is literally annihilated, while the "accidents" of that material substance (its colour, shape, feel, odour, etc.) remain, and that "under" these is concealed *the entire living body of Jesus*. It is miraculously multiplied, as well as dwarfed, millions of times (without leaving heaven nevertheless), because there are scores of these consecrated wafers in every chapel all over the earth; and it is present in every crumb that breaks off. How long this "Real Presence" of Jesus remains if a burglar steals the contents of the safe and profanes the wafers (called "hosts" or Blessed Sacrament), if the church and safe are bombed and the wafers scattered

in the dirt, etc., etc., is a profound problem in theology; as is also the question how many drops of water trickling down the throat, when the priest or communicant washes his teeth before partaking, "breaks" the fast which is prescribed, or if it is not better to "receive the body of the Lord" with unwashed teeth, as monks and a large proportion of the poor usually do, or if one may smoke before doing so, etc. Without going into detail, which the outsider is apt to find incredible, the Catholic boasts that this is the most precious doctrine or privilege of the Church. [See also *Communion* and *Mass*.]

Eudæmonism. Ethical systems of the ancient Greeks, like those of Epicurus and Aristippus, which are commonly called Hedonism, as claiming that pleasure (*hedone*) is the highest good, are better called Eudæmonism. It literally means "under the protection of a good spirit," but is practically what we mean by welfare. Some philosophers hold that this is the correct description of Aristotle's ethic. The word fits the modern social ethic, but is too academic for use in an age when a moral system is required that is immediately intelligible to every man, woman, and child.

Eugenics. The theory that the improvement of the human race must be effected by breeding from the best stocks. Although it is not yet settled to what extent congenital or early disorders can be remedied by environment [see] in the broad educational sense, it is generally agreed that there are tainted stocks or families with hereditary defects, and that these should not be allowed to propagate. This aspect of the system, or negative eugenics, is commonly admitted, and the Churches are the chief obstacle to its realization. Positive eugenics, or the proposal to bring together sound parents, is much more difficult and controversial, and the relaxation of the claims of the extreme geneticists of thirty years ago has led to some decay of the movement. [See *Genetics*.]

Eunuchs in the Papal Churches. A comparison of the article "Eunuchs" in the Eleventh Edition (1910) and all

earlier editions with that in the current or Fourteenth Edition of the *Encyclopædia Britannica* will illustrate our remarks on that standard work of reference. The article in earlier editions said: "Driven long ago from the stage by public opinion, they remained the musical glory and the moral shame of the Papal choir till the accession of Pope Leo XIII, one of whose first acts was to get rid of them" (IX, 891). In the new (Catholic-revised) edition, in which, we are told, the Church was permitted only to point out a few errors of date, etc., this passage is omitted, and the reader is given to understand that Leo XIII found the scandal in *theatre-life* (not churches) in various parts of Italy (not Rome) and indignantly suppressed it. It was one of the most notorious facts in Roman ecclesiastical life, and was found in many other Italian churches, until the Pope's secular authority over Rome was ended in 1870. Grove's authoritative *Dictionary of Music and Musicians* (1927, I, 580) gives it as an ordinary matter of musical interest. It is piquant to learn that this practice of castrating boys for the Papal choir, which so horrified British and American Catholics when they began to visit Rome that it had to be abolished, was said to be due to a moral delicacy of the Roman Church. It could not permit females to sing in the churches, and had thus to manufacture male sopranos: a grim commentary on the alleged mediæval appreciation of sexual asceticism. In point of fact, as Bishop Liutprand of the tenth century tells us in his *Antapodosis* (v, 1, 6), Christians—and some authorities conclude, on good grounds, that he means monasteries—used in his time to collect Christian boys, castrate and rear them, and sell them as harem-eunuchs to the Mohammedans; and as late as the seventeenth century Jews were castrated, and the mutilation publicly exhibited in Rome, for intercourse with Christian prostitutes.

Euripides (484-406), Greek tragedian. The third of the three great tragedians of early Athens, generally admitted to have shared the growing scepticism of the Athenians [see]. The stern piety of Æschylus and Sophocles is conspicu-

ously lacking in his plays. He was unpopular on that account and because he was considered morose and pessimistic, but his bitterness is in very large part a passionate protest against social injustice, especially as regards the treatment of women. Egypt and Babylon had given woman equality, but she was thrust into subjection by the early Greeks and Romans, and the *Medea* of Euripides is the first plea for justice in European literature. There is no reason to doubt the assurance of Plutarch (*De Placitis Philosophorum*, VII, 1) that he was an Atheist but dare not challenge the Athenian mob by an open avowal. (See Dr. J. E. Harry, *The Greek Tragic Poets*, 1899, who says that "he was a sceptic" and "a seeker after truth.")

Evans, George Henry (1805-55), founder of the first Rationalist paper in America. He was an Englishman who settled in America in 1820 and worked indefatigably in the abolitionist and other reforms. He edited, printed, and published the *Correspondent*, the earliest Rationalist periodical, and is said to have devised a theory of land reform which anticipated that of Henry George.

Evidences, Religious. A term invented in modern times for the arguments or proofs advanced on behalf of Theism or Christianity. Four general features of these should be noted. The first is that they show a remarkable variation from age to age, the "proofs" which sustained faith less than a hundred years ago being now either rejected or changed materially by modern educated believers. Prophecies, miracles, the unique morality of the New Testament, and the moral transformation of the Roman world by Christianity were almost universally held to be the supreme recommendation of that religion, while Paleyism and metaphysical plays upon words were supposed to put the Atheist on the level of the village idiot. We now find apologists exclaiming that there are "none so intellectually poor as to do them [the old evidences] reverence."

The second feature is that there is very little agreement among apologists about the value of particular evidences. Fundamentalists (and many preachers who would repudiate the name as an

intellectual insult) and Catholics impress millions of the less educated with demonstrative proofs which their more learned colleagues represent as moth-eaten, and—see, for instance, the article "Theism" in the *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics*—the latter have themselves very little common ground and are always inventing new arguments. Thirdly, there is among the apologists, as time goes on, a significant decrease of cultivated laymen, or laymen who are competent to make and have made a thorough study of the relevant fields of knowledge. We get little more than the pathetic futilities of literary or scientific men (generally not prepared to sign the Christian creed) like Millikan, Fleming, Belloc, Beverley Nichols, etc., who feel that it is enough to turn their common sense upon questions which really require vast expert knowledge for a sound judgment. Compare the list of lay adherents of the Christian Evidence Society, representing the richest and largest Church in Great Britain, or of the Catholic Truth Society with the corresponding list of the Rationalist Press Association [see]. The fourth and most painful aspect is the steady moral degeneration and increasing resort to trickery of modern apologists. [See *Controversy*, *Hints on*.]

Evangelicalism. The attitude of Churches which reject priestly authority, sacraments, and meretricious ritual, and insist that all Christian authority and inspiration be drawn directly from the Gospels (*evangelia*).

Evil, The Problem of. The aspect of nature which was discussed in the article *Dysteleology* is confirmed by a predominance of evil, physical and moral, in human life, and this has tortured believers for more than 2,000 years. If the book *Job* be, as many scholars believe, a Judaized version of a Babylonian work, we have scepticism from this source spread from Babylon to Alexandria long before the time of Christ. The leading Greek, Hindu, and Chinese thinkers, being for the far greater part explicit or virtual Atheists, had no problem, and concentrated their attention upon the diminution of evil. The Persians gave the world the facile solution that life is a battle-ground of a

supreme spirit of goodness and light and an almost supreme spirit of evil and darkness; and this led to the idea of a war of spirit and flesh in Plato, the Neo-Platonists, Christianity, and other sects or religions. The transfer of the accent of belief by the Deists of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries from Church and Bible to God gave new vitality to the problem, and the abandonment, in very large areas of Christendom, of the belief in hell, which had dulled the moral sensitiveness in this connection, made it more acute than ever for the Theist; nor does the crude old tradition of a primeval curse of the race now assuage the anxiety of any but the most impenetrably orthodox minds. Punishment for sin is, when the penalty falls equally upon just and unjust, an idea belonging to the primitive stage at which a whole family, village, or city could be held guilty for one man's transgression.

Attempts of modern apologists to reconcile the very large prevalence of evil with belief in God betray either a measure of despair or a quite fatuous optimism. Among the latter is the Christian Science idea that evil is an illusion to be blown away by a puff of resolute thought, or the variations on Browning's saying that it is "stuff for transmuting." It is characteristic of the carelessness of apologists to attempt to repeat this plea, that suffering tends to spiritualize a person, in an age which has experienced two great wars and a protracted depression. Hundreds of millions have in the last quarter of a century suffered grievously, apart from the normal hazards of life, and it is within everyone's experience that not one in 10,000 is improved in character. Hardly less futile is the academic assurance that evil is "only relative"—that it is "a defect of good"—or that to resent it is "hedonism" (Prof. J. Ward), or that it affords a magnificent opportunity to man to "co-operate with God" in making a better world. In *God and Pain* (1930), a special effort of the Student Christian Movement to provide a really intelligent apologetic, Dr. G. Stewart, after arguing that it spiritualizes human nature, rebukes our materialism and "makes heroes," pleads that man, not God (who, in his

opinion, made man), is responsible for most of it. We now get an occasional revival of the device with which J. S. Mill, in his invalid years, met the difficulty—that God is finite [*see Finite Gods*]—or a frank appeal to mystery. In *The God of the Liberal Christian* (1926) Prof. D. S. Robinson says that "most of the new Theists ingenuously confess that in the end God only knows how to make the reconciliation in detail." We might remind the Liberal Christians that they are the chief writers who urge that to see a plan in nature we must consider it as a whole, and they now want us to close our eyes to one half of it. From the naturalist and evolutionary point of view there is no problem. (See also A. G. Whyte's *Natural History of Evil*, 1920.)

Evolution. The idea that the contents of nature passed through a series of forms to attain their actual shape is so easily suggested by the growth of living individuals that we find it occasionally in pre-civilized races. The Maori had a tradition which embodied large ideas of evolution—see the present writer's *Growth of Religion* (1918, p. 103) for a translation given to him by a Maori doctor in New Zealand—and other peoples traced the contents of nature, or some of them, to an egg. The Chinese had prehistoric traditions of a sort of evolution of the human race from an animal condition, and the Babylonians had such a speculation besides the naïve creation-story which was common to them and the Egyptians and borrowed by the Hebrews. [*See Creation Stories.*] The growth of scepticism and the decay of the power of priesthoods in the first millennium B.C. inevitably led to independent speculation on the origin of things, and gradual development from some material that had always existed was the natural suggestion. Whether the Greeks of the Ionian cities, who were free from the traditions and priestly tyranny of the homeland, learned the Babylonian evolution-story, or to what extent they were the pupils of Phœnicia, we do not know, but from Thales onward all Greek thinkers who kept to the scientific line of speculation and avoided spiritualist or metaphysical distractions held that all the varied contents of

nature had been gradually evolved from one eternal reality (water, air, fire, or an infinite number of atoms or chaos). These necessarily crude speculations and the occasional revival of 'hem (from the poem of Lucretius) before the nineteenth century must be read in Clodd's *Pioneers of Evolution* (cheap ed., 1903), or H. F. Osborn's *From the Greeks to Darwin* (1895). Some writers on the subject state that St. Augustine was an evolutionist, since he held that God created "the seeds of things"; but long before his death Augustine [see] retracted this and became a thorough reactionary. The work of Lucretius and the Greeks was revived in France in the seventeenth century, and Descartes, followed later by Buffon and Kant [see article on each], further developed the idea of evolution in astronomy; but it was again the spread of scepticism in the nineteenth century that created the final conditions for the discovery of the great truth.

While Darwin was preparing the *Origin of Species*, R. Chambers (a Theist) drew some attention to the idea of biological evolution in England (*Vestiges*, 1843), and Herbert Spencer wrote in the *Leader* on the general theory of development (1852). From the beginning of the century Lamarck [see] had aroused a discussion of the subject in the scientific world, and outside England Darwin's monumental work was generally regarded as just one more eccentric effort to make the idea palatable. But Darwin had created such a massive basis of fact—in the case of Wallace it was little more than a guess—for his theory and won at once such a number of formidable adherents (Lyell, Lubbock, Huxley, Haeckel, etc.) that, in spite of the bitter hostility of the Churches and the grossest popular misrepresentation, the century closed with a complete triumph of the truth. Virchow, almost alone in the front rank of the biological sciences, seemed to dissent, but it has transpired that he merely opposed the teaching of evolution, and on sociopolitical grounds; while A. R. Wallace's plea that the mind (or soul) of man did not come under the scheme of evolution was recognized as due to his Spiritualist beliefs. It may be said on behalf of so many who hesitated or opposed, between

1860 and 1890, that the evidence, even of palæontology, available in those days was but a fraction of the evidence we have to-day. The advance of the telescope and spectroscope completed the establishment of the truth in astronomy; the geological and palæontological record was rapidly filled; biology, anatomy, and physiology, perfected their assistance; and the truth was extended with complete success to psychology, æsthetics, ethics, comparative religion, sociology, and every other branch of science. The Churches began to speak of "creation by evolution," which they had for half a century recognized as a deadly antithesis; though even to-day [see *Emergent Evolution and Mind*] they do not—indeed no Christian writer or leader does—fully accept the truth of evolution, because to admit the evolution of the "mind" would be fatal. In science it is as fully accepted as the evolution of the body [see *Prehistoric Man*].

In view of this unanimity of the proper experts—the leading professors in all countries of biology, anatomy, physiology, geology, palæontology, and comparative psychology—the rejection of the truth by the Fundamentalists (of whom in this respect there are large bodies in the Church of England and even the Congregationalist Church) and Catholics is merely a matter of religious controversy. Such of them as take any personal interest in the subject are duped by the assurance that a large number of "distinguished scientists" still reject evolution—the list of such names, with descriptions, in McCabe's booklet, *The Triumph of Evolution* (1925), shows that the supposed authorities are falsely quoted, or died decades ago, or are not scientific men—and are persuaded to read books by clergymen in which evolution and its evidence are gravely, often ludicrously, misrepresented. The evidence is, nevertheless, summarized in various articles of this work, and the different and converging lines may here be brought together:—

(1) *Astronomy*. In the universe to which our sun belongs we have stars in every phase of age and evolution, from embryonic to dying suns. Spectroscopy and photography show that the

nearer sister-universes (the nebula in Andromeda, etc.) are in the same condition and suggest that it is the common state of the million universes we already perceive. Evolution is written over the entire cosmos.

(2) *Geology*. The completion of the geological record of volcanic and stratified rocks, a work based upon the labour during decades of hundreds of thousands of field geologists, affords so convincing a proof of the evolution of the earth during some 2,000' million years that Fundamentalists have to appeal, in the crudest manner, to the Judæo-Babylonian legend of a universal Flood; and this, if we entertained it, would no more explain the strata than the Tower of Babel explains the fifty languages of the Amerindians. The "professor" McCready Price, who claims to have founded a New Geology for the Fundamentalists, is a teacher in a Seventh-Day Adventist college in Nebraska.

(3) *Palæontology*. The fossilized remains of animals and plants advance from lower to higher forms in perfect harmony with the dates assigned to the strata. There are no higher mammals (above the kangaroo stage) in or below the chalk; no mammals, reptiles, or birds below the coal, and so on. The palæontological record alone decisively proves the truth of evolution.

(4) *The geographical distribution of animals and plants* [see].

(5) *Comparative anatomy* [see].

(6) *Embryology*. [See *Biogenetic Law, The*.]

(7) *Vestigial organs* [see]. The anti-evolutionist has not even a plausible explanation to offer of such obvious features as the external ears, the nictitating membrane in the eye, the distribution of hair, the male breasts, the vestigial tail of man and the apes, the limb-bones of whales, serpents, birds, etc. Analogous features are observed in the plant world. Evolution alone affords an explanation.

(8) *Blood Tests* [see].

(9) *Comparative psychology*. This science has now discarded the old sharp antithesis of instinct and reason, of sub-human and human faculties, and traces a gradual development of modes and

mechanism of behaviour from the flagellates or the simplest bacteria to the highest intelligence.

(10) *Anthropology*. We have not only a complete gradation of mental capabilities and culture from the lowest human level, the Negritos, to the highest, but, in co-operation with prehistoric archæology, the science shows how the hierarchy of peoples is explained by the departure into isolation and stagnation of these various peoples at successive stages of man's development from the ape-form, so that they have substantially, allowing for some further development according to circumstances and the diffusion of culture, preserved those stages in nature's museum.

(11) *History*. The science of the present evolution of man. Pre-history, describing the evolution of culture from the eolithic or rostror-carinate implements [see *Prehistoric Man*] to the Bronze Age, and history, continuing the record from pre-dynastic Egypt or Sumeria to the age of science, exhibit an evolution of a greater magnitude than any claimed in the non-human world. The statement of some writers that man's intelligence has not increased since the Magdalenian period is at once unscientific—fossil skulls do not justify conclusions about the development of the pyramidal cells of the cortex, on which intelligence depends—and eccentric. Intelligence is judged by what it *does*, and the distance in culture between Magdalenian man and the man of to-day is immensely greater than the differences by which experts mark off different species, or even genera, in the animal world or in prehistoric remains.

Almost any one of these lines of evidence proves evolution, but the convergence of so many lines, each comprising vast masses of facts, is as decisive as is the agreement, after forty years of discussion for the last three or four decades, of all the authorities in every branch of science that is concerned with the relevant material. That a number of clerical writers, and a few physicists or other experts on irrelevant branches of science, raise "objections to evolution" must be regarded as a freak of religious controversy; and the objections or difficulties always betray a

tiresome ignorance of the relevant sciences or are just verbal formulæ, like "evolution is only a theory" or "evolution creates nothing." Evolution is now an interpretation of millions of facts which to the expert is as certain as the facts themselves; and it is "only a theory" that there ever was such a person as Jesus (to say nothing of Moses), or that there is another side to the moon, or that coal was once vegetation. The "sterility of hybrids" is another absurd and ignorant objection [see *Hybrids, The Sterility of*]; and it is amusing that it was decisively answered thirty years ago (Dewar and Finn's *Making of Species*, 1909) by one of the apostles of the present anti-evolution movement. "Species" is an artificial or arbitrary demarcation for the convenience of science. Where organisms are specially fit for preservation and are buried in favourable conditions (fossil sea-urchins in chalk, shell-fish in lakes, etc.) the successive specific types shade into each other; and zoologists discover a number of new species formed in changed environments (fish at the polluted mouths of rivers, shrimps in brackish water, emigrant snails in the Pacific Islands, etc.) to-day. A worse procedure is to quote to the ignorant public the names of opponents of *Darwinism* (or *Natural Selection*) and represent them as opponents of *evolution*.

In the scientific world the only dispute is about the agencies of evolution. Darwin and Haeckel left open the question of the cause of variations, and this is now generally settled by the science of genetics. Difficulties and obscurities in detail remained, and subsidiary hypotheses are occasionally discussed (the Age and Area Theory, the Isolation Theory, Holism, etc.), but this purely scientific discussion is beyond the range of the present work. Social objections are no longer seriously advanced. While Virchow [see], the oracle of the anti-evolutionists forty years ago, urged that it led to Socialism, some Socialists (not Marx or Engels) opposed it on exactly the opposite ground. Preachers denounced it as godless and debasing, and their successors greet it as "God's method of

creation" and "sublime." It is at once the only theory of life which explains the weaknesses and the slow advance of the race and the most inspiring theory of its capabilities and prospects [see *Progress*], since evolution is now proceeding more rapidly than ever. The present recrudescence of anti-evolution in England is due to the old type of devotion to *Genesis* on the part of an elderly physicist who is equally unfamiliar with Biblical scholarship and with geological and biological science. See A. Morley's *Evolution and its Modern Critics* (1937) and the review of this in *Nature* (November 27, 1937). The quaint appearance of a one-sided account of the McCabe-Dewey debate, in 1938, is due to the fact that Dewey proposed to publish the reports of his opponent's speeches without revision. The root of all opposition is still the old conception of the Bible, and to any Fundamentalists who may be willing to inquire it is better to recommend illustrated works like D. Hird's *Picture Book of Evolution* (revised 1932) or Haeckel's *Evolution of Man* (cheap ed., 2 vols., 1912). The section on evolution in *The Science of Life* (popular ed., 1938), by H. G. and G. P. Wells and J. Huxley, is easy and excellent, but the best recent work, of moderate size and not too technical a character, is Prof. A. F. Shull's *Evolution* (1936). See also Prof. J. Dendy's *Outlines of Evolutionary Biology* (4 ed., 1938), Prof. J. B. S. Haldane's *Causes of Evolution* (1932), Prof. T. H. Morgan's *Scientific Basis of Evolution* (1932), and Prof. H. S. Jennings's *Genetic Variations in Relation to Evolution* (1935). On the evolution of man see *Man, The Evolution of*.

Excommunication. An official declaration that a member is expelled from the Christian, especially the Catholic, Church. It is a clear right of any Church to expel a member, but few realize that the Roman Church in so acting declares that the person has no means left of avoiding eternal torment. The procedure began in apostolic times and was frequent in the early Church for heresy or grave and persistent misconduct. During the Middle Ages it was flagrantly abused for the political advantage of the Papacy, and anathemas

were distributed copiously. A bishop would excommunicate thieves who stole his property. It is rarely used to-day, the Church making a distinction between explicit and implicit (*ipso facto*, or incurred by a man's act without any passing of sentence) excommunication. Like putting a book on the "Index," which is equally rare, the action would often call attention to the secession or criticisms of a distinguished son of the Church. Canonists distinguish between minor and major excommunication, the former being merely a temporary refusal of the sacraments, the latter expulsion from the Church. Major alone, if any, is now used, but the social consequence, that no Catholic must hold any communication with the condemned, is often evaded.

Exorcism. The ceremony of expelling devils from a possessed person. It was familiar, as was the use of lustral (or holy) water for warding off demons, in Egypt and Babylonia, and the Jesus of the Gospels transmitted it to the Christian Church. In the Middle Ages, and to the beginning of the nineteenth century, the insane were believed to be "possessed," and the foulest and most brutal means were adopted to drive out the devil. Animals, also, were in abnormal cases treated as possessed by devils and were solemnly tried in court and burned. Cases of females, human or animal, assuming male characters and vice versa, which we now trace to tumours or other disorders of the sex-glands, were particularly apt to be so regarded. To-day Catholic authorities generally believe that Spiritualist mediums are possessed, and there have been cases of exorcism.

Expiation. [See Atonement.]

Exposure of Children. Apologists count the condemnation by Christianity of the exposure of children in ancient Rome as one of its great moral triumphs. Hardly any apologist who makes the point evinces even a moderate acquaintance with Roman history and life. Practices of early Republican days, when the Romans were isolated and were only a few centuries out of barbarism, are confused with the life of Rome at the time when—five or six centuries

later—the Church obtained power. In the exacting early days, when Roman law did not cross the threshold of the home, a new-born daughter would be brought before the father and he might condemn her to death or, which was more usual, exposure. This led, even in the early part of the Empire, to a fairly common practice of leaving new-born girls in a public place, where they were picked up by baby-farmers and reared for sale. Tacitus and other moralists condemned the practice, and the great Stoic lawyer Paulus, of the third century, got the declaration in Roman law that it was a crime equal to murder (*Dig. XXV, 3, 1, 4*). Christian writers quote Tertullian saying that this prohibition of exposure was futile. A charge against the pagans by one of their most bitter opponents—and one who lived very far from Rome—would not be very convincing evidence; and the same Father is not quoted when he gives a scorching account of the morals of the Roman Christians and their Pope. He does not, however, expressly refer to exposure, but to infanticide (*Ad Nationes, I, 15*). The Christian Emperors of the fourth century, in making infanticide a capital crime (again not naming exposure), merely repeated the pagan enactment of Alexander Severus. We have not a tittle of evidence that there was, in the fourth or fifth century, any diminution of exposure; but from the middle of the fifth century the pressure of population sank rapidly. Any impartial classical dictionary gives the facts, but the best account is in Pauly's *Real Encyclopädie* ("Aussetzung"). [See also **Children, Pagan and Christian attitude to.**]

Extreme Unction. The anointing with consecrated oil of persons in danger of death, counted as one of the "seven sacraments" in the Roman Church. Like baptism (for purification), anointing was a common practice of pre-Christian times, and the introduction of it into the so-called Epistle of James imposed it upon the Christian community. It was a voluntary rite, and the authorities are not agreed whether it was for healing, comfort, or the remission of sins. As part of the scheme for bringing every phase of life

under the priests in the Middle Ages it was gradually made compulsory. In the fifteenth century it was declared a sacrament, or part of the scheme of sacred magic, and the Council of Trent made it an obligatory rite for men and women whom the physician declared to be in danger of death. The priest now daubs the eyes, ears, nostrils, lips, hands, and feet of the patient, mumbling that this remits sins committed by those organs. Catholic writers are reticent about the fact that in the Middle Ages the anointing of what the Old Testament calls the "loins" was considered essential.

Ezra School, The. In most articles bearing upon the Old Testament we mention the Ezra (or Esdras) school or the post-Exilic redaction of the Hebrew sacred books. It is usually said that Ezra—Esdras is the Greek form—was a Jewish priest who returned from Babylon to Jerusalem in the fifth century and led the reorganization of the cult of Jahveh. Other Biblical writers contend that there is no evidence that he was a priest, and describe him as a scribe. The more radical point out that this was the great age of historical fabrication, and the priestly writers may have invented Ezra as easily as other historical details. H. H. Schaefer, in a special study (*Ezra der Schreiber*, 1930), concludes that he was a zealous Jew in high office under the Persians who returned to help in the restoration of Judæa. Later writers or "redactors" of the priestly school are supposed to have borrowed

his name and worked on the Law and the Prophets until these assumed the shape in which we have them. All that is clear is that the majority of the Jews preferred to continue, probably dropping their creed, in Babylonia, and even those who had remained and multiplied in Judæa intermarried with Gentiles and became lax. It is plausibly suggested that the zealots among the exiled kept in association and began to rewrite the Hebrew books so as to pretend that from the time of Moses and Aaron (if they did not fabricate those leaders) there was an elaborate cult of Jahveh with a powerful priesthood; that the Jewish leader at Jerusalem, Nehemiah, summoned these, with Ezra at their head, to come to his aid; and that the work of reconstructing the literature, or incorporating the old Jahvist and Elohist writers in a tissue of historical fiction, went on under the name of Ezra for a long time. This agrees with the literary analysis of the Pentateuch (or Hexateuch) and the so-called historical books and explains the numerous duplications, contradictions, and other confusions in the text. People who distrust linguistic analysis of this sort may be recommended to compare the language of Chaucer with the English of to-day. The difference in time of the Jahvist and Elohist writers from the age of the priestly writers is not greater. The Old Testament as the Ezra school completed it, and we have it, is, in spite of the ineptness of the work, the most successful forgery in literature.

F.

Fabre, Jean Henri (1823–1915), French entomologist. A schoolteacher who took such interest in natural history that he became the leading authority of the last century on insect life. He lived at Avignon and was friendly with J. S. Mill. His *Souvenirs Entomologiques* (1st vol., 1879) won a world-wide reputation, very largely by the charm of its style, but some of his statements which have been, and still are, used to support mystic views (by Prof. Bergson, for instance) have been refuted by later and more scientific observers. The Peck-

hams (*Wasps, Solitary and Social*, 1905) have shown, in particular, that his claim for "the Wasp Anatomist" (SpheX) is quite wrong. It is incorrect also to represent the famous naturalist as "a devout Christian." Although he refused even to read Darwin's *Origin*—the *Athenæum* wrongly said in its obituary notice that he was an early adherent of Darwinism—he was merely a stubborn Vitalist, like Butler. He was a Theist, but, as his chief biographer, D. G. Legros, says, he was "free from all superstition and quite indifferent to dogmas

and miracles" (*La vie de J. H. Fabre*, 1913, p. 192).

Faguet, Prof. Auguste Émile, D.-ès-L. (1847-1916), French writer. He was a professor of literature at the Sorbonne (Paris University) and for many years the leading literary and dramatic critic in Paris. For his distinguished historical and literary works he was admitted to the Academy and made a Chevalier of the Legion of Honour. In his *Voltaire* (1895) he deprecates aggression, but is Agnostic.

Faith and Reason. Owing to the low cultural quality of most of the early Christian leaders, and to certain intolerant phrases attributed to Jesus in the Gospels, the Greek spirit of rational inquiry was at once suppressed in favour of authority. All attempts to rationalize the obscurities of the new faith (by Gnostics, Sabellians, etc.) were truculently resisted, and the few learned men who adopted the creed in Alexandria (Origen and Clement) were accused of heresy or discouraged. With the general acceptance of the Gospels and the Pauline Epistles the rule of faith was established on the ruins of Greek thought. Faith is in this connection now defined by Catholic theologians as "acceptance of a statement on authority." They denounce the vaguer Protestant idea of faith as emotional and heretical, and Jesuits have at times described themselves as Rationalists, saying that they prove by reason and history the existence of God, the divinity of Christ, and the divine establishment of the Church, and it is then "rational" to accept doctrine from that authority. This is the real meaning of Tertullian's much-quoted (or misquoted) saying: "I believe it [accept it on authority] because it is impossible" (or not rationally demonstrable). The struggle against the tyranny broke out occasionally (Pelagians, Priscillianists, Nestorians, etc.), and the rights of reason were claimed by Scotus Erigena [see], in the ninth century, and by Abelard [see] and other brilliant masters as soon as Europe began to think once more. The Church triumphed by violence, but the development of the Arab civilization compelled the Scholastics [see] to compromise (especially in the *Summa*

Philosophica of Thomas Aquinas) and begin to elaborate "proofs from reason." The Roman position to-day is what it was formulated by these cloistral teachers of six centuries ago. [See also *Belief*.]

Fall, The. Although it is necessary to read with reserve some of the older writers on comparative mythology, like Doane (*Bible Myths and their Parallels*, 1882), who is on some points uncritically followed by "Philip Vivian" (*The Churches and Modern Thought*, 1906), the doctrine of the Fall, which seems to many distinctive of Christianity, is what we may call a natural myth of the human intelligence in a primitive stage of development. We find it in places as far apart as pre-Spanish America (Bancroft's *Native Races*, 1883, III, p. 105), Polynesia (Grey's *Polynesian Mythology*, 1857, p. 16), and India. Dr. MacCulloch gives a full and authoritative account of these legends in the *Encyclopædia of Ethics and Religion*. One Hindu myth runs that Siva dropped a blossom of the sacred tree from heaven and the first man took it, thinking that it would make him immortal, and was severely punished. Another Hindu legend which the experts describe as pre-Christian says that men were at first happy and peaceful and they fell from grace by eating a sweet scum that exuded from the earth. From early Greece we have the myth of Prometheus, who was punished for stealing the fire of the gods to give to men, and the myth of Pandora, who let out all evils upon men by opening a forbidden box, together with the legend of a golden age of Kronos succeeded by ages of silver, bronze, and iron. Maspero (*The Dawn of Civilization*, 1896) traces a legend of a Fall in Egypt, and we now have the tablet of the Fall in Babylonia, whence the early Hebrews apparently derived it. Prof. S. Langdon describes its contents in his *Sumerian Epic of Paradise, the Flood, and the Fall of Man* (1915). The first race of men lived under the rule of the gods in sinlessness, perfect health, and peace with each other and the animals. For an unknown reason the gods were angry and destroyed them [see *Flood*]. The descendants of the surviving pair lived again in a Paradise

without sin or sorrow, but they brought these upon the race by eating a forbidden fruit. Prof. Langdon tells us that this romance is at least a thousand years older than the earliest Hebrew settlement, and we may take it to be a priestly elaboration of the common myth: an attempt of pre-civilized man to explain why there is so much evil in a world made and controlled by the gods. We may assume that educated Babylonians and Egyptians, like educated Greeks and Romans, regarded the story in its proper light, and the elevation of it to the position of a fundamental doctrine after five centuries of Greek and Asiatic philosophy is a remarkable development. It is still more remarkable, or lamentable, that the four thousand years of cultural development of the ancient world should end in the domination of civilization by a religion which made this myth essential to its dogmatic structure, not only teaching a depressing doctrine of the paralysis of human nature by the curse of the gods, but extending the punishment, even in the case of babes, to an eternity of horror after death and making it the basis of its Christology. The sophistication of the Fall by theologians at the end of the last century had to be supplemented by a reinterpretation of the atonement [see], and most people can see in this only a confession that the world was most grievously led astray for fifteen centuries. For savage parallels see also Frazer's *Folk-Lore in the Old Testament* (1918, I, 45-76).

Family, the Church and the. In view of the failure of the old types of evidence on behalf of Christianity, apologists have had increasing recourse to social arguments, and prominent among these is the contention that the family is the foundation of the State, and the Church alone can protect it from disintegration. One must not admit the premises of this argument without clearer definition. These writers, in speaking of a foundation of the State, fallaciously induce their readers to picture a *vertical* material structure, which naturally requires foundations, and the figure of speech is most ineptly transferred to the State. We might recall, too, that monarchy or democracy or militarism

has at different periods been described as equally fundamental. When the apologist goes beyond pulpit rhetoric and explains that the decay of the family would entail a fatal reduction of births, we have to remember that by the modern conquest of disease the death-rate has been so lowered that before the end of this century (if not already) a full birth-rate of the old type would raise formidable problems and difficulties. [See *Birth Control*.] However that may be, the second part of the argument, which properly concerns us here, is based upon a number of discredited legends about the condition of the older civilizations and the social effect of the introduction of Christianity. Most of these are elsewhere exposed [*Children; Divorce; Marriage; Romans; Woman*; etc.], and it is necessary here only to draw the conclusion.

It is a commonplace of Christian literature that in the ancient Roman civilization the family was in danger of perishing and Christianity restored it to honour. For this it is usual to quote certain statements of Roman writers of the early Empire. It is not necessary to examine these strictures on the Roman "smart set" (which has a parallel in every civilization), for two reasons. The first is that the period to which reference is usually made, the Augustan age or earlier, instead of leading to decay, culminated in the finest and richest period of ancient history—the Antonine Age. When writers quote in particular the diatribes of Juvenal, which experts decline to take as items of social history, and the moral exaggerations of Tacitus, the genuine student of Roman history reflects that these critics actually lived in the healthiest period of the Empire. But, secondly, whatever truth there may be in the charges is irrelevant, because Christianity had no social influence whatever until two centuries later. In modern history the experts who have paid special attention to this point deny that there was any abnormal amount of vice or selfishness in Imperial Rome. Friedländer, perhaps the highest authority, says that "there is nothing to show that in Imperial Rome shamelessness ever went so far as it did in Paris about the middle

of the last (eighteenth) century" (*Sitten-geschichte Roms*, I, 431). Sir S. Dill, the highest British authority and a Christian, answers the gossipy charges of Juvenal against a class which he did not know by assuring us that "in his own modest class female morality was as high . . . as the average morality of any age" (*Roman Society from Nero to Marcus Aurelius*, 1916, p. 76); and in his later work he gives an even better account of the last predominantly pagan generation, in the fourth century. But this question of Roman morals will be considered later [*Rome, Morals in Ancient*].

The plea of the apologist begins to seem quite audacious when we examine what *did* happen after the triumph of the Christian Church. Historians tell us that the population of Rome sank from about a million, in the fourth century, to about 40,000 in the sixth. From this we must infer that the population of the lands which had formed the old Western Empire must have sunk from about 50,000,000 to much less than 20,000,000, and it remained phenomenally low until the eleventh century. Barbaric invasions—which, indeed, brought several million robust men, women, and children into southern Europe—are only part of the explanation. For the rest see *Children*; *Cruelty*; *Epidemics*; *Law*; etc. Here it is enough to note that the assertion that Christianity saved Roman society by protecting the family and thus ensuring a supply of citizens is fantastic, since the establishment of the Church was, whatever the cause, followed by one of the gravest decreases of population that is known in history. For the next period, the Dark Age, we admit an increase—a portentously slow increase—of population, but the general morality of all classes was such that the fertility of the women was not connected with any idea of the sanctity of marriage; over which, in fact, the Church had as yet no control [see *Divorce and Marriage*]. "Conjugal morals returned to brutality," says Legouvé in his *Histoire morale des femmes* (1849, p. 183). Serfs, who formed the great majority of the population, and were almost exactly in the position of the slaves of the later

Roman Empire, were coupled rather than married by the owners, who had little respect for their families. The sexual licence continued, indeed in the higher class was worse, during the second part of the Middle Ages, the abolition of divorce [see] being a mockery. Even on the theoretical side there was no pretence of promoting social interests. Men's affairs were *nominally* regulated in accordance with an ancient superstition and two contradictory utterances attributed to Jesus; *really*, in the interest of the power and wealth of the Church. One of the most unfortunate illustrations of Positivist ill-informed leniency to the Roman Church is that Comte recommended "the Holy Family" as symbolical of its beneficent influence during its thousand years of despotic power.

But Protestantism did little to restore the sanity and health of the social order in this respect. J. C. Jeafferson gives, in his *Brides and Bridals* (1872), some picturesque details about the sale of wives (even in the knightly class) and the general levity about marriage. He quotes a satirical popular song, of the days of Edward V, which told how, if a man wanted to get rid of his wife, he need only take to the church a little silver and "twei fals witnesses" (II, 310). Howard quotes, in his weighty *Matrimonial Institutions* (1904, II, 59), a statute in which Henry VIII (noble apostle of matrimonial integrity) complains that "marriages have been brought into such an uncertainty that no marriage could be so surely knit and bounden" that the clergy could not find a flaw in it. Cranmer prepared a scheme of reform, but the premature death of Edward and the return of reaction with Mary killed it, and the Anglo-Catholic element then obtained a declaration (1602) that the Canon Law was still in force. The state of affairs was in some respects worse than ever. Child-marriages [see] continued, and divorce could be had only by Act of Parliament, and cost from £2,000 to £10,000, so that there were only seven cases in the seventeenth century and 130 in the entire period from 1602 to 1857. The Anglo-Catholic who fancies that this protected the sacredness of

marriage should read the extraordinary story of the Free Parsons of the eighteenth century. Since these were not under the bishop, they tied the matrimonial knot, with no possibility of divorce, cheaply and without questions. Abducted heiresses, drunken sailors dragged in by whores, and infatuated girls were married by them for life. One (in the Fleet Prison) performed 36,000 marriages. Another performed 40,000 in twenty-seven years. See the works of Jeafferson and Howard (above) and Burn's *Fleet Street Registers* (1833). The cruelty to women, the relaxation of morals, and the sufferings of children can be imagined. It was not until the control of marriage was taken from the Churches, in the nineteenth century, and treated as a social interest that reform was effected. To what extent social welfare is bound up with the family is an issue beyond the range of this work, but the claim of the Churches is a flagrant defiance of the undisputed facts of history.

Fanaticism. The fanatic is, in common usage, the extreme or very impassioned devotee of a cause or a religion. As a rule fanatics are the most loyal and logical of its adherents, and their social influence or the effect which would follow if their attitude were generally adopted is a legitimate test of the value of a creed. Celibacy, strictly observed, is, for instance, an entirely logical consequence of the Christian creed. In this sense fanaticism has a grim record in history, from the Taoist kings of China, who burned the Confucian books, to the more sincere of the Inquisitors. The Arab-Persian empire, which gave every promise of restoring civilization speedily to the world, was entirely destroyed by fanaticism: by the Christians of Spain, the priest-ridden Moslems of Africa, and the Turks in their early years. The Oriental Christians who burned pagan temples and colleges deprived the world of a volume of art and literature far greater than that preserved by the Middle Ages. The modern apologist is too apt to ask us to consider the work of men who compromise on the principles of their religion, and to forget the work of those who most logically carried them into practice.

Farquhar, John (1751-1826), Scottish philanthropist. The son of poor parents, he settled in India and founded a very prosperous business there. He returned to England a millionaire, but lived in the greatest simplicity and gave away enormous sums in charity. He offered the city of Aberdeen £100,000 to found a college in which no religion should be taught, and with pain the pious city-fathers refused. Farquhar openly rejected Christianity and thought Brahmanism superior to it (*Biog. Dict. of Eminent Scotsmen*).

Fascism and the Papacy. Mussolini was an aggressive Atheist as well as republican until 1921. It is credibly reported that on a public platform he did what is falsely attributed to Bradlaugh—put his watch on the table and gave the Almighty a minute to strike him dead. When the military and industrialist leaders who offered to finance his party required him to abandon these attitudes, his Atheism disappeared in a few months; and one of his first acts after the March on Rome in 1922 (in which he did not take part, remaining in the provinces until its success was announced), was to present the valuable Chigi Library to the Pope. The Vatican, however, distrusted his sudden conversion, and for seven years refused to be reconciled, especially as the early Fascists were very largely anti-Papal. The Pope congratulated Mussolini on his escape from assassination, but was silent when he sent 10,000 opponents to jail, when he boasted that Fascism had "marched to power over the rotting corpse of liberty," and when he condoned, if he did not procure, the brutal murder of Matteotti (1924). That crime shook the power of Fascism, for more than half the adult Italians were, as the electoral figures prove, still Liberals, Socialists, or Communists, and from that date Mussolini's militarist and royalist supporters sought a reconciliation with the Church, so as to secure the Pope's influence, but the Vatican demanded too high a price. The Pope wanted the full application of the Canon Law in Italy, the suppression of all non-Catholic cults, the control of all education, and a generous measure of temporal (royal) power. In 1929 he was

forced to compromise and they signed an agreement by which the Pope got £19,000,000 in cash (which he is rumoured to have invested in America and lost in the ensuing depression) and State bonds—the sum, with accumulated interest, allotted to the Papacy in 1870 [see *Papal States*—and independent power in the Vatican City (108 acres of Rome, with its own postage, railway station, etc.). They signed also a Concordat by which the Pope got control of all schools and colleges below the universities (control of which both professors and Fascists heatedly opposed), the establishment of Catholicism as the State-religion, the endowment of the clergy, the protection of the property of monks, a law of religious marriage, drastic penalties on all criticism of the Church, the enforcement of the Church's Holy Days, relief from taxation for the clergy and Church property, and the expulsion of all ex-priests (who were very numerous in Italy) from the Civil Service.

This sordid bargain, hailed in the world's Press as a beautiful reconciliation of the secular and spiritual powers, was followed by bitter recrimination on both sides. Mussolini, who, to secure his own power, had sold the rights to win which half a million Italians had died in the nineteenth century, had to defend himself against his own followers, and the bold language he used caused the Pope to denounce him publicly as "a heretic" (*Osservatore Romano*, May 30, 1929). Against his statement that he had "made no concessions" the Pope claimed all the powers of a mediæval Pontiff. This extraordinary document, showing that the Papacy has not altered a line of its claims, was concealed by the Press from its readers in Great Britain and America. A translation of parts of it is given (direct from the *Osservatore*) in McCabe's *Papacy in Modern Politics*, 1937, p. 58.

Mussolini made further concessions in 1931 and began to attend church in 1932. In the same year he wrote the opening part of the article "Fascismo" in the new *Enciclopedia Italiana*, and in this he derided the Christian ideal of peace and glorified war as the agency which "alone raises the energy of man

to the highest pitch and impresses a seal of nobility upon the nations which have the manliness to undertake it"; while in the same year British newspapers printed only his public and passionate avowals that Italy sought peace and had no thought of aggression. The Pope, keeping his part of the criminal bargain, said nothing, and permitted the Italian Church and hierarchy to bless the rape of Abyssinia [see]. What sinister part the new Pope played in the recent war will in time be revealed. See McCabe's book (as above) and F. A. Ridley, *The Papacy and Fascism*, 1939.

Fate. Literally "that which has been spoken." In most religions this refers to the decrees of the gods. The equivalent Greek word, "moira," meant a share or portion of property, hence a person's lot in life, and finally the vague, impersonal (apart from the poetic myth of the Three Fates), inexorable, and generally sombre power which allots it. The word has no meaning to-day except as an expression for a tragic happening. Literary men have occasionally used the idea as an artistic expression of the constant failure of man's aspirations and achievements, but from the scientific point of view this is mere verbiage. We do not know of the existence outside man of anything more powerful than man (the race of men) himself. He is now equipped by science with such power that when all men, or the majority, are agreed upon a constructive plan, and war and wastage are excluded, human effort will decide the future, apart from such rare convulsions of nature as great earthquakes or eruptions.

Fatherhood of God. [See *Brotherhood of Man*.]

Fathers, The Christian. In the early ages of the Church the word "Papa" (father) was applied to all bishops, but it fell into disuse in Europe, or was restricted to monks and Popes. "Fathers of the Church" then came to mean the more prominent of the prelates and writers of the Church until the thirteenth century. The edition of their works, and of the decrees and letters of all Popes to Innocent III, which is used in quotation here is the Migne collection of Latin and Greek Fathers (the two

series running to many hundred quarto volumes), published by the Benedictine monks and supplemented by notes which are often much more candid and useful than the annotations of modern Roman or English Catholic editions.

Faure, François Felix (1841-99), President of the French Republic. A self-made man who founded a very prosperous shipbuilding business and was head of the Havre Chamber of Commerce. In 1881 he was elected anti-clerical Deputy to the Chambre, and advanced rapidly. In 1894 he became Minister of Marine, and in 1895 President of the Republic. He died suddenly of apoplexy four years later. Faure was a very high-minded and judicious statesman, and during his term of supreme office some of the most important laws against the Church were passed.

Fawcett, Edgar (1847-1904), American poet. Fawcett had a considerable reputation for verse and novels in America, and spent his later years in England. A warm friend and admirer of Ingersoll, he called himself "an Agnostic Christian," meaning that, while he had no belief even in God, he had a moral admiration of the Christian ethics. See his *Agnosticism and Other Essays* (1889) and *Songs of Doubt and Dreams* (1891).

Fawcett, the Right Hon. Henry, F.R.S., LL.D., D.C.L. (1833-84), the blind statesman. He studied law, but lost his sight in 1868, and concentrated on the study of political economy, on which he had already written a much-appreciated work, *A Manual of Political Economy* (1863), and politics. As Liberal Member of Parliament he warmly supported the abolition of religious tests, the secularizing of education, and reform in India. In 1880 he became Postmaster-General, and the serenity of his character and his efficiency under so grave a handicap won general admiration. After his death a monument to him was raised by public subscription and erected in Westminster Abbey. Sir L. Stephen shows, in his biography (*Life of H. Fawcett*, 1885, p. 103), that Fawcett was an Agnostic. In his letters he is impatient of "the miserable squabbles" of religious controversy.

Fawkener, Sir Everard (1684-1758),

merchant. Fawkener is the London silk-merchant at whose house Voltaire lived when he was in England. He was knighted and appointed ambassador to Constantinople in 1735. Voltaire wrote him many letters, and in one of these, dated Feb. 22, 1736 (*Lettres inédites*, 1856), he describes Fawkener "smiling with his human philosophy at the superstitious follies of believers."

Feast of Fools, The. [See *Fools, Feast of.*]

Feast of Reason, The. Not only religious controversialists, but novelists and essayists, continue to refer to a Feast of Reason which was held in the cathedral of Notre Dame at Paris during the French Revolution, at which, they say, a prostitute impersonating the Goddess of Reason was permitted or invited to sing lewd songs from the High (or principal) Altar of the church. The story is, like the exaggeration of the executions, one of the wild rumours current among the refugee priests and nobles in London, and is entirely opposed to the facts as told even by Carlyle in his *French Revolution* over a hundred years ago (1836); yet in manuals of history which were in general use in British colleges only thirty years ago pupils were taught—doubtless still are in many places—that "the goddess was represented by a prostitute" and honoured with "obscene rites" (Sir R. Lodge's *History of Modern Europe*, 29th ed., 1909, p. 546). An American historian, Dr. W. S. Davis, repeats this ("a light woman had been encouraged as she screamed a ribald song from the high altar of Notre Dame in Paris") in his *Europe Since Waterloo* as late as 1926. French historians have shown for more than a century that this is a fantastic perversion of the facts. Prof. A. Aulard, the leading authority on the Revolution, wrote a special work on the subject (*Le culte de la raison*, not translated) in 1893, and the substance of his research is available in his *Christianity and the French Revolution* (Engl. trans., 1927). The facts may be found also in Lavisse's standard history of the Revolution.

In 1790, long before invasion and civil war had embittered the revolutionaries, the practice spread in the

provinces of having festivals in honour of Liberty, sometimes before altars set up in the open air and presided over by orthodox priests. When, in 1792 and 1793, the Church was abandoned, in spite of Danton and Robespierre, by the great majority of priests and people, these Feasts of Liberty became very important in the provincial towns, Liberty being represented by some girl chosen for character as well as beauty. The people and municipality of Paris decided, again in opposition to the Government, to hold one, and, as the bishop and clergy of Notre Dame had resigned and handed over the edifice to the Council, they proposed to hold it in the cathedral. As the Opera company had previously staged a very artistic performance in honour of Liberty, it was engaged to organize the ceremony, which was in every respect dignified and decorous. The High Altar was *not* used, but draped, and a lady who personified the spirit of Liberty stood upon a special erection, a model of a small Greek temple, and recited an impressive "Ode to Liberty" from it. The poem was written by the chief poet of the time, a very temperate and refined revolutionary, Marie-Joseph Chénier [see], and may be read in his works. The lady is unknown, but of the four ladies mentioned by contemporaries none was "a loose woman." She did not represent even a "goddess of Liberty," much less Reason, but, though Liberty was the chief note struck, Parisians had coupled Philosophy or Reason with it. This was on November 10, 1793. It was a serious attempt to maintain in a new form the higher emotion once expended upon religion, which was almost extinct in France. [See *French Revolution, Religion and the.*] If the reader will now pass to the articles ([Ass, Feast of the ; Fools, the Feast of ; etc.] which describe the gross festivals that had been held in French churches and cathedrals during the "Ages of Faith"—festivals which are never now mentioned in literature or history—he will have some idea how gravely historical truth is now prostituted in the service of Catholicism.

Fellowes, Robert, M.A., LL.D. (1771-1847), philanthropist. He was ordained a minister of the Church of England, but

he rejected the creed and became a Deist. For some years he edited *The Critical Review* and wrote over the name of Philaethes. Fellowes was very active in the reform movements of the time and a very generous philanthropist. He was one of the founders of the London University College—the beginning of the University—which was set up to secure a purely secular education, and he helped to endow Edinburgh University.

Fels, Joseph (1854-1914), American philanthropist. A self-made man who built up the famous soap business that bears his name and made a large fortune. Of this he gave liberally to charity and to reform causes. He put £25,000 in a fund for advocating the single tax, introduced profit-sharing in his factories, and founded labour colonies. He assisted a wide range of movements and charities, but, like Carnegie, repudiated the title of philanthropist. In her biographical sketch (*Joseph Fels*, 1920, pp. 177-84) Mrs. Fels explains that he was a Theist, but rejected Christianity.

Feminism. A movement to secure the rights of women. How the position of equality which woman had enjoyed in Egypt and Babylonia, and substantially regained in the later centuries of the Greek-Roman civilization, was destroyed by the ascetic anti-feminism of the Fathers and the Judaic strain in the Christian religion, and how the freedom and aggressiveness of the Teutonic women of the new Europe were in turn defeated by the mediæval Church, will be told in a later article [*Woman and Christianity*]. The scores of writers of the modern feminist movement, which began in the latter part of the eighteenth century, have established that after fourteen centuries of Christian domination, which apologists blandly claim to have been favourable to woman, she was, besides being politically a pariah, subjected to the grossest legal injustice and social inequality. None now questions the disabilities which are described in Mary Wollstonecraft's *Vindication of the Rights of Woman* (1792), J. S. Mill's *Subjection of Woman* (1869), and especially Mrs. Cady Stanton's *History of Women Suffrage* (4 vols., 1887-1902).

Nor does any historian question that the revolt against the injustice originated in the heretical movement of the eighteenth century. From the writings of Rousseau and Diderot some of the French of the revolutionary age were inspired to demand that "Liberty, equality, and fraternity" be extended to women. The Condorcets [see] led the movement, but it did not, and does not in our time, find a ready acceptance in France, and it passed to the body of English men and women (Godwin, Shelley, etc.) who shared their heresies. Napoleon checked, and the Royalist reaction crushed, what agitation remained in France, and the reaction in England almost obliterated the traces of the work of Mary Wollstonecraft [see]. Robert Owen [see] included the reform in his complete collection of progressive ideals, and from him J. S. Mill learned the lesson, while G. J. Holyoake stimulated the enthusiasm of a wide circle of women—B. Raynor Parkes (later Mrs. Belloc), Mme. Bodichon, Harriet Martineau, Mary Somerville, etc.—who fought for social and educational equality. All these were Rationalists [see notice of each], and they were the chief figures in the feminist group which at this time led the demand for non-political rights. Rationalists also were Florence Nightingale (who broke other barriers for her sex), Mary Kingsley, Olive Schreiner, Mrs. Fenwick Miller, and other pioneers who are included in this work. Whatever may have been the views of Mrs. Pankhurst, the pioneer of political feminism, in her later years, her Radicalism was learned in the freethinking circle at Manchester to which her husband had belonged. The present writer was associated with her in the work at the end of the last century, when not a clergyman in England supported her, while the overwhelming majority derided her claim for justice. It was a movement originated by heretics and mainly sustained by them until the prospect of success gradually relieved it of obloquy and threatened the allegiance of women to the clergy.

In America the feminist movement had the same history. Its chief originator was Fanny Wright (Mme. D'Arusmont [see]), an Owenite Rationalist who

brought the gospel from England. Admirable as the leading women of the Revolution had been, most of them accepted from their Churches the obligation to acquiesce in the long list of injustices to their sex which Mrs. Cady Stanton scathingly summarizes in her history. Ernestine Rose, a Polish-Jewish Atheist, was her chief disciple and the most fiery apostle. Apart from a few liberal Quakers (the Grimke sisters and Abby Kelly), nearly all the names of the American women who fought and suffered for the cause in the days of unpopularity, which are given in Mrs. Cady Stanton's great work, are included also in Putnam's *Four Hundred Years of Free Thought* (1894). See notices of E. Rose, L. Colman, M. Gage, L. Child, H. Gardner, E. C. Stanton, S. B. Anthony, E. Ingersoll-Brown, etc., in this work. It is an amusing comment on the claim that religion alone inspires unselfish devotion to ideals that this movement (in its broadest sense) was, like most of the modern reform movements, almost wholly sceptical in its most difficult days, and attracted Christian leaders and Churches only in proportion as it conquered hostility and as the Churches themselves lost influence in the community.

Ferdinand II (1452–1516). The names of Ferdinand and Isabella of Spain still retain in our literature, even in some historical works, the glamour with which Spanish and Catholic writers have invested them. In serious literature—the *Cambridge History*, for instance—it is recognized that their destruction of the last Moorish kingdom, their gross treatment of the Moslem, and their effective establishment of the Inquisition, started the ruin of Spain—one of the swiftest and most tragic downfalls in European history. While, moreover, we may make for Isabella the excuse of genuine religious fanaticism and poor ability, Ferdinand has a repellent character in all non-Catholic works. The common representation that the last area of Arab civilization was swept away in a noble campaign of faith and virtue is refuted even in Prescott's *Ferdinand and Isabella* (10th ed., 3 vols., 1890). He describes the kingdom of the two monarchs—indeed, the whole of

Christian Spain in the fifteenth century—as astonishingly corrupt, and Ferdinand as a quite unscrupulous adventurer. He got the city of Granada by perjury, not conquest, and he broke his oaths and promises repeatedly. Prof. Chapman, who shows no bias against Catholicism, says in his *History of Spain* (1918) that to Ferdinand treachery was “a fine art of kingship.” Their children were degenerate and feeble-minded, and the later successors, who endeavoured to use the new wealth and power of Spain to carry out the designs of Isabella and her priests, ruined the country in fifty years, in spite of its adding the conquest of America to the conquest of the rich Arab civilization.

Ferrer y Guardia, Francisco (1859–1909), Spanish educationist. Having had very little schooling in boyhood, he developed a passion for the provision of education for the children of Spanish workers, and, with a small fortune which was left him by a French lady, he founded his first Modern School (without religious lessons, but with plenty of science and sound history) at Barcelona in 1901. Fifty more were opened in the course of time. The statement that they were Anarchist schools is false. Ferrer was an Anarchist only in the same sense as Tolstoy, and had the same sincere repugnance to violence. The lessons were, however, Socialist in substance and certainly anti-clerical, and Church and State combined to destroy him. An attempt was made to involve him in the plot to assassinate the King in 1906, but it was so insincere that the judges had to dismiss it. Three years later there was a revolt in Barcelona, and although Ferrer was then, and had been for some time, on family business in England—of which the present writer offered documentary proof to the Spanish Premier—he was arrested on the charge of having organized it, and, after a scandalous travesty of justice, was shot. On the walls of his dungeon in Montjuich he wrote: “Let no more gods or exploiters be served; let us learn rather to love each other.” He died with the dignity and serenity which were characteristic of him. The present writer at once visited Spanish refugees in France and published *The Martyrdom*

of Ferrer (1909), which kindled great indignation in the whole English-speaking world. The Australian Federal Government, after conferring orally with the present writer, sent an official inquiry, which was rebuffed, to Madrid. Prof. Simarro of Madrid University, quoting many pages of the *Martyrdom*, fully supported its charges against the Church and the Army in his large work *El Proceso Ferrer* (1910). William Archer was commissioned by an American publisher to write his *Trial and Death of F. Ferrer* (1911), of which an American Consul said that the author had strained so much to stand upright that he had fallen backward. It is unjust to Ferrer and his schools. See Ferrer's *Origin and Ideals of the Modern School* (Engl. trans., 1913).

Ferrero, Guglielmo (b. 1872), Italian historian. One of the leading sociologists and authorities on Roman history in Italy. He gave the Lowell Lectures in the United States in 1900, and his chief work, *Grandezza e a decadenza di Roma* (3 vols., 1904–5), is considered a standard work on the Roman Empire. He is an Agnostic, or what is called in Italy an independent Positivist (not in the religious sense). In the American symposium on immortality (*In After Days*, 1910, Ch. VIII) he rejects the belief.

Ferri, Prof. Enrico (1856–1929), Italian criminologist. Ferri taught penal law at, in succession, the Universities of Turin, Bologna, Siena, Rome, and Pisa, and he ranked with Lombroso as a founder of the science of criminology in Italy. He was better known as the very cultivated leader of the Socialists and editor of *Avanti*, but he retired when the disastrous squabbles of Socialists, Communists, and Fascists began. In a letter to the present writer he said, rather jubilantly, that he and his party had “rejected every religion under the sun.”

Ferry, Jules François Camille (1832–93), French statesman. A Parisian lawyer and journalist who entered political life and became one of the most prominent statesmen of the Third Republic. As Minister of Public Instruction (1879) he had a large share in the construction of the system of secular schools, and he was Premier

(1880 and 1883-5) and President of the Senate (1893) during the struggle with the Church. He was an Agnostic. See Rambaud's *Jules Ferry* (1903) and *Discours et opinions de Jules Ferry* (2 vols., 1903-4). He had a world reputation, and intellectually ranked very high among modern French statesmen.

Fertility Goddesses. As will be shown in the article **Religion, The Origin of**, the first definite religious belief of primitive men was, however that belief may have arisen, a conviction that the world about them teemed with spirits (though they had not the modern idea of spiritual substance), and some of these rose in time to the stature of godhead. The spirits of the sky and upper air (of rain, cloud, sunshine, wind, etc.) were in time concentrated in a great Sky-Father—Jupiter, Zeus, Dyaus-pitar, Ahura Mazda, Shang-ti, etc.—which some regard as, in Foucart's words, "the base of all the systems of the great civilized religions of the classical, Mediterranean, and Oriental worlds." Others—especially since Frazer's great work brought out the importance of the vegetation-cult as against the solar mythology—give priority to the Mother-Earth goddess in which the innumerable spirits of the earth were gathered together. In some places, it is true, the fertility deity was masculine (Osiris, Tammuz, Dionysos, etc.), but, as is shown in many articles of this work, history opened with a goddess in a commanding position in religious life over the whole area of early civilization (except Egypt) from Crete to India. She remained the single deity of Crete until near the end, when a young man god began to appear, and was the chief deity of Asia Minor, and remained one of the principal deities (especially in Syria) for ages. In the course of tribal and national amalgamations rival priesthoods "married" their divinities on the human model: the Maori Rangi and Papa, the Hindu Dyaus and Prthivi, the Greek Ouranos and Gaia or Zeus and Hera, the Egyptian Zeb and Nut, the Roman Jupiter and Juno, etc. Sometimes the sun-god had to be adjusted and explained as the son of sky and earth, and we get trinities like those of the Hittites, later Egyptians (Osiris, Isis, and Horus), etc.

A more interesting development, which has not yet been traced by some master of comparative mythology, is closely allied to ethical evolution. A fertility goddess easily leads in her ministers and festivals to a glorification of sex, or phallic worship and sacred prostitution, and there may have been originally a sincere belief in a sort of magical influence of copulation on the fertility of land, cattle, and women. The excesses to which this led came into violent conflict with the sex ethic which spread from Persia (possibly earlier from Babylonia) in the first millennium B.C., and much of the historical material of that age might be gathered up in a picture of a dramatic struggle between the Sky-God (the guardian of the new ethic) and the Earth-Goddess, ending in the apparent triumph of the former and the appearance of celibate priests, virgins, and ascetic sects and philosophies. We must remember, however, that the Hittites had already had Amazon priestesses, the Syrians emasculated priests, etc. A. Dietrich gives a large amount of material in his *Mutter Erde* (1905), in which he makes perhaps exaggerated claims for the priority of the cult of Mother-Earth.

Fetichism. The worship of material things which are considered to be the abode of spirits. The word "fetich," or fetish, is a corruption of a Spanish or Portuguese word meaning "hand-made," and it expressed the Christians' disdain of the worship of idols and trust in amulets—from which, in truth, the religious practices of the Catholics themselves were not far removed. For its rich development in Africa see R. H. Nassau, *Fetichism in West Africa* (1904) and R. E. Dennett, *At the Back of the Black Man's Mind* (1906).

Feuerbach, Prof. Ludwig Andreas (1804-72), German philosopher. He was a professor of Hegelian philosophy at Berlin University, but was deposed for publishing a work in which he, like Hegel, rejected the idea of personal immortality (*Gedanken über Tod und Unsterblichkeit*, 1830) and became an independent writer on philosophy and religion. His *Wesen des Christenthums* (1841, Engl. trans. by George Eliot, *The Essence of Christianity*) "won him a

place amongst the foremost advanced thinkers of the day" (Prof. Lowie) and had an incalculable influence on the growth of Rationalism in Germany. In its successor, *Das Wesen der Religion* (1845), he rejected all religion. In later works he expounded, though he did not call himself a Materialist, a scientific philosophy which may justly be considered Materialism and was the chief factor in shaping the Materialist attitude of the Socialist leaders. Later religious writers affect some disdain of Feuerbach, but he had a perfect command of philosophy and a brilliant and caustic style; and he was, says Prof. Lowie, "absolutely honest and uncompromising." There are many biographies of him in German.

Fichte, Prof. Johann Gottlieb (1762–1814), German philosopher. In the history of modern philosophy he is counted the successor of Kant, whose system he at first accepted. He was appointed professor at Jena in 1794, but he was accused of Atheism in 1798 for declaring in an article that God is only the moral order of the universe, and he was dismissed. He was very popular in Germany as the chief leader of the students in the struggle against Napoleon, and he again became a professor, and later rector, of Berlin University. His "transcendental Idealism"—a Pantheistic philosophy according to which we know only the Absolute Self which reveals itself in individual consciousness—marks a short phase in the progress of modern philosophy toward realism.

"Fielding-Hall," Harold Fielding Patrick Hall (1859–1917), writer on Burma. His *Soul of a People* (1898) rendered considerable service to Rationalism by showing—and it was very widely read and discussed—that an Asiatic Buddhist people, the Burmese, was superior in general character to any in Europe or America. His own creed is given in *The World-Soul* (1913). On the lines of Emerson he accepted only an Unknown Power or World-Spirit. He rejected Christianity and immortality.

Filangieri, the Cavaliere Gaetano (1752–88), eminent Italian jurist. Son of Prince d'Araniella, he took up law and won a European reputation. In

1787 he was appointed Royal Counsellor for Finance to the Naples Court, and he used his influence to promote the reform movement, which, in spite of the Church (which later drowned it in blood), was then making surprising progress in the Kingdom of Naples. His Deistic *Scienza della legislazione* (8 vols., 1780–8), a fine sequel to the work of Montesquieu, was put on the "Index," but was translated into many languages and had considerable influence.

Finite Gods. A number of writers, sometimes professedly Christian, have in recent times been driven by the problem of evil to deny the infinity of God. When J. S. Mill, in his later and feebler years, scandalized his many followers by professing belief in God (*Three Essays on Religion*, 1874), he meant a God who was limited in power. The wits commented that he believed in "a Limited Liability God." Prof. W. James [see] may be said to fall in the same class. He did not profess to have embraced Theism, but said that, while it was impossible to believe in an Infinite Supreme Being, it might be possible to give evidence of the existence of a number of higher but finite superhuman powers. Sir Oliver Lodge (*The Substance of Faith*, 1907, etc.), though a professed member of the Church of England, rejects the idea of infinite power (see McCabe's *Religion of Sir O. Lodge*, 1914). Dean Rashdall came to the same conclusion, and in America Prof. Beckwith (*The Idea of God*, 1923) and other liberal Christian writers have evaded the problem of evil in the same way. Prof. Montague (in his *Prometheus Unbound*), one of the very few American philosophers who believe in God, means a finite God.

First Cause. In spite of the assertion of Theistic writers like Prof. Alexander (*Space, Time, and Deity*, 1920, p. 343) that "no one is now convinced by the traditional arguments for the existence of God," at least three-fourths of the members of the Churches know, or could understand, no other evidence. Baptist, Methodist, sometimes Congregationalist, and particularly Catholic apologists, insist upon such arguments as that of the First Cause. In one of the

chief Catholic manuals, Father Boedder's *Natural Theology* (1891), it holds the place of honour. The lines of it are true. All around us are "secondary" causes—active agencies which clearly depend on others—so the mind must in the end postulate a First Cause which does not derive its force from others. Since ether (or whatever the fundamental material reality is) may be held to supply the want, the argument to this point is not impressive, but the apologist supplements it with phrases which carry weight with the uncritical mind. The cause must be "adequate to the effect," or "water does not rise above its source," or "you cannot take out of a bag what is not in it," and so on. The chief or most popular oracle on the Nonconformist side, Dr. Warschauer (*The Atheist's Dilemma* 1905), is just as peremptory. These writers do not mention that science does not use the words cause and effect quite so glibly, or that no philosopher now respects their reasoning on these lines, or that it is the quintessence of the doctrine of evolution that the most widely diverse effects have arisen from simple and homogeneous sources. The only sense in which there is a principle that the cause must be adequate to the effect is that the cause must be able to produce the effect, which is a truism, and completely sterile. It illustrates the fallacy of quoting the beliefs of "great scientists," when their expert knowledge is concerned only with the inorganic and they have made no study of either biological evolution or critical literature about religion, to find men of considerable eminence in science arguing on the same lines as the cheapest apologist. Millikan assures his American readers, in works and popular articles about religion of an offensively arrogant nature, that love, beauty, etc., must be found in the source of nature as well as in nature, and Einstein—when badgered by the clergy—is too apt to speak about a Great Power which is the Source of Love and Beauty. Such talk, in capital letters, is at least misleading. [See also *Cosmological Argument*; *Design Argument*; *God, the Existence of*; etc.].

Fiske, Prof. John (1842–1901), American philosopher. Although Fiske ren-

dered vital service in introducing Herbert Spencer's philosophy into America and was an outspoken critic of Christianity, he is often quoted, and by writers who abhor Spencer, as if he were orthodox. He admitted only an Unknowable God and immortality, and rejected Christian beliefs. See his *Outlines of Cosmic Philosophy* (1874) and *The Idea of God* (1885); also J. S. Clark's *Life and Letters of John Fiske* (2 vols., 1907). Fiske was professor of philosophy at Harvard and later of American history at Washington. Lectures at the University College, London, and the Royal Institution, as well as his writings, made him well known in England as one of the leading thinkers of America.

Fitzgerald, Edward (1809–83), translator of Omar Khayyam. He led a very secluded life in the country, and his early work attracted little attention. His version of Omar, which is recognized to be a paraphrase rather than a translation, also won little attention at first. A. W. Benn pointed out that the most sceptical passages in the English version are not found in the original—nor, it may be added, is the charm of Fitzgerald's verse—and this is borne out by his biographer, T. Wright, *Life of Ed. Fitzgerald* (1915). F. H. Groome shows that Fitzgerald himself was no epicure, but a man of very simple diet and high character (*Two Suffolk Friends*, 1895).

Flagellants, The. Bodies of religious fanatics of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries who paraded the streets scourging themselves until the blood flowed for the sins of the world. The reform of some of the Benedictine monasteries in the eleventh century, the ascetic movement (an offshoot of this) inaugurated by Hildebrand and Damiani, and the short-lived zeal of the first generation of friars in the thirteenth century, had revived the idea of self-scourging or flagellation, and the extraordinary gaiety and licence of the time were fiercely denounced by some of the friar-preachers. When the plague spread, in 1259, there were many epidemics of flagellation in Italy, an outcome of the neurotic strain and the rhetoric of preachers, and they spread to France, Germany, Poland, and Holland. They were disorderly crowds

with banners and crucifixes, and often priests or monks (or men dressed as such) were at their head, even children of five and six being drawn into them. In Italy the fierce and bloody struggle of Guelphs and Ghibellines, or Imperialists and Papalists, gave an additional stimulus. The scourgers confessed their sins to and absolved each other, and they won further merit by foul massacres of the Jews in many places. In the fourteenth century (1349) there was a new and organized movement in Germany, and it grew in strength when the Black Plague began. Thousands, generally stripped to the waist at least, filled the streets, and the epidemic spread to Sweden, England, and most of Europe. There was a recrudescence in the fifteenth century, but as it now in large part took the form of a rebuke of the sleek and vicious priests and monks, the Church branded it heretical and suppressed it. Many modern writers detect in the mania a good deal of sexual influence, flagellation being a known practice of certain types of morbid men. The suspicion is confirmed by the complaint of some contemporaries about "outrages on decency"—there is no doubt that the majority were sincere fanatics, even if subconsciously under other impulses—and by the scandalous scenes which were witnessed in Paris in the sixteenth century, when Henry III and his followers, alternating between religious fanaticism and complete sexual perversity, scourged themselves in the streets. Certain Russian sects of the nineteenth century were flagellants, and confirm the theory. Modern monks, even in London, "scourge" themselves by rule two or three times a week, but the ceremony is a joke even among themselves. See J. F. C. Hecker, *The Epidemics of the Middle Ages* (Engl. trans. 1844).

Flammarion, Prof. Nicolas Camille (1842–1925), French astronomer. Flammarion is always quoted by Spiritualists as one of the "great scientists" who endorsed their creed. He was a distinguished, not a great, astronomer, and he was not a Spiritualist, as he repeatedly stated. He was a Theist and believed in immortality, but he attributed the phenomena of seances, which he accepted,

to natural abnormal powers of the medium. "The supernatural does not exist," he said (*Les forces naturelles inconnues*, 1905, pp. 586, 592, etc.). He performed a useful service by exposing fraud, particularly on the part of the amateur mediums, whom people trust because they do not make a profit.

Flaubert, Gustave (1821–80), French novelist. He abandoned a medical practice to take up fiction, and, although he wrote (with infinite care and patience) only five novels, he is recognized as one of the supreme artists of the numerous French school of the second half of the last century. *Mme. Bovary* (1857) opened the series. His naturalism and scepticism appear in all, but especially in his *Temptation of St. Antony* (1874) and his letters.

Flood, The. [See Deluge.]

Flourens, Prof. Marie Jean Pierre (1794–1867), eminent French physiologist. He was one of the greatest physiologists of his time, and, since he was opposed to Materialism, he often figures in the fraudulent Catholic list of men of science belonging to that Church. He, though flourishing in the period of reaction, rejected all Christian beliefs. His son, **Gustave Flourens** (1838–71), who succeeded the father as professor of natural history at the Collège de France, was an outspoken Atheist and anti-clerical. He was deposed from his chair for writing his *Science de l'homme* (1865), and took up radical politics; and he was shot for fighting for the Commune in 1871.

Flower, Eliza (1803–46), composer. She devoted herself to the provision of music for South Place Chapel after it seceded from the Unitarian connection under W. J. Fox [see], and she composed sixty-three of the hymns that are found in its book. She shared Fox's Theism, and she and her sisters are described with great charm in Harriet Martineau's *Five Years of Youth and Deerbrook*. See Dr. Garnett's *Life of W. J. Fox* (1910, pp. 65–7).

Fontane, Theodor (1819–98), German poet and novelist. Deserting chemistry for literature, he won recognition as one of Germany's leading poets and as a distinguished novelist (12 vols., 1890–1) in the middle of the century. He was a

non-Christian Theist. See his poetry (*Gedichte*, 1851) and the biography by Ettlinger, *Theodor Fontane* (1904, p. 59).

Fools, The Feast of. The most popular of the annual festivals at which the Catholics of the Middle Ages burst the shell of the "simple piety" with which it is customary to credit them and indulged in incredible licence and profanation of their cathedrals and churches. So many historical writers now pretend to clear "the soul of the Middle Ages" from Rationalist and Protestant "libels" of the last century, and insist that the beautiful cathedrals and the persecution (at the demand of princes and peoples, Catholics say) of Jews and heretics prove the depth of their faith, that an entirely false version of such institutions as the Roman Church and the basis of its power is widely accepted. This is achieved by suppressing features of mediæval life (general sexual licence, cruelty, barbaric law, etc.) which are essential to an understanding of the period and for a correct view of the social evolution of Europe. One of these features which is now so generally ignored that it seems incredible was the grant of the use of cathedrals and churches on certain days for vulgar, sacrilegious, and often indecent pageants and festivals in which the clergy usually and hilariously took part. Cardinal Baronius, the father of Catholic history, tells us in his *Annales Ecclesiastici* (1588, year 956) that these extraordinary orgies were introduced into Christian churches by the tenth-century Archbishop of Constantinople, Theophylactus, whose depravity of life he describes very candidly. It is material to remember that the Greek Church, from which the contagion spread, had developed in a world that had not been corrupted by the Teutonic barbarians who are blamed for so much in Europe. From the foundation of Constantinople the prelates had been all-powerful, yet the Byzantine Empire [see] had in moral respects fallen as low as Europe. Theophylactus, a prince-bishop of royal blood, "turned the cathedral into a theatre and the episcopal palace into a place of debauch." The sacred building, says the pious Baronius, was polluted by "Satanic

dances" and "songs from brothels," and the practice spread over Christendom. As the festival was held at the beginning of the New Year, we see the influence of the old Roman Saturnalia; and Baronius quotes a successor of Theophylactus as witness that the revels still continued in the twelfth century in the Greek Church.

By this time several such festivals were annually celebrated in Europe [Abbot of Unreason; Ass, Feast of the; etc.] from North Germany to Spain. The inventory of the treasures of York Minster, in 1530, included a bishop's mitre and ring for the Feast of Fools, which was commonly held some day in the week after Christmas. France, the land of stately cathedrals, was the chief centre; and it was held not only in the great cathedrals (Paris, Chartres, Sens, Rheims, etc.), but in ordinary churches and in the chapels attached to monasteries and nunneries (the nuns masquerading in male dress). It is fortunate that in the case of this festival a French (Catholic) archæologist of the eighteenth century, M. du Tillot, devoted many years to the collection of records of the celebration of it in French cities before the last traces of it were obliterated, and his *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire de la Fête des Foux* (1741), which describes also a number of extraordinarily licentious societies which grew out of the festival, is thoroughly documented and reliable. He quotes Dr. Belet and other witnesses to the celebration in Paris in the twelfth century; Pope Innocent III denouncing the revels in the thirteenth century; a very grave letter of the University of Paris to the prelates of France, in 1444, protesting against the profanation of the cathedral and describing the sordid scenes; Dom Marlot, historian of the Church of Rheims, describing it as it was held in that and a dozen other famous cathedrals; and innumerable witnesses and documents down to the seventeenth century, when, we learn, nuns still maintained the festival in their chapels. In spite of the occasional protests of a few devout prelates, the cathedral of Notre Dame at Paris, which almost impresses a modern sceptic with a feeling of awe, was polluted every year for at least 250 years with the Feast of

Fools and other mockeries of the ritual.

From the letter of the doctors of the University and other sources Du Tilliot gives us a short account of the proceedings. A mock election of a bishop or archbishop took place in the cathedral, and this man presided over the burlesque of a Mass that followed. Deacons and priests, masked and in feminine clothes or fancy dress, took part. They "danced in the choir and sang obscene songs." They played dice and ate sausages before the altar while the caricature of the Mass proceeded, and when it was over there was a general dance and orgy in the church, during which "many stripped themselves." The behaviour of the people, who sang the indecent popular songs of the hour, is left to our imagination and lays no strain upon it. The priests were then put into filthy carts in the square before the cathedral and driven round the city. They were pelted with ordure while they played cards, "made obscene gestures," and banded lewd jokes with the crowd. Men of notorious life dressed as priests or monks, and prostitutes clad as nuns mixed with the clergy. This kind of thing took place every year during centuries in, as precise testimony shows, the great cathedrals of France as well as in parochial and conventual churches, and in places as far apart as Cologne and Toledo. It was a general custom. Like so many other scandals of mediæval Church-life it had, as far as the clergy were concerned, to come to an end when Protestantism spread, but the Catholic laity continued to enjoy the day of public licence. Du Tilliot includes a number of drawings—not imaginary, but taken from seals, banners, etc., of the time—in his work, and one of these, a copy of a banner used in the procession at Dijon, represents two men perpetrating an act of sexual perversity in the public street which equals anything that Martial describes occurring in private in ancient Rome, or that can be found in the weird catalogue of vice in Havelock Ellis or Krafft-Ebing. Louis XIII, who was no puritan, had to suppress the public orgies in Dijon and other French cities in 1630—nearly seven centuries after Archbishop Theo-

phylactus—but Du Tilliot says that they were not entirely discontinued. Catholic apologists now plead that what they call the demoralization of our time is due to the destruction of the authority of their Church, and urge us to return to the Ages of Faith. If any reader be tempted to think that this was a very exceptional feature of mediæval life, with some explanation which eludes us, let him read also the articles *Baths*; *Chivalry*; *Monasteries*; *Prostitution*; *Renaissance*; etc. A balanced view of the extraordinary age will be attempted under the heading *Middle Ages*.

Foote, George William (1850–1915), President of the National Secular Society. He came to London from Devonshire in 1868, and joined the Young Men's Secularist Association. After writing for a few years in the *National Reformer* and editing the short-lived *Secularist*, he founded, in 1881, the *Freethinker*, and edited it until his death. In 1883 he was sentenced, on the charge of blasphemy, to one year, with labour, for publishing satirical sketches illustrating Bible stories. He succeeded Bradlaugh in 1891 as President of the N.S.S. Foote had considerable ability both as a writer and a lecturer, and it was mainly through his efforts that bequests to Secularism and Rationalism were secured by law.

Force. In the last century it was taken, by writers like Büchner and in the phrase "the Forces of Nature," as equivalent to energy, or as the active principle associated with matter, which was said to be inert. The definition is still vague, and even Sir O. Lodge warned writers not to use the word as it is used in the expression "Vital Force" (*Life and Matter*, 1905, p. 165); yet he himself often confuses force and energy. Both are properly abstract words, but energy [see] is now used in a concrete sense. Lodge says that "matter and motion"—it would obviously be better to say matter *in* motion—are the only realities discoverable by scientific means. Beadnell's *Dictionary of Scientific Terms* (1938) defines force: "Efficient action. That which changes or tends to change the state of rest or of motion of a body. The cause of motion, of resistance to motion, or of arrest of motion." The

word is merely a convenience in engineering and in manuals of physics.

Forel, Prof. Auguste (1848–1931), Swiss physiologist. He was professor of psychiatry and Director of the Asylum at Zurich, but he wrote with authority on a remarkable range of subjects. His work on ants (*Ants*, Engl. trans. 1904) was awarded the Academy Prize and was translated into various languages, while he wrote with equal distinction on the anatomy of the brain (*The Hygiene of Nerves and Mind*, 1907), insanity, prison reform, and social morality. His chief Rationalist work is *Vie et mort* (1908), and he describes himself as an Agnostic in the symposium *Was Wir Ernst Haeckel Verdanken* (1914, I, 242). He was the leading scientific man of modern Switzerland.

Forged Decretals, The. [See Decretals.]

Forgery, Religious. In the case of all the historic religions (Persian, Brahman, Buddhist, etc.) there are documents or works of very disputed age and authorship, and they often purport to have been written in an age or by men when modern experts reject the claim. If forgery in relation to books is defined as the composition of fictitious narrative with intent to make the reader think that it is historical, or the adoption of a well-known name or other details with the same intent to deceive, it is often difficult to charge these ancient religious writers with forgery. We must make considerable allowance for the vagueness of the Oriental mind in such matters; though the belief of a writer that, while he knows that he deceives his readers, he serves a religious purpose does not absolve him from a charge of forgery. The convention of putting a "pious fraud" in a different category from other frauds is merely a device of apologetics. The modern mind finds a dishonest act in the service of religion worse than other acts of dishonesty. With all allowances for ancient Oriental conditions, however, we find that the interests of the Jewish and the Christian faith have been promoted by an unparalleled amount of real forgery. Beginning with the seventh century B.C., we have the almost certain fabrication

of a book of "the law of Moses" by the priests under Hilkiah (*Deuteronomy*) with the intent to deceive and with great profit to the priests. In the fifth century (*Ezra*) we have a monumental mass of forgery by means of which the history of the Hebrews was falsified and the older literature altered and woven into a fictitious narrative for the admitted purpose of deceiving the people in regard to the origin of their cult of Jahveh and the authority of the priests. To call this, as is customary, by the polite name of "redaction" (editing) is a gloss upon the colossal deceit which forms the basis of later Judaism. We need not trouble about later writings (Psalms of "David," Wisdom of "Solomon," etc.), though such books as *Daniel* are plain forgeries in the interest of the cult. With the founding of the new and professedly higher stage of the religion, Christianity, deliberate forgery in the interest of the religion became very common. Whatever we may make of the anonymous Gospel-writers who gradually put together a narrative which the great majority of Biblical scholars regard as in large part (birth, miracles, resurrection, etc.) fictitious, and the writers of spurious Epistles (*Apocrypha*), plain forgery (writings of "Clement," etc.) began in the second or third century and became rabid in the fourth century. In that and the following centuries a monstrous literature of saints, miracles, and martyrs [see] was fabricated, writers like Lactantius and Eusebius adorned Christian history with myths, and Popes began to derive authority from fraudulent decrees or canons of Councils. The audacity, or crime, reached its height in the Letter of St. Peter and the Donation of Constantine [see] in the eighth century, and the Forged Decretals [see] of the ninth. Upon this mass of forgeries the power of the mediæval Church was based, and the greater Popes [see Gregory VII] continued to add to them. Scholars of Renaissance days, who began to expose the grosser of the forgeries, were persecuted, and the Church of Rome to this day uses the great body of these forgeries in dealing with the mass of its poorly educated followers, while allowing the writers for its better-educated minority

to show an air of liberality by rejecting the Donation of Constantine or questioning the exploits of St. George. In our age forgery would, as a rule, be quickly exposed, but the amount of untruth purveyed, especially to the ignorant, in religious literature, particularly in the Roman Church, which forbids its members to read critics, is appalling. [See Controversy, Hints on.]

Forlong, Major-General James George Roche (1824–1904), writer. He was in the engineering service in India and was in 1872 appointed Secretary and Chief Engineer to the Government of Oudh. Forlong had in early years done some missionary work, but, like many Englishmen in the Indian service, he was led to study comparative religion and reject Christianity. He published a large work on the subject (*The Rivers of Life*, 2 vols., 1883) and later became an Hon. Assoc. and benefactor of the R.P.A.

Fortlage, Prof. Karl (1806–81), German psychologist. He was professor of psychology at Berlin (1845) and then of philosophy at Jena. At first a follower of Hegel, he abandoned his system and attempted to blend the "transcendental Pantheism" of Fichte with empirical psychology, in the early development of which he played an important part (*System der Psychologie*, 2 vols., 1855, etc.). He rejects Theism in his *Darstellung und Kritik der Beweise des Dasein Gottes* (1840).

Fouillée, Prof. Alfred Jules Émile, Ph.D. (1838–1912), French sociologist. His theory that "idea-forces" play the chief part in progress and in the evolution of religion is still prominent in works of sociology and comparative religion. It was a step toward the elimination of "will" from modern psychology. Fouillée was rather mystical, attempting to blend Plato's Idealism with modern thought; but he rejected Christianity.

Foundling Hospitals. The severe strictures of Lecky (*History of European Morals*, 1911, Ch. IV) on the Romans in regard to children, which are based upon imperfectly informed early historians (all prior to 1850), are answered elsewhere [Children; Exposure; Infanticide]. Mommsen, a much higher authority on the Romans, says that "the

moral obligations of parents toward their children were fully and deeply felt by the Roman nation" (*Roman History* 1894, I, 74)—which did not prevent ever apologists like Dr. Fairbairn writing later: "You know not how destitute of true and generous action the Roman world was"—and archaeological research has vindicated Mommsen's assurance. Sir Samuel Dill (*Roman Society from Nero to Marcus Aurelius*, 1904) shows that the founding of institutions for poor children and foundlings began under the first Emperor, expanded under Nero and Nerva, and reached its height under the Antonine Emperors. He says that "anyone who knows the inscriptions may be inclined to doubt whether private benefactions under the Antonines were less frequent and generous than in our own day" (p. 191). His works and those of Boissier give a number of texts showing how the Emperors and the wealthy helped the municipalities to care for orphans and foundlings. An inscription found in the ruins of the comparatively small town of Velleia tells us that Trajan gave funds for the maintenance there of 296 children; and it is a pleasant comment on the too common view of Roman morals that (the inscription says) only three of them were illegitimate. An inscription at Terracina records that a wealthy lady left the municipality 1,000,000 sesterces to maintain Alimentary (Free Feeding) Institutions. Pliny gave £5,000—really many times as much in modern values—for an institute for poor children at Como, and we know from his letters that this was only one of many princely donations. Hadrian, the Epicurean, so augmented the work that by the year 140, the experts estimate (Dill), at least 300,000 poor or orphan children were fed daily, and there were in, addition, a large number of orphanages. Since they were pagan institutions, the Christian Church was compelled to open a few small institutions for its own; and to represent this as the *beginning* of charity to destitute children—three centuries after Nero and Nerva—is a serious perversion of the truth. It is all the worse when we consider what happened after the fall of paganism. Lecky finds *one* foundling hospital in the

sixth century, *one* in the seventh, and *one* in the eighth—in fact, eight in nearly 1,000 years, though morals were now deplorable and “orphans” very numerous—and modern research adds none to his list. Rome had none until the thirteenth century, when the number of dead babies caught in the nets of fisherman in the Tiber shocked the Pope into taking action. The Council of Nicaea (787) had ordered that each city of the Greek world should build one, but we have no evidence that any were built. London had its first Foundling Hospital in the eighteenth century. Setting aside the rhetoric of controversialists, it is an undisputed historical fact that the charity of the Romans, the Arab-Persians, and our own sceptical age, shines conspicuously against the darkness of the intervening Christian periods.

Fourier, François Marie Charles (1772–1837), French philanthropist. A wealthy merchant who adopted Socialist ideas on the lines of Robert Owen's Socialism, but mixed with rather mystic ideas, and founded and spent large sums upon Fourierist institutions. They were discussed throughout Europe in the first half of the last century. Fourier's mysticism did not include a belief in Christianity.

Fourier, Baron Jean Baptiste Joseph (1768–1830), famous French mathematician. He entered a monastery in his youth, but abandoned Christianity and served the Republic as professor of mathematics at the Polytechnic. Napoleon, who later made him a Baron and prefect of a Department, took him to depute as one of the leaders of his corps gotavants. In spite of the opposition of and Church, with which he was never key iced, he was admitted to the boasley of Sciences in 1817, and to the French Academy in 1827. He was also a member of the British Royal Society and other learned bodies, and his *Analytic Theory of Heat* (1822) is counted a classic in physical science.

Fox, Henry, first Baron Holland (1705–74), statesman. He entered politics and became Lord of the Treasury in 1743, Secretary of War and Privy Councillor in 1746, and Leader of the House of Commons (1755–6 and 1762).

He was created Baron Holland on his retirement. Lord Chesterfield says, in his *Characters*, that Fox had “no fixed principles either of religion or morality,” but the article in Chalmers's *Biographical Dictionary* describes him as “an excellent husband” and a man “possessed in abundance of the milk of human kindness.” His son, the **Right Hon. Charles James Fox** (1749–1806), was one of the most brilliant statesmen in that period of British history, and the rival of Pitt. He was appointed Lord of the Treasury in 1773, and Foreign Secretary in 1782. A fine orator and courageous progressive, Fox, leader of the Whigs, opposed the American (and later the French) War, hailed the news of the destruction of the Bastille as one of the greatest events in history, and pressed for Parliamentary Reform, the abolition of the Slave Trade, and the removal of the disabilities of Catholics and Dissenters. He was one of the most enlightened and most outspoken statesmen in British history. Reactionaries criticized his private life, but Gibbon, who knew him well, says that “perhaps no human being was more perfectly exempt from the taint of malevolence, vanity, or falsehood” (*Miscellaneous Works*, I, 168). He allowed his wife to have prayers said at his deathbed, but Lord Holland, his nephew, told Greville that Fox, who was “no believer in religion,” was not interested in the prayers and “did not like to pretend any sentiment he did not entertain” (Greville's *Memoirs*, IV, 159). Lord Holland, who was present at his uncle's death, repeats the statement in his *Memoirs of the Whig Party* (1852). This nephew, **Henry Richard Vassall Fox**, third Baron Holland (1773–1840), sustained the progressive enthusiasm of his famous uncle and supported the Greeks and the Spaniards in their fight for liberty. He became Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster. Sydney Smith, who knew him, says that “there never existed in any human being a better heart or one more purified from all the bad passions” (*Dict. Nat. Biog.*). His wife, **Elizabeth Vassall Fox** (1770–1845), was, as Lady Holland, one of the best known and most brilliant women in London. Holland House was one of the chief centres of culture and wit, and

the principal members of the family were Agnostics and attracted all the accomplished sceptics of the metropolis. Greville, who frequented it, describes Lady Holland as "a social light which illumined and adorned England, and even Europe, for half a century" (*Memoirs*, V, 313) and says that she was "known to be destitute of all religious opinions" (314). Another visitor in later years, the Hon. H. J. Coke, says that she had no belief in a future life (*Tracks of a Rolling Stone*, 1905, p. 13).

Fox, William Johnson (1786-1864), orator and politician. He was a Congregationalist minister until 1812, when he changed to the Unitarian Church. In 1824 he was appointed to South Place Chapel, which was built for him, and he later drew it from Unitarianism to a liberal Theism. He followed Bentham in social philosophy, and his splendid powers as an orator were of great service. "He was the bravest of us all," Francis Place said; and he was one of the chief speakers of the Anti-Corn-Law League. He retired from South Place in 1852, and Conway completed its development. *Life of W. J. Fox* (1910), by Dr. R. and E. Garnett.

France, Jacques Anatole (1844-1924), French novelist. He was Librarian of the Senate and had published a volume of verse and a biography of A. de Vigny when, in 1881, his *Crime de Sylvestre Bonnard* inaugurated the series of novels which gave him a unique place in world-literature. His works throughout reflect his genial paganism, but he wrote also a drastic criticism of the Church (*L'église et la République*, 1905), and in A. Brisson's *Les prophètes* (1903) he emphatically disowns all religion. He was Hon. President of the French National Association of Freethinkers. In a caustic letter to the International Congress of Freethinkers at Paris, in 1904, he said: "The gods advance, but they always lag behind the thoughts of men. . . . The Christian God was once a Jew. Now he is an Anti-Semite."

France, Religion in. In his special study of the attitude of the people to the Church during the Revolution (*Christianity and the French Revolution*, Engl. trans. 1927), Prof. Aulard, the highest authority on the subject, is so impressed

by the speed with which they abandoned religion, in spite of the efforts of Danton and Robespierre to protect the influence of the Church, that he concludes that the faith had never had deep roots in the country. Many articles in this work bearing upon mediæval and later France [Abelard; Feast of Fools; Louis XIV; etc.] confirm this, and the ease with which Protestantism [see Huguenots] captured the sincerely religious minority in the sixteenth century gives the same impression. The history of the Church explains this. From the sixth century [see Franks] to the eighteenth the French Church was lenient to moral disorders, in priests and people, so that its creed was held lightly. Cardinal Richelieu [see] gravely threatened to sever the Church from Rome, and for a century after his time the French clergy asserted a remarkable degree of independence. [See Gallican Church.] Scepticism flourished more in Paris than in any other city, while in the provinces a defiant devil-worship captured entire regions. The provincial judge L'Ancre of the seventeenth century has left us an amazing picture of it in his book *L'incrédulité et mescréance du sortilège pleinement convaincu* (1622). [See Black Mass; Satanism.] The first great wave of modern scepticism (due to the works of Rousseau, Voltaire, and the Encyclopædists) met little opposition except from the clergy, and the notorious corruption of the leading prelates deprived these of moral power. These matters and what happened during the Revolution will be discussed in a later article [French Revolution]. Napoleon [see], frankly for political reasons restored the power of the Church, for the return of the monarchy gave least customary Fascist authority. But where sceptics of Paris fought stubbornly, the Catholic writer Veuillot said, in the thirties, that it was as surprising to see a young man enter a church as to see a Moslem; but Napoleon III, again for purely political reasons, helped the Church to regain power after 1848, and the Communal rising of 1871 frightened the sceptical middle class into an alliance with it. The faith had, however, no real roots, and from 1880 onward Catholics dwindled to a minority of the entire

country, and have from that date never had a President or leading statesman of the country until the co-operation of the Vatican with Hitler, and the deliberate use of loose women to seduce the leading Radical statesmen, gave power to Pétain, Weygand, Darlan, and Laval—all strict Catholics.

McCabe's *Decay of the Church of Rome* (1909) proved, by Catholic authorities and statistics, that in the first decade of the present century there were, at the most, 5,500,000 Catholics out of a population of 40,000,000, and such high authorities as Sabatier put the number at about 4,000,000. During the European War (1914-18) the powerful body of French Freethinkers voluntarily dissolved in a sort of "gentleman's agreement" with the Church to avoid destruction of the national effort—so the ex-minister Buisson informed the present writer—but the Church seized the opportunity to reorganize, and inaugurated a vigorous campaign. It was again heavily favoured by political circumstances. Alsace and Lorraine, taken over from Germany, remained sullen and troublesome, and, since they were overwhelmingly Catholic, the Vatican made its usual deal with the Government: we will keep them quiet—at a price. Joan of Arc was "canonized"; Rationalist statesmen attended church ceremonies; criticism of religion was discouraged; the Papal Nuncio at Paris had a voice in foreign politics; and so on. The royalists now organized and became aggressive and, though the Vatican checked their premature demonstrations, the country was split into deeply hostile factions, and the Church got priest-ridden politicians like Laval and officers like Pétain and Weygand in key positions. Yet, in spite of the boasts of progress, in English Catholic literature, the Church had not regained ground in numbers. Catholic writers like G. Goyau (*L'effort Catholique dans la France d'aujourd'hui* (1922), say that the number of Catholics (including more than 1,000,000 accessions in Alsace-Lorraine) was estimated at between five and ten millions; and Denis Gwynn (*The Catholic Reaction in France*, 1924), a Catholic writer resident in France, repudiated the higher figure. English

Catholics often try to reduce the significance of the figures by drawing a distinction between "practising" and "non-practising" Catholics. They do not explain that their Church does not recognize secession, and so they continue to include seceders. What happened in 1940 we do not yet clearly know, but fragments of news which have escaped the Catholic censors and appeared in British papers—as that it was the Catholic Laval who bribed and intrigued to get supreme power entrusted to Pétain (*Annual Register*, 1940), that the Pope was the first foreign power to congratulate Pétain, that the surrender of Catholic Belgium was arranged in Paris, that Italy, Spain, and the new France were to receive a mandate from the Pope to control South America, that the German bishops were checked by the Pope in a proposal to publish a new agreement with Hitler, and that Cardinal Hinsley has warned British Catholics to expect a violent attack on their Church in England at the close of the War—prepare us for another sordid revelation of Papal activity. But the elections of 1946, at which the Catholics dare not appear under that name, show that the proportion of Catholics remains the same.

Franciscans. An Order of "friars" (a corruption of *fratres* or "brothers") founded in 1210 by an Italian, Giovanni Bernardone (nicknamed Francesco, or the Frenchman) of Assisi, who, like Ignatius of Loyola, was converted from gay ways by a severe illness. Though of a well-to-do family, he adopted the brown robe and roving life of a beggar; hence the brown (in some cases, as in mediæval England, grey) tunic, cord, and sandals which his followers still wear. Others joined him, and with great difficulty, on account of the general disdain of the corruption of the monks, he got the Pope to recognize the new Order. The members were called "friars" because there was at first no distinction of priests and lay brothers and no plan to promote members to the priesthood. The rich laity, unaccustomed to see monks who really lived ascetically, showered gifts upon them (in return for prayers), and, as Francis was a man of mediocre intelligence, ambitious men entered and seized the

opportunity. While practically all our literature now uses lyrical language about the rise of the friars, it is a tradition in their Order itself that Francis died (1226) of a broken heart at sight of the speedy corruption of his followers, and that Antony of Padua, its most fervent and ablest member, was punished for resisting the corrupt authorities. Four years after the death of Francis, the chief schemer, Brother Elias, a man who loved wealth and luxury, and his supporters, smashed in the doors of the Chapter (election) House and got Elias nominated General. He had, within twenty years of the founding of the Order, a stud of horses and a comfortable house. His successors, with full Papal approval, maintained his policy, and the Order grew rich and vicious. The more zealous were driven out and formed the Spirituals or the Fratricelli, hundreds of whom were burned at the stake as heretics. Except for this last detail, which may be read in any history of the time, this story of the corruption of the Order is taken, not from opponents, but from the history of the Order by one of its ablest (or one of its very few able) historical writers and quite orthodox members in modern times, Fr. H. Holtzappel (*Handbuch der Geschichte des Franziskanenordens*, 1909, the highest authority on the subject); yet none of the numerous French, British, and American writers on the friars ever notices it.

The coming of the friars to England, about the end of the thirteenth century, is told by all writers in the same idyllic terms, and they all omit to state that within a few years these friars in England offered Pope Boniface VIII [see], one of the most openly disreputable of Popes, a sum of £20,000, which they deposited with the bankers, if he would declare that, in spite of their vow of poverty, individual and collective (according to all theologians), they could collectively own property. Boniface decided that they could not, and, since they therefore could not own the £20,000, he appropriated the sum; and the English friars, nevertheless, grew rich and corrupt. It was the same in all countries. Fr. Luke Wadding, the chief mediæval historian of the Order, tells how, in

1495, Cardinal Ximenes (a friar) was put at the head of the Spanish brethren by Isabella. They appealed angrily to Rome; but Isabella insisted, and they were ordered to reform their corrupt ways or go into exile. At Toledo they marched out in a body, a cross-bearer at their head, chanting the 114th Psalm, preferring exile (they said) to reform. But they did not leave Spain, and a decree of Philip II of the year 1545 tells us that they did not reform. By this time the sloth, greed, and sensuality of the great majority of them were derided throughout Europe. In Italy, Spain, and Latin America they continued in the vicious ways of pre-Reformation days. A work (an official report) published by D. Barry in London in 1826, *Noticias secretas de America*, which was stolen from the Spanish Archives by the Revolutionaries, gives a quite amusing picture of the Spanish-American friars and their wives and families. For the life of the friars in England to-day, a regime of petty hypocrisy and deception with many scandals, see McCabe's *Twelve Years in a Monastery* (cheap ed., 1930).

It is often very difficult to appraise the value of mediæval indictments of the friars, and in the above only Catholic, and mainly loyal Franciscan, authorities have been quoted. But what has happened in Germany and Austria in recent years has disclosed epidemic unnatural vice in Franciscan friaries, on a scale not equalled in any mediæval document, and far beyond even the suggestions of Boccaccio and Rabelais. In the last twenty years more than twenty eulogies of the "beautiful life" of the Franciscans have been published in England, and reviewers have urged them upon the public. Yet since 1936 there has been a sensational exposure of the lowest vice in the Franciscan monasteries—houses of brothers, with few priests, but recognized in Catholic literature as monasteries—in Germany. Of 400 friars in the Province of Westphalia, 276 were arrested on a charge of sodomy (and in many cases of seduction of the young or the feeble-minded under their charge) and fifty others fled from the country to avoid arrest. Details will be given under Germany, Religion

in, and it will be shown that the trials and convictions, which were accepted by the German Catholics of the western provinces, where they occurred, are unimpeachable from the juridical point of view. The accused confessed their acts, with incredibly sordid details, and all witnesses and officials were Catholics. The exposure spread to Austria, when it was brought under the Nazis, and is said—here evidence is unreliable—to have extended to Poland since the conquest. That they are corrupt in a different way in the Catholic Republics of South America is shown above. It would be quite wrong to suppose that such corruption exists in all branches of the Order, but this amazing exposure in modern times—and it transpired in court that the situation was not of recent origin—lends credibility to mediæval charges and shows that the unnatural life does in fact in all ages lead to very grave hypocrisy. It is part of the scandalous falseness (as regards religion) of modern public instruction that these truths should be wholly suppressed and a quite untruthful account of the friars, mediæval and modern, should be pressed upon the public.

François de Neufchâteau, Count Nicolas Louis (1750–1828), French statesman. He won high distinction as a poet in his teens, and Voltaire engaged him as secretary. Later he became General Procurator of Haiti, moderate Republican member of the Revolutionary Legislative Assembly, and in 1798 one of the three members of the Directorate. Napoleon, to whom he rallied, made him a Count and President of the Senate, and he never abandoned his Rationalist opinions.

Frankland, Sir Edward, K.C.B., Ph.D., D.C.L., LL.D., F.R.S. (1825–99), chemist. He taught chemistry in the Owenite Queenwood College and then spent a year with Tyndall at Marburg University. Returning to England, he was professor of chemistry at, successively, St. Bartholomew's Hospital, the Royal Institution, and the Royal College of Chemistry. He was, says Prof. Hartog in the *Dictionary of National Biography*, "an exceptionally brilliant and accomplished man of science." Besides the above honours he received the Royal

Medal of the Royal Society, the Copley Medal, and diplomas from many foreign learned bodies. He tells us in a fragmentary autobiography that he had abandoned belief in God and immortality as well as the Christian creed (*Sketches From the Life of Sir E. Frankland*, 1902, pp. 41–8).

Franklin, Benjamin, LL.D., F.R.S. (1706–90), American statesman. He was intended for the Church, but got himself apprenticed to printing and devoured books. His reading included English Deistic works, and at the age of twenty he published a Deistic pamphlet. He started a printing business at Philadelphia, bought the *Pennsylvania Gazette*, and founded the Philadelphia Public Library. Some years later he founded the American Philosophical Society and devoted himself for twenty years to science and invention. He was appointed, in 1764, Postmaster-General for the Colonies, and in 1775 represented them in London; and he was one of the signatories of the Declaration of Independence and President of the State of Pennsylvania. Franklin was, says Prof. Fiske in Appleton's *Cyclopædia of American Biography*, "in many respects one of the greatest of Americans." His Rationalism cannot be disputed by zealots, as is that of Washington or Lincoln, because he says in his *Autobiography* that he left the Presbyterian Church in 1734 and remained a Deist throughout life (1909 ed., pp. 185–8).

Franks, The. Though it is usual to describe the French as a Latin nation because a corruption of Latin became the national tongue, the ancient Franks, who were a Teutonic people, formed the body of the nation. From the banks of the Rhine they spread through Belgium, and in the fifth century covered the whole of Gaul and were converted to Christianity. They are of interest because we happen to have a better knowledge of them than of the Italians, Spaniards, or Anglo-Saxons in the early part of the Dark Age, and can check the reckless claim that Christian virtue succeeded pagan vice in Europe. Gregory, Bishop of Tours in the sixth century, one of the few educated Gauls who survived the Roman collapse, wrote a *History of the Franks* (Engl. trans.

1927) which we still have. It is one of the most comprehensive pictures of vice and crime in literature: a record of veritable savagery on the part of clergy, nobility, and princes (and especially princesses). Even Lecky, who is so eager to show that Christianity improved the world, gives (*History of European Morals*, II, p. 100) a shuddering summary of part of Gregory's *History*; and he then observes that the age was "eminently religious." It was the age of the profoundly religious Pope Gregory I, who [see] corresponded amiably with, and showered compliments upon, the vilest woman of them all, Queen Brunichildis. France was still as savage in the days of Charles Martel in the eighth century, was little improved by the "reforms" of the loose-living Charlemagne in the ninth, and was found by St. Boniface [see] to be in a state of general ecclesiastical corruption. It is piquant that the Church counts far more "saints" in France in these four centuries than in all the remainder of its history.

Frazer, Sir James George, D.C.L., LL.D., Litt.D. (1854-1941), anthropologist. He was appointed professor of social anthropology at Liverpool University in 1907, but is best known throughout the world as the author of the series of learned and sumptuous volumes on comparative religion which have the collective title of *The Golden Bough* [see Diana]. The first volume appeared in 1890 and the twelfth in 1915—a feat comparable with Gibbon's *Decline and Fall* and Spencer's *Synthetic Philosophy*. There is an abridged edition in one volume (1922). Few expressions of Frazer's personal belief occur in the volumes, though in the Preface to the second edition of the *Golden Bough* (1900, p. xxii) he acknowledges that his work "strikes at the foundations of beliefs in which the hopes and aspirations of humanity through long ages have sought a refuge." In later works (*Folk-Lore in the Old Testament*, 1908; *The Belief in Immortality and the Worship of the Dead*, 3 vols., 1913-24; and *The Fear of the Dead in Primitive Religion*, 3 vols., 1933-6) his personal creed is clearer, though he disliked being labelled, and his biographer, R. A. Downie

(James George Frazer, 1940), does not discuss his Rationalism. The Dean of the Chapel of Trinity College said after his death: "He was not an Atheist. I would say perhaps that he held his judgment in suspense." In other words, he was an Agnostic; but the Dean gave him a religious funeral. *News-Chronicle*, May 9, 1941.

Frederic II (1194-1250), the Wonder of the World. It may be thought characteristic of our time that while one of the leading Christian writers of the thirteenth century called the great Rationalist prince "the Wonder of the World," and even distinguished Church writers of the last century recognized his towering genius, we now pay little attention to him. In many respects he is one of the most significant figures of the Middle Ages. Son of a Norman princess and a German prince, and reared in the Arab-Norman kingdom of Sicily, he represents, and in large part he effected, the grafting of a higher culture upon the mediæval barbarity of Europe. In the year of his birth, his father, the German Emperor, extinguished, with all the savagery that still characterized German princes, the line of Norman kings whose equal savagery had been transmuted into a high civilization in two generations by contact with the Sicilian Arabs whom they conquered. The Pope of the time, and probably the greatest of the Popes in point of power and religious conviction, Innocent III, instead of furthering the promise of this blend of Teutonic strength and Arab culture, unscrupulously promoted, in the interest of the Church, the fierce wars of rival claimants of the imperial crown, which belonged to his ward, the infant Frederic, and played upon the anæmic piety of the widow to get power over Sicily and the boy. Thus Frederic's precocious mind opened upon a world of Papal treachery. He was almost robbed of his heritage, and the Pope compelled him at the age of fourteen to wed a most uncongenial Spanish princess of twenty-one. In contrast to this, his Arab tutors taught him a gracious philosophy of life and a love of art and science, while the Oriental atmosphere of the palaces helped to give him an admirably

balanced ideal of beauty and strength. If we add that Innocent III was succeeded by Popes who had all his sourness and arrogance without his greatness, we see that the lines of Frederic's life were predetermined.

He was, after a vigorous campaign to establish his legitimate rule in Germany and Italy, distracted all his life from his great aim of restoring civilization to Europe and securing the development of science by struggles with three successive Popes for whom no historian has now a word of excuse or admiration. Innocent IV, who, says Dr. Holland, "surpassed all his predecessors in the ferocity and unscrupulousness of his attacks on the Emperor," used the new friars to inflame the people against him everywhere. Gregory IX was vulgar and almost apoplectic in his invective, and, against the rules laid down sternly by the Popes themselves, he called for a Crusade against Frederic's kingdom while he was absent on Crusade—because Frederic got from the Sultan all that was wanted by friendly negotiation. To their repeated anathemas Frederic replied with an astonishing letter to his fellow-kings urging them to rebel against the miserable Papacy. In spite of this life-long distraction, he, by linking the crown of Italy with that of Norman-Arab Sicily—he wore seven crowns—greatly promoted the development which was soon to flower in the Italian Renaissance, and found a home for science in the cities of North Italy. He was the most accomplished man of his age, and so openly sceptical that it was widely believed that he wrote the anonymous work *The Three Impostors* (Moses, Christ, and Mohammed). One must lack the historical sense to overlook his great work for culture and humanity and dilate censoriously upon his elegant palaces and still more elegant harems. As to his being the first monarch to penalize heresy, though he did not enact the death penalty which the Popes wanted, this was wrested from him by the Popes when the struggle compelled him to make concessions. We have no evidence that he applied his law. It was Matthew of Paris, one of the most accomplished Christian writers of the time, who at his death

wrote that "the greatest of earthly princes, the Wonder of the World" (*Stupor Mundi*), had passed away. The reigning Pope disgusted Christendom by a letter to the world in such terms as "Let the heavens and the earth break into joy." Freeman (*Historical Essays*, "Frederic II") describes him as "the most gifted of the sons of men, by nature more than the peer of Alexander, of Constantine, or of Charlemagne: in mere genius, in mere accomplishments, the greatest prince who ever wore a crown." Frederic's chief modern biographer, Allshorn, affects to dispute this, but later admits that "in genius he has had no superior among the princes of the world," and he had "a singularly enlightened conception of the arts of government." His conception was that of the sceptical Caliphs of the Arab civilization [see]. Allshorn's *Stupor Mundi* (1912) is the best modern study, but not adequate to the great theme.

Frederic the Great (1712-86). Without disputing the title of this second famous Rationalist prince to be called "the Great," we may regret that it had not been pre-empted for the far greater Frederic of Sicily and Germany, but Christian historians had preferred to reserve it for such men as Constantine, Justinian, Charlemagne, and Pope Gregory I. Apart from aggressive wars and a certain Machiavellism in diplomacy, which we may connect with the painful character of his education and the demoralized condition of Germany, Frederic ruled his kingdom of Prussia with enlightenment and beneficence. He abolished serfdom on the royal domains (while it lingered in France and Russia), founded new industries, granted freedom of speech and religion, codified the law, and greatly promoted art, literature, and education. Prussia led Europe in the establishment of a system of schools. In his *Anti-Machiavel*, which was written before his accession (1740), he lays it down that a monarch must be "the first servant of the State." He is not responsible for—indeed, he detested—the Prussian nationalism which ever since the eighteenth century has tainted Germany. Frederic would make it an international centre of culture, and was himself more French than German.

His letters, especially to Voltaire, freely express his Deistic Rationalism (in his *Collected Works*, 31 vols., 1846-57).

Freemasonry. The origin of the organization is still obscure. The symbolism and mystic verbiage which led some writers to trace it to ancient Egypt were really adopted less than two centuries ago, and a widely accepted opinion is that the body is in some sense a survival of the ancient Roman unions of workers [see *Colleges and Guilds*] which are said to have reached Roman Britain. The earliest documents, which are English, belong to the fourteenth century, and tell of a code of rules of conduct which was read to applicants for initiation. Others besides working masons were admitted, but what precisely is meant by the description "free" is disputed. The religious aspect is more relevant here. Until 1877, when the Grand Orient of France cut out references to the "Grand Architect" and required no belief in God or immortality, the Freemasons were, at least in profession, definitely religious. The action of the French caused a schism, several Grand Lodges in the United States refusing to recognize the Swiss body because it supported the French. The rabid hostility to it of the Papal authorities also is comparatively modern, and is due to the fact that the work which in the course of the nineteenth century destroyed religion in the greater part of France was largely organized in the Lodges. It was the same in the revolutionary movement against Church and State in Latin America, Spain, and Portugal. Catholics are still forbidden under pain of excommunication to join a Lodge, though the old anti-clerical fire is dimmed even in French Freemasonry.

Freethought. In his *Short History of Freethought* (1915, I, pp. 1-6) Robertson finds the word "Freethinker" first used in English literature of the seventeenth century, though French writers had used the words "Libertins" and "Esprits forts" for sceptics. Freedom of speech was much discussed after the Restoration, and the title "Rationalist," which had been used in Elizabeth's time, but was rare, was superseded by "Freethinker." Collins's *Discourse of Free-*

thinking (1713) was occasioned by an orthodox work, *The Rise and Growth of a Sect called Freethinkers*. At this time even heterodox religious sects adopted the name, and the first periodical that called itself *The Freethinker* was not concerned with religion. The meaning was fixed in the course of the eighteenth century. Like the word "Rationalism," Freethought means that a man repudiates all coercion of authority or tradition in forming his opinions on religion, so that the witticisms of superficial opponents about the word "free" are pointless. The word is now chiefly used by Secularists, since their organ, founded by G. W. Foote in 1881, is called *The Freethinker*, and it does not necessarily imply Atheism.

Free Will. The belief that a man has the power to act without compulsion of material circumstances. The occasional statement that an act of free will would be "an uncaused act" would not be accepted by indeterminists because they regard the soul or mind as the cause of an act. The history of the controversy has been sufficiently sketched in an earlier article [*Determinism*]. The modern controversy is whether any of a man's acts—it is admitted that the great majority are automatic or routine actions—are not as inevitably determined by the neural conditions as are the actions of animals. The attempt to give the issue a moral significance by pleading that where there is no freedom there is no responsibility has been generally abandoned by serious thinkers. The challenge of free will has not made the least difference to social conduct; rather, the progressive rejection of the idea of soul in the last hundred years has been accompanied by a progressive improvement of the general character [Crime, etc.]. The spirited psychological controversy of the last century brought out two further facts: first, that the idea of freedom, which seems superficially so clear, is very vague and elusive, and, secondly, that the mechanism of man's higher actions is so intricate and so imperfectly known that the acts themselves must have a very different character from those due in animals to ordinary automatic reflexes. In this more intricate mechanism, with stored

(or delayed-action) impulses, as well as those received at any given moment, there is often bound to be a conflict of motives or impulses to action and a delay, which might run to months or even years—as in the idea of committing murder or suicide—between the thought of the action in consciousness and its execution. Before the end of the last century psychologists in increasing numbers concluded that what is claimed to be a consciousness of free will is a consciousness that alternative or conflicting motives of action restrain each other until one gets (possibly from sub-conscious activity) a decisive preponderance and automatically issues in action. Even in what seems to the inexpert a very clear proof of free will—for instance, when I “please myself” whether I go to my destination by taxi, bus, or train, whether I take a holiday at Cromer or in Devonshire—the explanation is adequate. See a small work by C. Cohen, *Determinism or Free Will* (1912).

In the meantime, however, a change occurred in psychology which made the old controversy seem to most experts superfluous. The claim that man alone enjoyed freedom in a deterministic universe was based upon the belief that he had a spiritual “soul.” Only a minority of psychologists, who moved rather on religious or philosophical lines, held this even thirty years ago, and the word is almost never mentioned in modern psychological (and very rarely in philosophical) works. The word “mind” remained, but this in turn has been generally abandoned [see *Brain and Mind*]. Now that, as psychology advances, the word “will” itself is being abandoned, we have no basis left for the old belief in free will. References to recent literature will be given in the article *Psychology*, but it may be said, summarily, that, of modern scientific manuals, not one in ten even deigns to notice the question of the freedom of the will, and more than half never mention will. Prof. Young, in a special work (*The Motivation of Behaviour*, 1936), tells how several series of searching experiments were made on students, and they disclosed “no trace of a definite factor which we could call

will.” Modern psychology lays more stress on “sets” or attitudes formed by our inherited fundamental urges and experience or learning. Most experts say that what used to be called volition (later conation, or “hormic force,” or self-orientation) is an act of intelligence: that a desire is “anticipatory thinking.” The point will be better treated under *Will*, and the general recent development under *Psychology*.

French Revolution, Religion and the. There is no other instance in history of so loose a use of the word “revolution” as in the phrase “French Revolution.” A revolt may, especially when it puts rival armies in the field, last for months or years; but once it has accomplished its aim and definitely established its own government the revolution is considered to be over. In the case of the French revolt against absolute monarchy in the eighteenth century the phrase is made to cover five years, and, whatever the original motive was, this enables apologists to impute all crimes or follies that were committed from 1789 to 1794 to a body of men who carried an almost bloodless revolution against a regime that had a horrible record of injustice and then entered upon, and for three years persevered in, a sober and enlightened work of reconstruction. The wanton libel which is exposed in an earlier article [*Feast of Reason*—a libel retailed to this day by even historical writers and literary men—is only one of many; yet most of them were refuted in Carlyle’s history and other works of a century ago and have been excluded from serious history for many decades. A few points only can be discussed here, and it is enough by way of authority to say that the following observations are supported by the two standard works on the Revolution (vol. III, 1904, of the *Cambridge Modern History*, and Vols. I and II of Lavisse’s *Histoire de France Contemporaine*, 1921), supplemented by the specialist work of the highest recent authority, Prof. Aulard’s *Christianity and the French Revolution* (Engl. trans. 1927).

(1) The French Revolution of 1789 was an inevitable and beneficent revolt against a cruel and very corrupt tyranny. It was organized and conducted by a

body of nobles and middle-class representatives of the people (and a few priests), and in the circumstances it was remarkably free from bloodshed. The people, who had been kept by Church and State in a 90 per cent illiteracy and had been grossly exploited for centuries, broke into disorder in many places, but, the National Assembly, controlled by a majority of moderates, did its best to suppress such outbreaks. About the evils of the *ancien régime* there is no dispute. "The masses were ignorant and brutalized" (*Camb. Mod. Hist.*), crushed by appalling taxation and maddened by the tyranny of local *seigneurs*. Brisson shows in his *Histoire de travail* (1906) that the immense majority earned only fivepence a day. The Church owned one-fifteenth of the total wealth of the country (about £1,200,000,000) and paid no taxes; and even in its highest representatives—Cardinal de Rohan, Archbishop de Brienne, Archbishop Dillon, etc.—was cynically and luxuriously corrupt. By August 1789 it was clear that repression would not solve the problem. So conscious were nobles and prelates of their guilt that in the National Assembly on August 4th, as described in the *Moniteur* next day, their leaders voluntarily surrendered all their privileges and accepted the Revolution. For this rarely noticed development see McCabe's *Talleyrand* (1906, p. 76). We have, therefore, not to defend the Rationalist writers of France (Rousseau and the Encyclopædists) against blame for their predominant share in causing the Revolution, but to put this to their credit.

(2) A point of cardinal importance in judging the Revolution is to realize clearly that the men (Lafayette, Talleyrand, Mirabeau, Sieyès, etc.) who had led the Revolution retired in September 1791 and left power to a set of men of less ability and often inferior character. To this point the work had been soberly constructive and enlightened and had produced a Constitution (including the establishment of the Roman Church and the monarchy) much milder than that of the United States. And the reason why these men stood aside was a piece of political morality which was

without parallel. In order to avoid even the appearance of corruption they bound themselves to take no office under the new Constitution. Until then there had been no interference with religion, although the Pope had (March 1890) bitterly denounced their Declaration of the Rights of Man—rights which all now regard as elementary—and the French clergy abroad were urging the Powers to invade France. The festival of Corpus Christi, in July 1791, was celebrated as usual in the streets of Paris, the National Guard lining the route and all citizens being compelled to decorate their houses. The King was not in danger until long afterwards, and the guillotine was unknown.

(3) Even the new men worked on the whole admirably for a year, but in the summer of 1792 there were 90,000 Prussians ready to invade France, and England, Austria, Sardinia, Naples, and Sweden, stirred by the fugitive clergy and the Pope, prepared to assist; there was, as transpired in 1794, a formidable Catholic "fifth column" in France ready to co-operate with them; and the priests kindled in the west a gruesome civil war which drew off half the Army. The September Massacre followed; but even Sir R. Lodge, who repeats many libels of the Revolution in his *Modern Europe* (1909), ascribes this to "not more than five or six hundred men." It will be examined in a later article [*September Massacre*], but the most recent authorities find that only about 1,100 were killed, and of these the majority were criminals and prostitutes from the jails, the butchers declaring that their aim was "to purify Paris." In other words, the murderers were at least in large part Catholics. They were, in any case, some 500 out of 20,000,000 people. The Terror[*see*] which followed in 1793 and 1794 was the outcome of a political feud. The summary of research in Lavis's *Histoire* (II, p. 199) shows that, of about 18,000 victims in two years—the St. Bartholomew Massacre had had 50,000 in a few days—67 per cent were working men, and only 8 per cent priests and nuns; and the chief butcher, Robespierre, was a firm believer in God, a man who hated and persecuted Atheism.

(4) The common charge that the leaders of the Revolution "robbed the people of their religion," and so caused the horrors, is thus seen to be due to a gross historical ignorance and a refusal to consult any recognized authority. Not only the earlier revolutionary leaders, but Danton (though an Atheist) and Robespierre maintained the establishment of the Church and heatedly resisted all attempts to destroy it. The myth of the Goddess of Reason exposed in a previous article [Feast of Reason] is typical of the stuff on which writers rely who repeat that the people were deprived of, or in any degree persuaded to abandon, religion. Prof. Aulard (pp. 31-44) shows by abundant evidence that the movement began with the people and the priests. It was a rural district far from Paris that first declared its abandonment of the Church, and Catholic Strasburg that first closed its cathedral. The heads of the Government resisted all the anti-clerical demands of the representatives of the people until the end of 1793, when the great majority of the people had disowned the Church; and it was under the auspices of Robespierre's Cult of the Supreme Being—practically Unitarianism—that the bulk of the massacres of the Terror were perpetrated. But there were still millions of Catholics secretly organized in the provinces, and it will be shown elsewhere [see *White Terror*] that, as soon as Robespierre fell, these butchered Republicans by the thousand, and with such savagery as had been witnessed only in the worst days of the Red Terror. Yet so deeply is the false account of the Revolution and religion rooted in English tradition, while all serious history rebukes it, that shortly after the Russian Revolution an editorial in *Nature*, our leading scientific periodical, called upon British scientists to support religion in view of the horrid example of the French Revolution!

Fréret, Nicolas (1688-1749), French writer. A Parisian lawyer and distinguished scholar who was the first Frenchman to describe himself as an Atheist in his *Lettre de Thrasybule à Leucippe*, (1758). He was a very learned and prolific writer—his works were published in 20 vols. in 1796—and this

was recognized by his appointment as Perpetual Secretary of the Academy of Inscriptions.

Freud, Prof. Sigmund, M.D., LL.D. (1856-1939), founder of Psycho-analysis. A professor of neurology at Vienna University (1902-38) who, having studied neurotic patients at the Salpêtrière, in France, made a concentrated inquiry into the subconscious basis of neuroses and issued a series of works (*Studien über Hysterie*, 1895; *Über dem Traum*, 1901, etc.) which founded the new science of psycho-analysis. His complete works, the chief of which were translated into many languages, fill 12 vols. In his last published book, *Der Mann Moses und die Monotheistische Religion* (1939), he is thoroughly Rationalistic, and in the last years of his life he was an Honorary Associate of the R.P.A. [See *Psycho-Analysis*.]

Freycinet, Charles Louis de Saulces de (1828-1923), French statesmen. In a long career of distinguished public service he held some of the highest offices of State—President of the Senate, Minister of Public Works, twice Minister of War, twice Foreign Minister, and three times Premier—and these periods covered the period of the secularization of France, in which he cordially co-operated. He was a member of the Academy and author of a number of economic and mathematical works.

Froebel, Friedrich (1782-1852), German pioneer of education. A forester, surveyor, and architect in early years, he studied education under Pestalozzi, and ranks second to him in the history of pædagogy. His chief work, *Die Menschen-Erziehung*, had a great influence in Germany, though the Prussian Government refused to allow him to open kindergartens because (mainly) of his rejection of Christianity. He was a Pantheist, as his chief biographers show (H. Goldammer, *A. Froebel's Weltanschauung*, 1866, and Pastor Schmiedler's *Die religiösen Anschauungen F. Froebels*, 1883), but the interference of the clergy with his work checked his personal professions as regards religion.

Froude, James Anthony, M.A. (1818-94), historian. Froude joined the Tractarians (High Church) while he was at Oxford (Oriel) and took minor orders in

1844, but he fell under the influence of the works of Carlyle and Goethe and did not go beyond the diaconate. In his autobiographical novel *Shadows of the Clouds* (1847) he professes belief in God, but describes all other religious beliefs as "shifting clouds" (p. 180). In 1849 he made a stronger statement in his *Nemesis of Faith* and resigned his Fellowship of Exeter College; and in 1872 he availed himself of the Clergy Disabilities Relief Act to shed his orders, though he remained a Theist. He spent twenty years on the writing of his famous *History of England* (first two vols., 1856), which gave him such distinction that in 1892 he was, to the great anger of the clergy, appointed Regius Professor of Modern History at Oxford.

Fuegians, The. [See **Yahgans.**]

Fuller, Sarah Margaret, Marchioness of Ossoli (1810-50), American writer. A brilliant pupil in her girlhood—she learned Latin at six, and Greek at thirteen—she became a teacher at Boston and joined the Transcendentalist group. She edited their *Dial* and won a high reputation as literary critic to the *New York Tribune*. At Rome she married the Marquis of Ossoli, who took part in the anti-Papal Revolution of 1848; and at its failure both were drowned fleeing to America. Emerson, Channing, and others, wrote very appreciative biographies of her, but she was a more advanced Pantheist even than Emerson. In a profession of faith (*Credo*) which is published as an appendix to Braun's *Margaret Fuller and Goethe* (1910, p. 254) she says: "You see how wide the gulf that separates me from the Christian Church."

Fundamentalism. A movement within the Churches in America to defend the "fundamentals" of the Christian faith and expel ministers who refuse to subscribe to them. In the examination of American recruits for the European War (1917-18) it was found that so many men (nine out of ten) disowned the Christian creed that there was a strong agitation in the Churches to jettison or explain away as many dogmas as possible. The reactionaries, especially of the Baptist Church, which in America is less advanced than the Methodist, began the fight for the fundamentals,

and a sermon of Dr. Fosdick, in 1922 ("Shall the Fundamentalists Win?"), made the movement widely known. The General Assembly of Fosdick's Church, the Presbyterian, stated the fundamental doctrines to be: the Virgin Birth, the Resurrection, the Inerrancy of Scripture, the Atonement, and Miracles. Even the bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church attempted to set up a Fundamentalist minimum in 1923, but were forced by their professors of divinity to withdraw. When the Baptists induced several States to forbid the teaching of evolution in their schools and fiercely resisted the repeal of Prohibition—tobacco was to be the next item—the phrase "Funny-Mentalists" became popular in America. The Fundamentalist leader, Dr. Riley, told the present writer (with whom he had a number of public debates) that he believed he had 15,000,000 followers. American writers and journalists carefully refrain from pointing out, because of its social and political power, that the Roman Church is in this respect in precisely the same position as the Baptist, and the analysis of men of intellectual or other distinction in *Who's Who* puts it [see **Culture and Christianity**] on the same very low cultural level. If we add the 15,000,000 Catholics to the Baptist and other Fundamentalists, we find that the great majority of members of Churches in America are in that mental stage; and it is the same in England. The facts do not seem to be known to those who say that criticism of these mediæval doctrines is now superfluous. [See also **Modernism.**]

Funerals, Secular. It ought to be known to all Rationalists that any person may, by invitation of the relatives of the deceased, conduct a funeral service, and in any form he cares. There is not, as there is in the Marriage Service, any clause that is legally required. The law requires no service and is not interested in it. The most outspoken Agnostics—Sir Leslie Stephen, for instance—were buried with the Church service, and in Scotland there have been cases in which the minister of the parish has forced his way in and insisted upon burying avowed and militant Atheists. Rationalists ought to use their right to have a secular service at weddings or

funerals and to substitute an affirmation [see] for an oath on all occasions. Watts & Co. publish a little book of *Funeral Services without Theology* (1906), compiled by the late F. J. Gould, and advice may be had from the headquarters of the R.P.A. and the N.S.S.

Furnivall, Frederick James, M.A., Ph.D., D.Litt. (1825–1910), writer. He was called to the Bar, but although he had already ceased to be a Christian, he devoted himself to educational work with the Christian Socialists. He helped to found the Working Man's College

(1854), and was very active in the Sunday League and other progressive organizations. Later he held a high position in British literature by his discoveries and editions of mediæval manuscripts and records. He founded the Early English Text Society and the Chaucer, Wyclif, Shelley, and Browning Societies. He took particular pleasure in publishing the sixteenth-century record of child-marriages [see] in the diocese of Chester. Furnivall was an Agnostic (personal knowledge) and an Honorary Associate of the R.P.A. until his death.

G.

Gadow, Prof. Hans Friedrich, M.A., Ph.D., F.R.S. (1855–1940), zoologist. Of German extraction, he was educated under Haeckel at Jena and studied at several other German universities. Migrating to England, he became, after some years in the Natural History Department of the British Museum, Strickland Curator and Lecturer on Zoology at Cambridge, and attained a high position in his science. While he made no profession of his Rationalist views in England, he describes himself as an Agnostic in the symposium in honour of Prof. Haeckel (*Was Wir Ernst Haeckel Verdanken*, 1914, II, pp. 160–4) and pays a glowing tribute to his old master.

Gage, Matilda Joslyn (1826–98), American writer and reformer. Daughter of the prominent Abolitionist Dr. Joslyn, she took up his work in that movement and also in the Feminist agitation. She had a high position among the women of America, was President of the Women Suffrage Association in 1872, and collaborated with Miss S. B. Anthony in writing the classic *History of Woman Suffrage* (3 vols., 1881–6). Like Miss Anthony, she was an Agnostic. The great majority of the Feminist pioneers [see] in America were Rationalists, but Mrs. Gage was one of the most aggressive. See her *Woman, Church, and the State* (1893).

Galdos, Benito Perez (1845–1920), Spanish novelist. He was trained in law, but preferred a literary career, and

became the most powerful writer of modern Spain. He wrote seventy novels, twenty of which (*Episodios Nacionales*) form a series that gives a splendid record of Spain's struggle against the Church and absolute monarchy. Of his sixteen plays, the most popular, *Electra* (1901), is a brilliant symbolical expression of the fight of Rationalism for the soul of the Spanish people. Galdos was a member of the Academy, and Republican deputy in the Cortes for Madrid, which worshipped him. The British Royal Society of Literature described him, in awarding him its medal, as "the most distinguished representative of Spanish literature." Galdos was an Agnostic.

Galileo and the Papacy. Galileo (1564–1642) was born at Pisa (then a dependency of Florence) and educated at Florence. The cities of North Italy had taken the lead in the development of science because the study of it had (avoiding Rome) been communicated to them from Arab Sicily [see *Frederic II.*], but as Florence, in which Frederic had had less influence, was more interested in literature, Galileo met bitter opposition there to his work in physics and mechanics. He went to Padua University to teach, and drew large crowds. The study of physics led him to astronomy, though this was never his chief subject. The principles of optics which Roger Bacon had adopted from the Arabs had remained undeveloped, but a casual observation led a Dutch spectacle-maker to fit two lenses in a tube, and

Galileo made his first telescope by improving upon this, and announced his discoveries of sun-spots, the satellites of Jupiter, etc. He was accorded a triumph even in Rome, and was won back to Pisa, but the priests raised the issue of the stoppage of the sun by Joshua and denounced him to the Roman Inquisition. He cheerfully went to Rome, but Cardinal Bellarmine, head of the Inquisition and chief ornament of the Jesuit Society—he knew nothing whatever about science—officially summoned him (1615) and informed him that the “Holy Office” found his proposition that the sun is central and immovable “formally heretical inasmuch as it expressly contradicts the statements of Holy Scripture in many places.” The Latin sentence is correctly translated in White’s *Warfare*—so that Catholic attacks on that book are untruthful—and in J. J. Fahie’s *Galileo* (1903). The original document is quoted in the leading authority, A. Favaro (*Galileo e l’Inquisizione*, 1907). The only serious dispute about this first condemnation is whether the Inquisition commanded Galileo, and whether he promised, to discontinue teaching the centrality of the sun. The documents of 1615, including Bellarmine’s instruction, did not see the light until 1633, and are believed by many to have been falsified on this point; but it is not material. Galileo was on both occasions condemned by the institution, which in these matters represented the Church, for teaching “formal [explicit] heresy.” G. H. Putnam (*Censorship of the Church of Rome*, 1906, I, p. 128) wrongly gives it as an undisputed fact that Galileo made this promise and later broke it, but he correctly states that the Inquisition then proceeded (1616) to put on the “Index” all works teaching the Copernican system [see].

The second and chief condemnation, in 1633, is scandalously misrepresented by Catholic writers (Fr. Zahn, Dr. Walsh, etc.), whom a few other recent writers (chiefly Forbes, Holden, and S. Taylor) have culpably followed. It is false that Galileo went out of his way to challenge theologians, for these, now fiercely augmented by the Jesuits—Taylor incorrectly says that Galileo was

educated by the Jesuits and admired their system—continued to provoke him and deride his science; besides that there is no proof that he had promised to keep silent, however probable we may consider this. It is a total and gross misrepresentation of the facts, especially in Taylor’s *Galileo and the Freedom of Thought* (1938), to say that the reigning Pope, Urban VIII, was a student of science and very friendly to Galileo, and that he did no more than allow an inevitable trial for breach of faith to proceed and softened the rigour of it for Galileo as much as possible. It is equally false to say that Galileo was treated with consideration, and that the Church or the Papacy is not involved and did not condemn Galileo for heresy. The Pope was the prime mover in the procedure and was moved by vindictiveness.

A central fact is the character of Urban VIII, which is generally falsified. Instead of being a serene and accomplished patron of culture, he was hated by the Romans for his fatuous conceit and criminal nepotism as no other Pope was in that century. Catholic historians of the Papacy—see Hayward’s *History of the Popes* (1931)—have now to admit that in squandering upon his relatives (who, according to a careful estimate by L. von Ranke, made a fortune of £100,000,000 in modern money) the vast sum collected for the fight against Protestantism, he starved the Catholic armies in the Thirty Years’ War and let the Protestant Powers win. As long as Galileo turned his caustic wit upon the Jesuits, whom Urban hated, he was friendly with the scientist; and, as his Nuncios were reporting that Protestants made capital of the Church’s hostility to science, he was willing that Galileo should defend Copernicanism. Favaro shows, from the documents, that he approved Galileo’s intention to attack his opponents—which cancels the charge of breach of faith. But in the famous *Dialogue on the Two Principal Systems of the World*, which Galileo now published (1632), he not only attacked his opponents, but introduced a weak-witted defender of the Copernican system who was commonly understood to be a caricature of the Pope himself.

Here Catholics dissent, but the character precisely embodied the educated Roman's opinion of the Pope and was widely understood to represent him; and in fact from that point the Pope took a personal and extremely harsh part in the procedure. Galileo, nearly seventy years old and suffering from hernia and insomnia, was ordered by the Pope, in cruel language, to come to Rome for trial, the Florentine ambassador and all others being ignored when they protested. He was kept in suspense, though comfortably lodged (or he would not have survived), for months after his arrival in Rome. It is clear that the Pope wavered between the scandal of his procedure, for even prelates tried to restrain him, and the feeding of his vanity by the Dominicans and Jesuits. Taylor says that Rationalist writers represent Galileo as languishing during this period in the dungeons of the Inquisition or writhing in its torture-chambers. No Rationalist writer has ever said this, but the threat of torture actually occurs in the official documents given by Favaro, and both he and Fahie point out that the documents significantly omit to say where Galileo was from June 21 to June 24. The circumstances suggest that he was in the dungeon, as they admit.

He was then compelled to recant, on his knees, before a crowd of prelates and cardinals. "I abjure, curse, and detest the said errors and heresies"—the centrality of the sun and movement of the earth—he was forced to say, and it is a late and negligible fable that on rising he muttered: "It moves for all that." We easily imagine and understand the profound dejection of the aged invalid. Dr. Walsh, the chief American Catholic apologist and medical authority, has the effrontery to assure the readers of his book (*The Popes and Science*) that Galileo's life was "the most serene and enviable in the history of science." This is based upon the myth that the gentle and friendly Pope eased him as much as possible through the necessary formality of trial and continued to be amiable. The truth is that protests rained upon the Pope from all parts, but the most they could wrest from him was that Galileo might retire to a

country house—exiled from his beloved Florence—and, when blindness fell upon him, might return to Florence, where he was confined to his own house. He had waged a bitter fight against venomous clerical enemies for thirty years. What his real religious convictions were we do not know. Giordano Bruno had been burned at the stake in Galileo's early manhood, in large part for following science, and a few years later the clerical rancour had turned upon himself. We can therefore put no definite evidence against the Catholic claim that he was "a great Catholic scientist" and "devout son of the Church." The documents relating to the two persecutions were kept in the Vatican Archives until the nineteenth century, when the Napoleonic troops extracted them. At the Catholic reaction they were restored on condition that they be published, but the published version was falsified. When Italy became less Catholic they were again accessible, and A. Favaro devoted his life to the study of them and of Galileo. His small work (*Galileo e l'Inquisizione* (1907) gives a summary, but none of his works are available in English. J. J. Fahie's *Galileo* (1903) is the best in English, though it has not the aid of Favaro's book. C. S. Holden's *Galileo* (1905) is, although it ran serially in the *Scientific American*, based upon the untruthful Catholic version: as are also the chapter on Galileo in G. Forbes's *History of Astronomy* (1909) and the recent *Galileo and the Freedom of Thought* (1938) of F. S. Taylor. The translations of documents in the latter are taken from an unreliable English work of the last century, and the documents given by Favaro are ignored. A satisfactory work on Urban VIII and Galileo has still to be written.

Gallatin, Albert (1761–1849), American statesman. Born and educated in Switzerland (Geneva University), but emigrating to America, he acquired great wealth in business and entered politics. He was Secretary to the Treasury 1801–13, Minister at Paris 1815–23, and Envoy Extraordinary to Great Britain 1826–27. In later years he worked zealously for education and for the abolition of slavery. He helped to found the

University of New York, so as to "have a foundation free from the influence of the clergy"—compare the founding of London University College—and later resigned from the Council because "a certain portion of the clergy had obtained control" (J. A. Stevens in the chief biography, in the "American Statesman" Series, 1884). His son, J. Gallatin, says in his diary (*A Great Peacemaker*, 1914) that Gallatin adopted Voltairean Deism in his youth and never abandoned it.

Gallican Church. In spite of the Roman Catholic description of France as "the oldest daughter of the Church," it has in nearly all ages been ready to challenge the pretensions and forgeries of the Papacy. In the fifth century Bishop (St.) Hilary of Poitiers was one of the last prelates in Europe to oppose Rome's claim of supremacy, and Pope Leo I complained (*Ep.*, X, 31) that he "used language which no layman even should dare to use." Charlemagne, in 794, gave his name to *The Caroline Books*, in which Rome was very haughtily treated as heretical, and the Frank bishops supported their ruler. The next ambitious Pope, Nicholas I, in whose pontificate the Forged Decretals [*see*] appeared, was sternly and opprobriously resisted by Archbishop Hincmar of Rheims. Hincmar tells us, in his *Annals*, that he and his bishops excommunicated the Pope and derided his claim to be "emperor of the whole world." The supremacy of Germany then absorbed the attention of the Papacy for two or three centuries, but at the beginning of the fourteenth century the Papacy fell into submission to France, and the Popes were used very cavalierly. [*See Avignon, Boniface VIII, and Templars.*] On its return to Rome the Papacy entered upon a long period of degradation, but in the seventeenth century it was again disdainfully defied by the French. Historians tell how Cardinal Richelieu [*see*], in defiance of the Pope, refused to lend French armies to the Catholic Powers in the Thirty Years' War for the destruction of Protestantism, and note that this was a very important factor in the Catholic defeat; but they seem generally to overlook the fact that Richelieu threatened to with-

draw the French Church from obedience to the Vatican (McCabe's *Iron Cardinal*, 1909, Ch. XVI). Later in the same century the friction between Louis XIV and Rome became so serious that the French prelates drew up, to the anger of the Pope, a "Declaration of the Liberties of the Gallican Church" (1681). How Louis, in his later years, atoned for his sins by submitting and revoking the Edict of Nantes is told under that heading. [*See French Revolution* for later developments.]

Galsworthy, John, O.M. (1867-1933), novelist and Nobel Prize winner. He was called to the Bar in 1890, but eight years later he turned to letters and became the most notable and most respected writer of his time, his dramas especially showing a very high social-moral standard. He had, the *Annual Register* said in its obituary notice, "an almost prophetic passion for social justice." He gave away the money of the Nobel Prize, and it transpired after his death that, among other philanthropies, he had fed 500 Hungarian children for many months and refused to allow the fact to be made public. He rejected the honour of knighthood, and not long before his death he published a poem protesting against any ceremonious burial of his body ("Scatter my ashes," etc.), particularly by the Church. The Society of Authors, nevertheless, asked that he should be buried in the Abbey. The Dean refused, but held a memorial service (*Life and Letters of John Galsworthy*, by H. V. Marrot, 1935). Galsworthy quite openly rejects Christianity in his *Moods, Songs, and Doggerels* (1911). In the opening poem, "A Dream," there is a vague and wavering Theism ("My faith but shadows that required of men"). His great character was entirely humanitarian.

Galton, Sir Francis, D.Sc., D.C.L., F.R.S. (1822-1911), founder of Eugenics. Grandson of Erasmus Darwin, and son of a Quaker, who left him a fortune, he devoted himself to science, especially the study of heredity, and in 1869 attracted attention by his *Hereditary Genius*. He invented the name "Eugenics" for his theory that racial improvement depends upon breeding,

and spent large sums in promoting and developing it. He endowed an anthropometric laboratory, a research fellowship, and a scholarship at University College, and at his death he left £45,000 to endow a chair. He had the Huxley, Darwin, and Darwin-Wallace medals and other high honours. In a letter to Charles Darwin he says: "Your book drove away the constraint of my old superstition as if it had been a nightmare" (*Life and Letters of Francis Galton*, I, p. 207); Prof. K. Pearson, the author, says that from 1846 he "ceased to be an orthodox Christian in the customary sense." Pearson never said much that might offend the clergy.

Gambetta, Léon Michel (1838–81), French statesman. He was called to the Bar in 1859, and very boldly attacked, even in court, the reactionary Catholic-Imperialist regime. He was Minister of the Interior (1870), President of the Chambre (1879), and Premier (1881). Gambetta was the outstanding and most formidable leader of the anti-clericals, and to him they owed their war-cry "Le cléricalisme-voilà l'ennemi" ("Clericalism is the enemy").

Gardener, Helen Hamilton (1858–1902), American writer. She was the daughter of a clergyman and, although she married Col. Day, was well known all over America, for her radical writings, as Helen Gardener. She was a very accomplished woman, and travelled in thirty countries, and she was one of the most advanced Rationalists in the group of American feminists of the second half of the century. Her Agnosticism appears in her *Men, Women, and Gods, Facts and Fictions of Life*, etc.

Garibaldi, Giuseppe (1807–82), Liberator of Italy. He was the son of a sailor of Nice, and to escape education for the priesthood he ran away to sea in his boyhood. After years of adventure and anti-clerical conspiracy in South America he returned to Italy in 1859, and in the following year he led his famous Expedition to Sicily, which began the liberation of the country from Pope and feudal monarchs. In spite of the jealousy of Italian statesmen, he continued to fight, and he sat in the new Italian Parliament. He was received in triumph in England. Mazzini was

pained by the blunt Atheism of his great colleague and his scorn of "the Sacred Shop" (the Church)—see J. W. Mario's *Birth of Modern Italy* (1909, p. 199)—but he remained an Atheist, his chief English biographer, Bent, says, throughout life (*Life of Giuseppe Garibaldi*, 1881). He quotes a letter which Garibaldi wrote two years before he died: "Dear Friends—Man created God, not God man. Yours ever, Garibaldi" (p. 299).

Garnett, Richard, LL.D., C.B. (1835–1906), writer. Garnett read Greek, German, and Italian at the age of thirteen and refused to go to Oxford or Cambridge. He entered the service of the British Museum and became superintendent of the Reading Room and, later, Keeper of Printed Books; and he was President of the Bibliographical Society (1895–7). His Rationalist views are freely expressed in his *Twilight of the Gods* (1888) and *Life of W. J. Fox* (1910). The notice in the *Dictionary of National Biography* says that he "cherished a genuine and somewhat mystical sense of religion which combined hostility to priestcraft and dogma with a modified belief in astrology."

Garrison, William Lloyd (1805–79), the great American Abolitionist. He began work as a boy in a printer's shop, and became a journalist and the most fiery writer of the anti-slavery movement. He founded and edited the Boston *Liberator*. The American Churches, which now quote him as a great Christian idealist, hated and persecuted him, and he served a term in prison for his zeal. His children, who wrote his life (*William Lloyd Garrison*, 4 vols., 1885–9), explain that he was a Theist but had "quite freed himself from the trammels of orthodoxy" (IV, p. 336). He repeatedly attacked the Churches in the *Liberator* (III, pp. 145–7, 267, etc.), never went to church, and was reviled by the Unitarian clergy as well as the others.

Garth, Sir Samuel, M.A., M.D. (1661–1719), physician. He was a London physician of great distinction—Gulstonian Lecturer in 1694 and Harveian Orator in 1697—who nevertheless went even beyond the Deists of the time. Chalmers's *Biographical Dictionary* says

that he was a notorious sceptic as well as one of the most eminent physicians in London. Reimann claims him as an Atheist in his *Historia Universalis Atheismi* (1725, p. 463).

Gautier, Théophile (1811–72), French novelist. He opened his literary career with poetry and fiction in the romantic vein, but presently caused a sensation by his famous novel *Mlle. de Maupin*. The Academy closed its doors against him, but all the world put him in the front rank of French literary artists of 1850–70. He is disdainful of religion in all his works.

Gay-Lussac, Joseph Louis (1778–1850), eminent French chemist. Berthollet [see] chose him as his assistant, and he buried himself in science during the stormy years of reaction. The restored royalty had made him professor of chemistry at the Jardin des Plantes, but after the Revolution of 1830 he entered the Chambre as an anti-clerical and became its President. He was an intimate friend of Arago [see] and A. von Humboldt, and their correspondence confirms that he shared their advanced Rationalism.

Geddes, Sir Patrick (1854–1932), Scottish biologist. After studying science at London, Paris, Edinburgh, and Montpellier Universities he travelled extensively for the purpose of research, and taught, successively, physiology at University College, London, zoology at Aberdeen, botany at St. Andrews, sociology and civics at Bombay, and natural history at the Edinburgh School of Medicine. Geddes had a wide range of social as well as scientific interests and was a practical idealist of high character. He was an Honorary Associate of the R.P.A. See A. D. Defries, *The Interpreter Geddes* (1927).

Geijer, Prof. Erik Gustaf (1783–1847), Swedish historian. Geijer is counted one of the leading historians of his country. At the age of twenty he won the Grand Prize of the Swedish Academy, and seven years later was appointed professor of history at Uppsala University. Later he was the national historiographer and an Academician. He was a fearless and outspoken Rationalist, and was prosecuted in 1820 for sceptical observations

in his introduction to the works of Thorild [see]. In his *Valda smärre skrifter* (2 vols., 1841–2) and his *Auch ein Wort über die religiöse Frage* (1847) he is a Deist, but opposed even to Unitarian Christianity.

Genealogical Trees. [See Apes and Man and Evolution.]

Genesis. The word means "origin," and is given to the first book of the Old Testament because of the Babylonian legends about the origin of the world and man in the first two chapters, though it carries the mythical early history of the Hebrews as far as the death of Joseph. Reading the childlike stories of creation, Eden, the Fall, the Deluge, the longevity of the patriarchs, etc., one gets some idea of the paralysis of intellect during the domination of faith, considering that even men of the greatest learning and ability regarded them as literally true and inspired until the seventeenth century, most of them until the eighteenth century, and a large proportion until recent times. Toward the end of the eighteenth century scientific criticism of the book began [see Astruc] with the discovery that it was not written by a single writer, but combined two documents, Jahvist and Elohist [see], of different dates. With the advance of Biblical Criticism these documents were dissected and it was established that they had been clumsily blended in a narrative which aimed to show, falsely, that Jahveh had always been the God of the Hebrews. The third document is known as that of the Priestly Writer, and is part of the fraudulent re-setting of Hebrew literature in the sixth and fifth centuries B.C. [Ezra]. Meantime, discoveries in the ruins of Assyria had revealed the source of the earlier part of the book [Adam; Babel; Creation; Eden; Fall; Flood; etc.], and the attempt to show that the first chapter of *Genesis* was in accordance with the teaching of science, upon which a whole library had been written in the second half of the last century, ended in an ironic situation. The early history of the Hebrews, which fills the greater part of the book, may or may not embody fragments of genuine tribal tradition, but the chapters are so obviously mythical on nearly every page

that its statements are useless without independent corroboration, and are then superfluous. Attempts to vindicate the story of Abraham [see] or of the sojourn of the Hebrews in Egypt [see] have completely failed. For literature see the articles quoted above. A work with the title *The Genesis of Genesis* (1932), by Dr. D. E. Hart-Davies, is Fundamentalist and misleading. The book with the same title by Prof. B. W. Bacon (1893) is good to that date only. It is amusing to see how even the latest and largest encyclopædias—the *Americana*, for instance—cater to the prejudice of the less-educated Christians.

Genetics. The science of heredity. Darwin acknowledged that the cause of the variations upon which Natural Selection acted in the evolution of species was obscure, and he ignored the theory of Lamarck that such variations could be caused by the direct action of the environment. Toward the end of the last century Weismann took up the study of the germ-plasm (the ova and spermatozoa) and presented a theory that there were particles ("determinants") in this which built up the several parts of the new organism and were therefore responsible for variations from parental type. Mendel [see] had already discovered some of the laws ruling this inheritance, but his paper on the subject had been buried and forgotten. The rediscovery of these laws in the early part of the century, and the advance of eugenic research [see], concentrated study upon the germinal elements. Bateson in England, and Cuénot in France, particularly, extended the discovery of Mendel and de Vries from the plant to the animal world, and the new science of Genetics was founded. With the exaggeration which commonly attends the acceptance of new theories, it was widely contended, and the contention was broadly endorsed by Bateson at the British Association Meeting at Toronto in 1922, that the Darwinian theory was now discredited and the action of the environment or Natural Selection negligible. The Mendelists, moreover, contended that the change of a type was not effected by the gradual accentuation of very small variations, but by relatively large changes or

deviations from the parental type in a single generation ("mutations"). In the last twenty years Mutationism [see] has fallen out of use as a name for the Mendelist theory, the occurrence of such large variations having been found to be very restricted, and there has been an increasing recognition, even by Geneticists, of the importance of environment [see]. That the "genes"—the microscopic particles in the chromosomes—are the vehicles of heredity is now generally accepted, but the science of these does not concern the present work. It has, however, not only been of considerable service to breeders, but, though heredity and embryonic development are still very obscure, it has confirmed the theory that the processes are, like all other processes, mechanical. H. S. Jennings, *Genetics* (1935) and *Genetical Variations in Relation to Evolution* (1935); H. E. Watts, *Genetics* (1938); C. H. Waddington, *Modern Genetics* (1939).

Geoffrin, Marie Thérèse (1699–1777), French writer. She was the daughter of the Chamberlain of the Dauphin, and she used her wealth and her high social position to protect and help the Encyclopædists. Her salon, which they frequented, was one of the most brilliant in Paris, and D'Alembert and Morellet speak of her with the highest appreciation in *Éloges de Mme. Geoffrin* (1812). They also published her letters and essays.

Geoffroy Saint-Hilaire, Étienne (1772–1844), famous French zoologist. At the age of sixteen he became a canon and an abbé, in the loose ecclesiastical fashion of the time, but he quitted the Church for science and became one of the greatest zoologists of France. His theory of organic types (in his *Philosophie anatomique*, 1818) prepared the way for the acceptance of evolution on the lines of the argument from comparative anatomy, and he warmly defended that doctrine, to the delight of Goethe, against Cuvier. He was a Deist; yet at the Revolution of 1830, he, at the risk of his own, saved the life of the Archbishop of Paris. He had, says one of his biographers, "a fanaticism of humanity."

Geographical Distribution, the argu-

ment from. The extraordinary diversity in the regional distribution of animals and plants can be explained only on the theory of their evolution during vast periods of time during which the land-surface constantly changed, and it is an important section of the evidence of evolution. One of the facts which first impressed Darwin was the peculiarly local character of the fauna of the Galapagos Islands and their distant relation to species and genera on the mainland. Research has shown that 96 per cent of the reptiles on the islands are peculiar to them. Of the plants on the Hawaiian Islands, 83 per cent are found there alone, and the animal population shows a similar local development. There are no bears or tigers in Africa, no lions in Asia, no horses (indigenous) in either. New Zealand had no mammals until man came, and had only the kinds of birds which could have flown from the Pacific islands. Australia had only the lower mammals (platypus and kangaroo types), and its animal and plant population generally had the character of a world of life marooned there ages ago and with only such new types as could float or fly over. The longer an island or continent has been severed, as determined by the geologist, from the nearest land, the more its species and genera differ from those of that land, yet are related to them. To give examples is, however, inadequate. The law applies to the population of the earth generally, and the literature recommended under Evolution gives a good summary of it. The argument is strongly reinforced when we compare the living with fossil forms in any region.

Geology, Evidence of evolution in. The phrase that "evolution is only a theory," which the less educated believers are taught to repeat, is seen to be pointless when we glance at the geological record. That the successive strata were formed slowly in water during hundreds of millions of years is "only a theory," but to the geologist it is as certain as the facts themselves. The only alternatives are, in fact, so childish that in the present century no geologist has been found to oppose evolution. The "Prof." McCready Price who is some-

times quoted by anti-evolutionists was a teacher of literature in a Seventh-Day Adventist College, who turned to geology for theological purposes. Some anti-evolutionist writers say that God created the strata (chalk consisting of myriads of microscopic shells, limestone comprised of masses of marine molluscs, coal very obviously made from masses of vegetation, etc.) just as they are. The other school holds that the present state of the crust of the earth is due to the Deluge. It is useless to argue directly on scientific lines with these people. One has to criticize the doctrinal beliefs which make their minds accessible to this nonsense and close them against scientific truth, which is based upon the labour of field geologists in all parts of the world during more than a century and a half. It is, however, material to understand that the great majority of members of the Churches are in this position. An American work, for instance, in which the idea that God created the strata as they are, boasts of a sale of 9,000,000 copies. For literature in this connection any simple and well-illustrated manual of geology should suffice, but since the great majority of Church members are still Fundamentalists, such works as Ingersoll's *Mistakes of Moses* and Paine's *Age of Reason* are as relevant as ever.

George, St. The Crusaders found the cult of this famous dragon-slaying martyr—he is supposed to have been a victim of the Diocletian persecution (about A.D. 303)—in the East and brought it to Europe, where its picturesque details gave it a wide popularity. Those details disappeared at the first touch of criticism or were recognized as lingering elements of the old myth of Perseus and Andromeda. Gibbon (Ch. XXIII), whom Prof. Bury does not support in his notes to the *Rise and Fall*, suggests that the Catholic story is probably based ultimately upon the career of George of Cappadocia, an Arian martyr who is accused of embezzlement and looting. The charges are mainly in hostile Trinitarian writers, and in any case the identity is not admitted. Orthodox though critical experts like the Jesuit Fr. Delehaye (*Catholic Encyclopædia*)

claim only that a St. George of entirely unknown character was martyred under Diocletian. We might be content to note that the stories about St. George which are told as true, especially to children, in the Roman and Anglican Churches, are fiction—Delehaye admits that the earliest written accounts of George are of the fifth century and obviously fabulous—but it is interesting to see how these “critical” theologians find a kernel of truth in legends. The belief that there really was a shadowy St. George in the days of Diocletian is based upon the fact that two churches in the East dedicated to St. George can be traced in the sixth century, and that Pope Gelasius (495), or whoever wrote the Gelasian List of Prohibited Books, admits the reality of the martyr while condemning the current account of him. The existence of two churches dedicated to George in a crassly ignorant region after the forgers of martyrs had been busy for two centuries scarcely impresses us, and the reference to the Gelasian Canon is at least misleading. The Pope does not say that George was a genuine martyr. After condemning (Migne Collection of the Fathers, IX, 61) the *Acts of St. George* and other forgeries, he goes on to say: “Nevertheless we venerate all martyrs.” The adaptation of the Perseus legend is shown by Dr. F. Görres (an expert on martyrs) in the *Zeitschrift für Wissenschaftliche Theologie*, vol. XVI, p. 454 (1890).

Gerbert, or Pope Sylvester II (reigned 999–1003). One of the most curious phenomena of the Dark Age is that in its most degraded phase the Roman See was occupied by the only Pope who ever had a good knowledge of the science of his time. Catholic boasts that one of their Popes figures in histories of science leave the phenomenon quite unintelligible, and there is still so much reluctance to appreciate the brilliant civilization of Arab Spain [see] that most historians of science—Sarton is a happy exception—do not explain it. The facts afford a decisive proof of the unpopular truth that it was sceptics of Spain who roused Europe from the Dark Age. Gerbert was born in Aquitaine and educated in the abbey of Aurillac.

This southern province of France, being coterminous with Spain and in close contact with Barcelona, which, though nominally Christian, had an Arab culture, was the first part of Christendom to be awakened [see Abélard]. Even Catholics do not dispute that the brilliant pupil was sent for higher studies to Barcelona, from which the Aquitanians got their zeal for education, and Abbot William of Malmesbury tells us that Gerbert went on from there to the famous colleges of the “Saracens” at Cordova. As the Abbot adds that Gerbert was seduced by the gallantries of Andalusia, his testimony here is rejected by Catholics; but in the only serious study of the life of Gerbert (the Duc de la Salle de Rochemaure’s *Gerbert, Sylvestre II*, 1914) it is shown that at least he learned his astronomy at Cordova. He became Pope because he was hired as tutor to the son of Otto II, and as the German Emperors had just begun to dominate the Papacy, his pupil, Otto III, whose dreams of a mighty empire he encouraged, forced him upon the degenerate Romans. He had great ability and would in a better age have made an excellent Pope, but it was an age when even the “noblest” ladies of Rome could not write their names, and what Cardinal Baronius calls the Rule of the Whores (from the Papal palace) was barely over, so Sylvester II found his grave after four years of cruel struggle.

Germany, Religion in. Certain religious aspects of the (German) Holy Roman Empire and the Reformation are discussed under those heads. The modern development began with the founding of the German Empire, in 1871. Since the annexation of Alsace-Lorraine added very materially to the Catholic population, which Protestant Prussia already regarded with distrust, a quarrel soon developed, and Bismarck launched a heavy campaign against the Roman hierarchy. [See *Kulturkampf*.] But the rapid growth of a new enemy, Socialism, caused the Emperor to abandon Bismarck’s policy and seek alliance with the Catholic Church against Socialism. The accession of a new Pope, Leo XIII, who had the illusion that he was a great diplomat—in fact during his

pontificate the Church lost, largely through his blunders, almost as heavily as at the Reformation—facilitated the alliance, and from that date the Kaiser and his statesmen were accustomed to speak with respect of “our two great Churches.” Reference-works and the Press still almost always describe the German people as two-thirds Protestant and one-third Catholic, though at other times they explain Nazi barbarity on the ground that the population has become suddenly irreligious. Scepticism had, however, made the same progress in Germany as in France and Great Britain, as the immense circulation of the Atheistic works of Feuerbach, Nietzsche, Büchner, Haeckel, etc., testifies, and, although the Catholic birth-rate is much higher than the general rate, the Roman Church steadily lost ground, and the life-and-death struggle to which the Pope had committed it had disastrous consequences.

In view of the bitter mutual hostility with which this struggle was conducted, election figures here afford decisive evidence. The Catholics were politically organized in the Centre Party [see] and the Bavarian People's Party, and only a very negligible number of them would defy the bishops and vote, against their stern orders, for Socialists or Communists. These election statistics therefore prove that the Catholic Church in Germany had lost about 10,000,000 followers before Hitler seized power. In the twenty years after the alliance to fight Socialism the proportion of the Catholic to the total vote fell, in spite of the high Catholic birth-rate, from 20·1 to 19·3 per cent (figures in the official *Statistisches Jahrbuch*). By 1910 the total vote had doubled, but the Catholic vote had risen by only about 50 per cent. At the last free election (1932) the total vote was 35,148,470. The Catholic share of this, while every work of reference continued to describe the Catholics as one-third of the nation, was 5,326,583 votes, or little over one-seventh; and this was with the support of the Jews (against Hitler), as the Catholic writer E. Ritter shows in his work *Der Weg des politischen Katholicismus* (1934). The Communists and Socialists polled 13,000,000 votes;

the Nazis, who made a supreme effort with the financial aid, since disclosed by Hugenberg and Thyssen, of the big industrialists, polled only 11,737,391 votes, or less than one-third of the whole.

The statement that the Nazis began to persecute both Churches when, largely through the Pope's blunder, as we shall see, they secured power, is false. It was part of Hitler's amateurish imperial scheme that religious influence should be made stronger than ever by some vaguely conceived blend or amalgamation of the rival sects in one National Christian Church, which he would subsidize generously. As far as the Lutherans are concerned, the great majority of the clergy and laity readily accepted the new regime. Rebels like Pastor Niemöller—few in England reflected that his was almost the only name of a recalcitrant Protestant minister that appeared in the Press, though for a time he had the support of several hundred less important ministers—based their objections upon the interference of the State with their credal formularies, and did not attack Hitler's criminal ambition and savage treatment of Jews, Communists, Pacifists, etc. A staunch Protestant writer, D. Schafer (*Die Bibel im dritten Reich*, 1935), boasts of the healthy condition of the Lutheran Church in his country and of the enormous circulation of the Bible. This was repeated by the American Bible Society in 1939, which said that in 1938 the sale of the Bible had exceeded that of *Mein Kampf* by 200,000 copies. On February 5, 1940, the *News-Chronicle* reproduced the boast of a New York commentator of the National Broadcasting Co. that there was in Germany “a growth of religious fervour on a scale not known for many years; churches and cathedrals are crowded with worshippers.” Although Hitler had effectively replied in 1939, in a speech reproduced in the London Press, that, instead of persecuting religion, the Nazis had paid a subsidy of 1,770 million marks to the Churches in five years (1933–8), had quadrupled the subsidy of their predecessors, and had not closed a single church, and although it was generally agreed in 1940 that at least four-fifths of the nation (still

described in annuals as two-thirds Protestant and one-third Catholic) fully supported Hitler, British and American religious periodicals and the Protestant bishops continued to make it a charge against him that he "persecuted all religion." In the meantime the more solemn speeches of Hitler, Goering, Von Papen, and most of the leading Nazis, contained pious invocations of the Almighty on every important occasion.

This painful misrepresentation in the Press, to the detriment of Rationalism, was worst on the Catholic side. At the end of 1932 the Pope, after a deal with Hitler through the Catholic Von Papen, ordered German Catholics to drop their opposition to him. This is stated in the impartial *Annual Register* for 1933 and in an article in the Catholic *Révue des Deux Mondes* (January 15, 1935); and Von Papen boasted of his mediation in an address to Catholics which was later published (*Der 12 November*, 1933). The Nazi vote at the next election, after Goering had fired the Reichstag, rose to 17,000,000 (still less than half the country, it should be noted), and Hitler, as head of the strongest single party, took power and destroyed the parliamentary system. Against this, and the horrible outrages that followed, and even the Blood-Purge of 1934 (in which several Catholic leaders perished), the Pope and the German hierarchy did not utter a word of protest. They continued to press Hitler for an alliance (*News-Chronicle*, September 12, 1936, *Times*, November 4, 1936, etc.), especially as he had now entered upon a policy which threatened the Church with more terrible losses than ever. As is stated in the article *Franciscans*, the police, at the beginning of 1936, arrested 276 Franciscan monks (lay brothers with a few priests) in one single Catholic district on a charge of sodomy. Most of the remaining friars of the province were secretly warned and fled the country. Of the sensational trials that followed, no British paper gave any account, but they occasionally reproduced false Catholic statements that the charges were merely technical financial irregularities or were Nazi fabrications. For a short summary of the facts see McCabe's

Papacy in Modern Politics (cheap ed. 1940, pp. 76—9). Here it can be said only that the statement that the charges and trials were a fraudulent part of a Nazi persecution of the Church was a deliberate untruth of the American and British clergy. Every police official involved in the inquiries and arrests was a Catholic; every single witness was a loyal Catholic; nine-tenths of the friars pleaded guilty and accused each other in court, though they got no reduction of sentence; and the Pope, after the first ten trials, suppressed the entire Westphalian province of Franciscan monks on the ground of irregularities. All trials were held in Catholic cities (Coblenz, Bonn, Cologne, Munich, etc.), and were fully reported in and approved by the papers of those cities (which have three Catholic readers to one Nazi). From Westphalia the exposure spread north to the Dutch frontier, south to Austria, and all over Germany, and a number of religious brothers, priests, monks, etc., which Goebbels declared to be "several thousands," were arrested for sodomy or seduction of the young or feeble-minded. The *World Almanac* for 1939 (p. 236) says that "up to October 1938 more than 8,000 Catholic monks and lay brothers had been arrested by Nazi officials," or half the total number in Germany; that 242 monastic priests and brothers were "sentenced on immorality charges"; and that 188 priests were acquitted or released without trial. The last sentence is misleading. The present writer read the reports of dozens of trials of secular priests in the German Press and all were convicted of sodomy. This completed the disorganization of the Catholic body in Germany, the proudest in the Church, and it now probably numbers not more than 10,000,000 followers, instead of one-third of the population (about 80,000,000).

Gestalt Theory. The. A psychological theory which originated in Germany in 1912 and is so difficult to express in a few clear words that psychologists usually keep the German name for it. *Gestalt* means "shape," but is here translated, if at all, as "configuration." The theory is des-

cribed as a protest against the tendency which had prevailed in scientific psychology to build up what are called the contents of the mind by the association or accumulation of individual sense-presentations, percepts, images, feelings, etc. This is condemned as psychological atomism. We have, it is said, to take into account a larger whole or pattern, as "the whole determines the nature of the parts," not vice versa. No attempt to explain this in a few lines can do more than mystify the inexpert, and a longer account can be read in any modern manual of psychology, in which it is treated as one of the three fundamental schools to-day, or in the *Principles of Gestalt Psychology* (1935) of Kurt Koffka, one of the founders. It is of interest here only in so far as it is an attempt at a reaction against the growing acceptance of Materialist or Behaviourist principles in psychology, though the Gestaltists claim that this is not the only error in psychology against which they protest. Although it would be quite incorrect to regard them all as attempting to reintroduce "mind" into the science, the theory obviously lends itself to such efforts. Recently attempts have been made to modify its antagonism to Behaviourism.

Giannone, Pietro (1676-1748), Italian writer. A Neapolitan lawyer who spent twenty years in writing a history of Sicily (*Storia Civile del Regno di Napoli*, 4 vols., 1723) which so exposed the Church that the clergy got him exiled. The Austrian Emperor pensioned him, but he returned to Italy, was again expelled, and continued his attacks upon the Papacy, from the Deistic standpoint, from Switzerland. He was enticed to the Italian frontier, treacherously arrested, and imprisoned.

Gibbon, Edward (1737-94). At Oxford, where, he later said, he spent some of "the most idle and unprofitable months" of his life, he became a Roman Catholic. At Lausanne, to which his father sent him, he returned to the Church of England, but later turned to Deism or something more radical. Johnson described him as one of the "infidel wasps" of the clubs before he was forty, and Robertson (*Pioneer Humanists*, 1907) points out that there

is no depth or feeling in his religious expressions. He conceived the idea of writing his great work, *The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, during a visit to Rome in 1764, and a few years later his father left him a fortune which enabled him to approach the enterprise. The first volume appeared in 1776, the last in 1788. Prof. Bury's edition, in seven volumes, with very valuable notes, is incomparably the best. The chaste and stately style wins readers in every generation, but the book is also a masterpiece of historical research and composition. There has been much discovery in history and Italian archaeology since the eighteenth century, and errors, which Bury corrects, are inevitable, but the gibes of religious writers (who now rarely, if ever, read him) are ignorant and petulant. Sir Leslie Stephen, a very critical historian, rightly says, in the *Dictionary of National Biography*, that "his accuracy in statement of facts is now admitted," and "in accuracy, thoroughness, lucidity, and comprehensive grasp of a vast subject the *History* is unsurpassable." The common charge that his prejudice against Christianity perverted his judgment is so far from true that his largest mistake was that he favoured religion. In the famous chapter (XV) in which he examines the rise and progress of the Church (Clodd is here equally uncritical in his *Gibbon and Christianity* (1915)) is too flattering to its moral character and wrongly ascribes its "triumph" to its spiritual attractions [see *Paganism, the Fall of*]. Other works of Gibbon, including *Memoirs of My Life and Writings*, were published in two volumes 1796. His work rendered as great a service to history as it did to Rationalism.

Giddings, Prof. Franklin Henry, A.M., Ph.D., LL.D. (1855-1931), American sociologist. Professor of sociology at Columbia University since 1894 and one of the most eminent American authorities in his science. He was President of the American Sociological Society 1910-11 and of the International Institute of Sociology 1913, member of the New York Board of Education and of the American Academy of Political and Social Science. His chief works were *The Elements of Sociology* (1898) and

Inductive Sociology (1901), but his Rationalist (Agnostic) views are best seen in his *Pagan Poems* (1914).

Gifford, Lord Adam (1820–87), Scottish judge, founder of the Gifford Lectures. Called to the Scottish Bar in 1849, he advanced to the position of Judge of the Court of Session, with the title of Lord Gifford (1870). At his death he left £80,000 to the Scottish universities to promote the study of natural religion. The fund is now used chiefly for the support and propaganda of Theism, and is of much service to the Churches. Gifford, however, was not a Theist, and would certainly not have approved. In *Lectures Delivered on Various Occasions* (printed in Germany in 1889, but afterwards published in Great Britain) he professes a creed between the Pantheism of Spinoza and that of Emerson ("there now lives no greater English writer than Ralph Waldo Emerson," he said). In the fourth lecture he says: "We are parts of the Infinite—literally, strictly, scientifically" (p. 157). It is not the creed of most of the Gifford Lectures.

Gilbert de la Porée (1075–1154), philosopher. He was one of the brilliant scholars who remind us that when Europe emerged from the Dark Age, in the eleventh century, there was at once an attempt to throw off the shackles of dogma. Gilbert was a master in the cathedral school (later the university) at Paris, and afterwards Bishop of Poitiers. He was closely associated with Abélard [see], and shared his conviction that reason has its rights against faith. Abélard's bitter enemy, Bernard of Clairvaux, the arch-apostle of virtue and intellectual reaction, attacked him, but he escaped condemnation for his heresies.

Gilgamesh, The Epic of. The Babylonian semi-sacred romance, inherited from the Sumerians, from which, probably indirectly, the Hebrews got the story of the Creation and the Flood. Its proper title is *Enuma Elish*, and the hero, Gilgamesh, is said to have been a King of the First Dynasty of Erech, so that the stories go back to the dawn of civilization. The first tablets came to light in the ruins of the Assyrian royal palace of the seventh century B.C., but

older fragments have since been recovered. Prof S. Langdon, *The Sumerian Epic of Paradise, the Flood, and the Fall of Man* (1915); Sir E. A. T. W. Budge, *The Babylonian Story of the Deluge and the Epic of Gilgamesh* (1920); R. C. Thompson, *The Epic of Gilgamesh* (1930). [See also **Creation Stories**; **Eden**; **the Fall of Man**; **the Flood**.]

Giordano Bruno. [See **Bruno, Giordano**.]

Giotto (1267–1336), Italian painter. Giotto, whose real name was Ambrogio Bordone, was one of the greatest pioneers of Italian painting in the Renaissance period. The interest here is that he is always quoted as a proof of the inspiration of the mediæval faith, particularly in connection with his church frescoes, whereas we have evidence (generally suppressed) that he had his tongue in his cheek when he executed some of the finest of these—the frescoes on the walls of the memorial church of St. Francis at Assisi. They seem to depict the lives of Francis and his early followers with sympathetic tenderness; but Vasari, the famous mediæval writer on the Italian painters, tells us that, while he was painting these, Giotto relieved his feelings in a poem in which he drastically condemned the friars and their ideals. This passage is omitted from the English translation of Vasari's *Lives* (1846 ed., I, p. 348) and all English biographies of Giotto (Basil de Selincourt, etc.), but there is a summary of the poem in Sir A. Crowe and G. Cavalcaselle's *New History of Painting*, (2nd ed., 1912, I, p. 200). It is amusing that these writers themselves go on to praise his deep religious feeling as inferred from his paintings.

Girard, Stephen (1750–1831), American philanthropist. He went to sea as a boy, and in time became one of the wealthiest ship-owners in America. In Philadelphia, where he settled, he won the esteem of all by his generosity and high character. When the city was devastated by yellow fever he remained in it and worked heroically; and at his death he left nearly his entire fortune of \$7,500,000 for charity. Of this sum \$5,260,000 was allotted by him for the purpose of building and endowing a princely orphanage, and he expressly

and emphatically stipulated that no ecclesiastic should ever be permitted to enter it except as a visitor. He was so firm a Deist and opponent of Christianity that he gave such names as Voltaire, Rousseau, and Helvétius to his ships. The Churches were not long in persuading the authorities to ignore his stipulation and control the Institute. The estate is now valued at \$40,000,000. See Putnam's *Four Hundred Years of Freethought* (1894) and *Lives of American Merchants* (1858) by Freeman Hunt (I, 252).

Gisborne, Maria (1770-1836), friend of Shelley. She was the daughter of a merchant, a beautiful and gifted girl, who had (for the time) an exceptionally good education, and through Godwin she became the friend of Shelley. He tells us (*Dowden's Life*, II, p. 210) that she was an Atheist, and pays her a high tribute in his poetical "Letters to Maria Gisborne."

Gissing, George Robert (1857-1903), novelist. Gissing developed Rationalist opinions during a course of study at Jena, and he was for some years tutor to the sons of Frederic Harrison. He had little success as a novelist until late in life, when he was awarded a high place in English letters. He was an Agnostic and sceptical as regards immortality. Though he felt that there was "some purpose" in life, he could not accept "any of the solutions ever proposed" (*Clodd's Memoirs*, pp. 179-82).

Gjellerup, Karl (1857-1919), Danish poet and Nobel Prize winner. In his youth he was devoted to Herbert Spencer's works and accepted the synthetic philosophy, but he later fell under the influence of Schopenhauer. A rather grim idealism colours all his later work. P. A. Rosenberg, *Karl Gjellerup* (1922).

Gladiatorial Games, The. The contests in the Amphitheatre, at Rome, of *gladiatores* ("swordsmen") against each other or against beasts, which are commonly quoted as evidence of what even H. G. Wells unfortunately called the Neanderthal strain in the character of the Romans, were neither a native development, nor did they ever cater to more than a minority of the Romans. They were borrowed from the rather

mysterious Etruscans, whose isolated position in Italy—hundreds of miles from the nearest civilization—may account for some peculiarities of their life. The Romans did not adopt them until the third century, and did not hold them on a large scale until the second century B.C. After this period the wars brought to Rome immense numbers of barbarian captives whose lives were considered forfeit. Besides these, only criminals condemned to death for grave crimes were made gladiators until the days of morbid Emperors like Nero, when for a few years Senators and one or two women of high rank entered the lists. This last scandal of an abnormal time was suppressed, but, like bull-fighting in Spain (and animal combat all over Europe until modern times), the passion had mastered too many of the citizens of Rome to permit decey Emperors like Augustus (who tried) Marcus Aurelius to suppress the spectacle. The Amphitheatre, however, held only 90,000 spectators, while the Circus attracted more than 300,000. The Christian Emperors made no attempt to suppress the games, and the legend that a monk secured the abolition of them—100 years after the accession of Constantine—has no serious basis. [*See Telemachus.*] For the equally baseless legend that Christians were executed or exposed to lions in the arena see *Coliseum (also Amphitheatre)*. It was an unhappy deep-rooted tradition of the Roman people, fostered in an age of wars and war-captives from barbaric nations. It came to an end, as the games were very costly, with the economic collapse after the Fall of Rome, and from first to last the practice had not lasted half as long as the judicial and other duels (with the blessing of priests) and barbarous animal combats which succeeded it in Christendom.

Glands, the Endocrinal. Glands are organs which "secrete"—extract the material from the blood and build up—fluids which are of importance in the work of the body. Some (liver, etc.) have the fluid conveyed from the gland by ducts or tubes; others pour the fluid directly into the blood, and are therefore called ductless or endocrinal ("inter-

nally secreting"). The discovery of the latter is one of the most revolutionary advances in science of the last quarter of a century, and is of primary importance in all controversy in regard to the nature of man and his behaviour. The secretions of these glands are called "hormones" (excitants) because this seemed at first to be their function, and in the majority of cases this remains true, though many are now known to have a restraining action. Their influence in the life of the body is out of all proportion to the quantity of the hormone involved and the size of the organs, and seems to be in the nature of the action of enzymes (substances which in small quantities influence chemical combinations by their presence without taking part in the combinations). Their activity was vaguely noticed in the last century when the importance of the "suprarenal capsules" (adrenal glands) was perceived (1855), and when later the connection of the state of the thyroid gland with cretinism, and of the pituitary body with giantism, was proved. As other discoveries were made it was suggested that the body had two delivery services of stimulants to the organs: the telegraphic service of the nervous system and the postal service of the glands and the blood stream. Some experts suggested that the latter is the older economy of the body. However that may be, we realize that in the case of man the hormones have an amazing influence on mental vitality and on much of our behaviour that comes under the heading of moral or immoral; and we begin to have a grasp of the human mechanism compared with which the body-and-soul theory seems as ingenuous as the story of Eden or of the Tower of Babel. Equally important is the large, but as yet imperfectly defined, promise of aid in the improvement of behaviour (or "human nature"). In 1936 Prof. M. Bogart, one of the most distinguished chemists in America, said, at the annual conference of the American Chemical Society, that "the time must come when the chemist will be able to make substances that will greatly increase the thinking powers of the brain," and that "we are now able to synthesize drugs which affect human

personality . . . drugs that will enhance alertness and intelligence and create synthetic supermen."

Prof. Bogart, and other scientific men who have used only slightly less optimistic language about the possibility of "changing human nature," were thinking primarily of the Thyroid Gland. This double gland (or two glands, two inches in length, connected by a thin bridge across the lower part of the wind-pipe) puts into the blood a substance (thyroxin) which stimulates all tissues of the body much as a stream of oxygen feeds a fire. Its chief ingredient seems to be iodine; hence, apparently, the prevalence of idiocy (or cretinism) in districts where the water lacks iodine and the gland is sluggish. Over-activity of the gland causes a feverish and consuming activity of the tissues. The hormone is produced synthetically, and there is ground to suppose that administration under careful medical supervision may one day do wonders, especially on the mental life, as the brain-tissues are the most notably affected. Between excessive and morbidly defective activity of the glands there is every shade of variation, and this is bound to be reflected in shades of mental life. But the Pituitary Gland (a body, about the size of a hazel-nut, at the base of the brain) now attracts even greater attention. It is a double or compound gland. Its anterior part is known to regulate growth; hence its irregularities cause giants on the one hand and dwarfs on the other, while in normal activity it keeps the organism within the average limits of size for its species. The more it is studied the more important it is found to be. Some experts believe that the pituitary secretes at least twenty-four hormones with different actions, and that it is the "master-gland" of the system, controlling and co-ordinating the other glands (Prof. Cannon, *Recent Advances in Endocrinology*, 1936). It certainly influences sex-life—it is claimed to control menstruation, precocity, parturition, the development of the breasts, etc.—and consequently mental life and moral behaviour (or the reverse). The Adrenal Glands (small capsules lying against the kidneys) supply an emer-

gency stimulus to the nerves and muscles (in case of accident, fight, etc.), and these also have an important sexual connection. Tumours on them often account for the development of male characteristics in females, and vice versa. Some (L. Berman, *The Glands Regulating Personality*, 2nd ed., 1928) consider that their action is continuous, as well as to prepare for an emergency, and that a good deal of the colour of character (the choleric man, the tame character, etc.) is due to variation of the glands in individuals. Berman replies to his many critics in *New Creations in Human Beings* (1938). The ovaries and testicles secrete hormones in addition to their primary function, as the effeminacy of a castrated man and the appearance of male characters in a woman with an ovarian tumour betray. Here, again, differences of character are largely related to glandular differences. The Parathyroids ("near the Thyroids") seem to control the assimilation of calcium and are related to character, since defect causes various degrees of nervous sensitiveness and irritability. The Thymus Gland (in the breast) is believed to check premature sex-development in the young, as it ceases to function at the onset of maturity. For the Pineal Body, which some claim to be a gland, see article under that title. Dr. F. Mateer has some useful chapters on the influence of the glands on mental efficiency and behaviour in her *Glands and Efficient Behaviour* (1935); and see J. G. Cobb, *The Glands of Destiny* (1936), and Prof. M. A. Goldziher, *The Endocrinal Glands* (1939).

Gnosticism. In many respects the five or six centuries before the beginning of the Christian Era may be compared with the last few centuries. Old creeds and religions decayed, and there was a false (or premature) dawn of modern thought. In Asia Atheistic Buddhism and Confucianism appeared; in the West the Ionian thinkers started a tradition of independent (practically Atheistic) speculation, a purely humanitarian ethic which culminated in the Epicurean-Stoic philosophy that commanded most allegiance in the educated circles of the Greek-Roman world. As in modern times, a very much smaller

number of the educated Greeks rejected this general Rationalism as "superficial" and professed to cherish, more or less secretly as a rule, a very superior "wisdom" of a spiritualist character. This occurred among the Brahmins of India, the followers of Lao-tse in China, the later Babylonians and Persians, the Pythagoreans and Platonists of Greece, and the Egyptians and Syrians. The Jews of the Dispersion, their eyes opened to the crudity of the cult of Jahveh, often embraced this esoteric wisdom and embodied their speculations in an apocryphal literature [*Odes of Solomon*, etc.; and see *Cabbala*] which some writers call Gnostic, though the word is generally used—it seems to have first appeared in the second century after Christ—of a large body of heretical sects which attempted in the first and second centuries to apply this *gnosis* ("knowledge" or wisdom) to the Christian story. L. G. Rylands (*The Beginnings of Gnostic Christianity*, 1940) suggests that the cult of Jesus [see] grew out of this pre-Christian mysticism. The main features of this very varied pre-Christian ferment of thought were that the conception of God was removed from the materialistic older theologies and spiritualized, and that, to reconcile this purely spiritual God with the world, a whole hierarchy of lesser spirits (æons), with outstanding personalities close to God (Sophia, Demiourgos, the Word or logos, the Lord, etc.), had to be invented. Like our modern occultists, the adherents commonly affirmed that their esoteric wisdom had come down from some earlier revelation or from some extraordinarily gifted beings.

The works of Philo Judæus, on the one hand, show us the intellectual side of this movement among the Jews in the time of Jesus, and (if we care to attach any historical value to the story) the account of Simon Magus in *Acts* represents the practical claim of power over spirits. In the very cosmopolitan and closely intercommunicative cities of that time these small groups of occultists would naturally borrow the widely prevalent idea of a Messiah, Redeemer, or Saviour of the world from sin and evil. Not only the later Jews offered

this idea, but, as Count von Baudissin shows in his *Adonis und Esmun* (1911), the Babylonians and Phœnicians had evolved the idea of a divine Saviour and Healer from the age-old legend of Tammuz as the vegetation or spring-god (redeeming men from the winter-death). Some claim a corresponding development in India (E. Abegg, *Der Messias Glaube in Indien und Iran* (1928)); and in the case of Persia the rise and spiritualization of the Mithra [see] cult is familiar. The crude dualism of older Persia—an eternal world of good spirits presided over by Ahura Mazda and an equally eternal world of evil spirits headed by Angra Mainyu, the creator of darkness and matter—failed to meet the questions of the new age. It was sought to save the omnipotence or supremacy of God by suggesting that the leaders of the wicked spirits, who had created matter, were originally good spirits—emanations from God as the rays emanate from the sun—who had fallen from grace, and that, instead of man having to wait fatalistically until it pleased God to annihilate evil and matter, one of the good spirits or æons would lead men in the attack on evil or in some way redeem them. Wisdom (personified or as an esoteric doctrine) was this redeemer in the pure creed, just as we say that science will redeem the race, but among the very numerous shades of the new thought we find ideas akin, on broad lines, to the Christian conception of a divine or divine-human Redeemer. Where and how this pre-Christian thought contacted the belief in Jesus and his mission is a matter of speculation. Religious writers are coy about facing the paradox (as it is on their views) that on the greatest event of all time we have the scantiest and most obscure and unreliable literature of any important event in an era of fully developed civilization with an ample literature. [See Jesus.] What we clearly know is that before the end of the first century certain educated Christian leaders with large bodies of followers began to apply the old speculations to the story of Jesus. These are the Gnostics of history, and since they generally regarded Jahveh and the Old Testament as evil and the human nature of Jesus as a

mere phantasm—all consequences of their hatred of matter—the bishops fell heavily upon them, and the Churches were convulsed by a passionate struggle. Very little of the Gnostic literature has survived the fury. Mead's *Fragments of a Faith Forgotten* (1900) gives (mixed up with Theosophical speculation) some interesting fragments, and he has published a translation (1896) of the occultist work of the time, *Pistis Sophia*. See also E. Amélineau, *Essai sur le Gnosticisme* (1887); M. Friedländer, *Der vorgeschichtliche jüdische Gnosticismus* (1898); Isidore Levy, *La légende de Pythagore* (1927); L. G. Rylands, *The Beginnings of Gnostic Christianity* (1940); and works cited in the text.

Gobineau, Count Joseph Arthur de (1816–82), French Orientalist. Entering the diplomatic service, he was sent to Persia and became Ambassador Extraordinary there in 1861. He made a thorough study of the country and its history, and his *Histoire des Perses* (2 vols., 1869) and *Les religions et la philosophie dans l'Asie Centrale* (4 vols., 1853–5) were standard works at the time. Count Gobineau was a Theist who had rejected Romanism. His biographer, L. Schemann (*Gobineau*, 2 vols., 1916), tells how his friends made futile efforts in his last year to bring him back to the Church, had the sacraments administered to him while he was unconscious, and buried him with Catholic rites.

Goblet, René (1828–1905), French statesman. A provincial lawyer who worked with the anti-clerical Liberals of the Third Empire and in 1871 was appointed General Procurator to the Court of Appeal at Amiens. Later, entering the Chambre, he became Minister of the Interior, Minister of Education, Premier and Minister of Foreign Affairs. As Minister of Education he excluded the clergy from the schools, and as leader of the Radical-Socialists he supported every measure against the Church.

Goblet d'Alviella, Count Eugène, LL.D., Ph.D. (1846–1925), Belgian anthropologist. He was professor of the history of religions at Brussels University, member of the Belgian Académie Royale, and leader of the anti-clerical Liberals in the Senate. He

was President of the Belgian Cremation Society, which the Church bitterly opposed. Although he was one of the highest authorities on comparative religion in Europe and a liberal Theist, the Balliol officials refused him a room in 1891, when he was invited to deliver the Hibbert Lectures (*Lectures on the Origin and Growth of the Conception of God*) at Oxford. His Rationalism is best seen in his *Croyances, Rites, Institutions* (3 vols., 1911).

God. Although the word is believed by so many to express the highest conception, if not the most august reality, that the mind has attained, its derivation and literal meaning are, like those of the names Jahveh and Allah, unknown. The most plausible guess is that in old German it was a neuter noun meaning image or idol. It is found in all Teutonic languages and in no other branch of the Aryan race. It is almost equally difficult to-day to assign it a definite and universal meaning. The common definition, "the Supreme Being," is inaccurate in connection with polytheistic religions, which are historically the majority, and it is incongruous if applied to the conception of God of many who now claim to be Theists. Nor is the connotation of awe, reverence, or worship, which is often included in the definition, always correct. Many Theists who give the name to the basic "Power" of the universe or to the collective idealism of the race have no such emotional reaction to their idea, while among educated people the idea of worship is increasingly regarded as a reminiscence of ancient Oriental despotisms. They resent the idea of "a venerable Being with an inordinate lust for propitiation and praise" (Wells), or "a God for ever hearkening unto his self-appointed laud" (Sir W. Watson). If we further recall that the spokesmen or writers of the general body of Theists, the members of the Churches, warmly dispute the validity of each other's proofs of the existence of God [see *Beauty in Nature*; *Cosmological Argument*; *Design*; *First Cause*; *Psychological Argument*; *Theism*; etc., and later in this article] we realize that what millions are taught to regard as the most certain and

incomparably the most important of all truths is really one of the most obscure, incoherent, and uncertain of assertions. Some find in this immense variety of views the incidental consolation that it prevents any man from denying the existence of God—"Which God?" they ask—but even this is illusory. Very few Atheists [see] have ever thought it necessary to deny the existence of God, and their "disbelief," which the best dictionaries define as simply lack of belief, is strictly logical. It means that they have examined, and rejected as invalid, all the evidence for the existence of any reality other than nature (whether in nature or no) and man, and they consider that the name God is wrongly applied to the dynamic element of nature (which might be ether), or to an abstract conception of "the soul of humanity," or to whatever produced all that we admire when the same cause produced all that is ugly, stupid, repulsive, or painful.

(1) The existence and various conceptions of the nature of God are discussed in a large number of articles of this work, and the conclusions may here be summarized under three headings. The origin of the belief in God, in the first place, is as obscure and disputed as the origin of the Hebrew, the Zoroastrian, or the Christian religion. However, Egyptian and Sumerian documents have made an end of the ingenuous idea that Moses or Abraham inspired the belief, and we may set aside as equally fantastic the theory of a still more primitive revelation which the (Catholic) founders of the Diffusionist School [see] have recently tried to introduce into anthropology. We have then two chief theories: that tribes deified ancestors of special importance [*Ancestor Worship*], or that they projected personality into the forces of nature, imagining superhuman beings in the sun, sky, earth, fire, etc. [*Nature Gods*]. The lowest peoples known to us, the Negritoes [see], have no gods. What religious ideas, if any, they have will be discussed under that title and under *Religion*, *The Origin of*; but their godlessness disposes both of the idea of a primitive revelation and of the argument, which was once very popular, for the existence of God from

the supposed universality of the belief [see *Universality of Belief in God*]. In the case of some of these lowest peoples, who represent man as he was before the development of the Neanderthal (or Mousterian) race, it is agreed that in their pure state they have no idea of superhuman powers or deified ancestors. At the next stage of human progress, represented by the Australian aboriginals, we find the highest authorities at variance. All agree that they believe emphatically in a spirit-part of man which survives the body, and that they have a tradition of an ancestral race of more powerful or more gifted men, the Alcheringa. These are in no sense gods, and the idea of creation (or of having made the rivers, mountains, etc.) which is sometimes associated with them is said by many experts to be due to contact with Christians. Spencer and Gillen, who are regarded in academic circles as the highest authorities, deny that any of the tribes isolated from white influence have an idea of a being who might be called a god (*Northern Tribes of Central Australia*, 1904, and *Native Tribes of Central Australia*, 1899). Against these some religious writers quote Dr. A. W. Howitt (*Native Tribes of South-Eastern Australia*, 1904), who certainly knew the natives thoroughly, but he says only that the tribes have an idea of a sort of chief (variously named Bungil, Altjira, etc.) of the spirits, and, since there is not the least worship of these, they have "no religion" in the ordinary sense. It is now impossible to check Christian adulterations of the native beliefs. All that can be admitted, and this is not undisputed, is that many tribes had ideas of a "big fellow," coarsely described as a rule, whom Theists may care to regard as a god. At the next cultural level, the Melanesians, we find dead chiefs particularly honoured (with sacrifices, etc.), and at the next higher level (the Bantu, Polynesians, Amerinds, etc.) nature-gods are plentiful, as well as glorified ancestors. We have no definite evidence that enables us to decide whether man first imagined gods (superhuman powers) in nature or deified outstanding ancestors, but from that level upward the next world reflects this world as it expands in the

mind of the people or the priests. The chief of the shades rises to the status of monarchy or principedom just as the living chief does in the course of social evolution.

(2) In the article *Monotheism* it will be shown that the old tradition, to which so many still cling, that men learned to rise above polytheism only through the Hebrew and Christian religions is false. We are too apt to examine savage or ancient religions with an outfit of ideas (spirit, infinity, eternity, etc.) which they had not developed. There are, indeed, modern thinkers, sympathetic to religion—Prof. W. James, for instance, in his *Pluralistic Universe*—who deny that the idea of monotheism is superior to that of polytheism, and there is an increasing number, not only of independent Theists, but of members of Churches, who claim that attaching to the idea of God the attributes of infinity, omnipotence, and omniscience was an error that must be abandoned [see *Finite Gods*]. As to the question of personality, see *Personal and Impersonal Gods*. The Hebrew religion [see] never at any time rose above the moral and intellectual (or religious) level of contemporary civilizations, and during the far greater part of Hebrew history was notably inferior to them. The Christian religion [see] did not add a single improvement to the conception of God of the higher religions or religious philosophies which immediately preceded it, and it introduced elements (vindictiveness, hell, atonement, etc.) which brought it down to the degraded level of the mediæval Church. By that time, however, the *rise* of the gods or of God had culminated and the *fall* had begun. Atheistic Buddhism and Confucianism had captured the thinking minority in the great civilizations of Asia, and the disguised Atheism or non-Theism (since Atheism was a civic crime) of the early Greek thinkers had, through Epicurus, Zeno, and the Sceptics [see *Greeks*], supplied a purely humanitarian creed to the great majority of the thoughtful Greeks and Romans. We now know that it had been the same in Egypt [see]: we find it in the next efflorescence of civilization, the Arab-

was President of the Belgian Cremation Society, which the Church bitterly opposed. Although he was one of the highest authorities on comparative religion in Europe and a liberal Theist, the Balliol officials refused him a room in 1891, when he was invited to deliver the Hibbert Lectures (*Lectures on the Origin and Growth of the Conception of God*) at Oxford. His Rationalism is best seen in his *Croyances, Rites, Institutions* (3 vols., 1911).

God. Although the word is believed by so many to express the highest conception, if not the most august reality, that the mind has attained, its derivation and literal meaning are, like those of the names Jahveh and Allah, unknown. The most plausible guess is that in old German it was a neuter noun meaning image or idol. It is found in all Teutonic languages and in no other branch of the Aryan race. It is almost equally difficult to-day to assign it a definite and universal meaning. The common definition, "the Supreme Being," is inaccurate in connection with polytheistic religions, which are historically the majority, and it is incongruous if applied to the conception of God of many who now claim to be Theists. Nor is the connotation of awe, reverence, or worship, which is often included in the definition, always correct. Many Theists who give the name to the basic "Power" of the universe or to the collective idealism of the race have no such emotional reaction to their idea, while among educated people the idea of worship is increasingly regarded as a reminiscence of ancient Oriental despotisms. They resent the idea of "a venerable Being with an inordinate lust for propitiation and praise" (Wells), or "a God for ever hearkening unto his self-appointed laud" (Sir W. Watson). If we further recall that the spokesmen or writers of the general body of Theists, the members of the Churches, warmly dispute the validity of each other's proofs of the existence of God [see *Beauty in Nature*; *Cosmological Argument*; *Design*; *First Cause*; *Psychological Argument*; *Theism*; etc., and later in this article] we realize that what millions are taught to regard as the most certain and

incomparably the most important of all truths is really one of the most obscure, incoherent, and uncertain of assertions. Some find in this immense variety of views the incidental consolation that it prevents any man from denying the existence of God—"Which God?" they ask—but even this is illusory. Very few Atheists [see] have ever thought it necessary to deny the existence of God, and their "disbelief," which the best dictionaries define as simply lack of belief, is strictly logical. It means that they have examined, and rejected as invalid, all the evidence for the existence of any reality other than nature (whether in nature or no) and man, and they consider that the name God is wrongly applied to the dynamic element of nature (which might be ether), or to an abstract conception of "the soul of humanity," or to whatever produced all that we admire when the same cause produced all that is ugly, stupid, repulsive, or painful.

(1) The existence and various conceptions of the nature of God are discussed in a large number of articles of this work, and the conclusions may here be summarized under three headings. The origin of the belief in God, in the first place, is as obscure and disputed as the origin of the Hebrew, the Zoroastrian, or the Christian religion. However, Egyptian and Sumerian documents have made an end of the ingenuous idea that Moses or Abraham inspired the belief and we may set aside as equally fanciful the theory of a still more prior revelation which the Catholicism had of the Diffusionist School. Jer recently tried to introduce a new pology. We have then theories: that tribes deified us, on the special importance [Ancestral side or that they projected persons in the the forces of nature, image to attach human beings in the sun, story] the fire, etc. [Nature Gods.] in Acts peoples known to us, the Negri of power have no gods. What religiously any, they have will be discussed of that title and under Religion, The cultists of; but their godlessness disposes of the idea of a primitive revelation, of the argument, which was origin and popular, for the existence of God offered

the supposed universality of the belief [see **Universality of Belief in God**]. In the case of some of these lowest peoples, who represent man as he was before the development of the Neanderthal (or Mousterian) race, it is agreed that in their pure state they have no idea of superhuman powers or deified ancestors. At the next stage of human progress, represented by the Australian aborigines, we find the highest authorities at variance. All agree that they believe emphatically in a spirit-part of man which survives the body, and that they have a tradition of an ancestral race of more powerful or more gifted men, the Alcheringa. These are in no sense gods, and the idea of creation (or of having made the rivers, mountains, etc.) which is sometimes associated with them is said by many experts to be due to contact with Christians. Spencer and Gillen, who are regarded in academic circles as the highest authorities, deny that any of the tribes isolated from white influence have an idea of a being who might be called a god (*Northern Tribes of Central Australia*, 1904, and *Native Tribes of Central Australia*, 1899). Against these some religious writers quote Dr. A. W. Howitt (*Native Tribes of South-Eastern Australia*, 1904), who certainly knew the natives thoroughly, but he says only that the tribes have an idea of a sort of chief (variously named Bungil, Altjira, etc.) of the spirits, and, since there is not the least worship of these, they have "no religion" in the ordinary sense. It is now impossible to check Christian adulterations of the native beliefs. All that can be admitted, and this is not undisputed, is that many tribes had ideas of a "big fellow," coarsely described as a rule, whom Theists may care to regard as a god. At the next cultural level, the Melanesians, we find dead chiefs particularly honoured (with sacrifices, etc.), and at the next higher level (the Bantu, Polynesians, Amerinds, etc.) nature-gods are plentiful, as well as glorified ancestors. We have no definite evidence that enables us to decide whether man first imagined gods (superhuman powers) in nature or deified outstanding ancestors, but from that level upward the next world reflects this world as it expands in the

mind of the people or the priests. The chief of the shades rises to the status of monarchy or principedom just as the living chief does in the course of social evolution.

(2) In the article **Monotheism** it will be shown that the old tradition, to which so many still cling, that men learned to rise above polytheism only through the Hebrew and Christian religions is false. We are too apt to examine savage or ancient religions with an outfit of ideas (spirit, infinity, eternity, etc.) which they had not developed. There are, indeed, modern thinkers, sympathetic to religion—Prof. W. James, for instance, in his *Pluralistic Universe*—who deny that the idea of monotheism is superior to that of polytheism, and there is an increasing number, not only of independent Theists, but of members of Churches, who claim that attaching to the idea of God the attributes of infinity, omnipotence, and omniscience was an error that must be abandoned [see **Finite Gods**]. As to the question of personality, see **Personal and Impersonal Gods**. The Hebrew religion [see] never at any time rose above the moral and intellectual (or religious) level of contemporary civilizations, and during the far greater part of Hebrew history was notably inferior to them. The Christian religion [see] did not add a single improvement to the conception of God of the higher religions or religious philosophies which immediately preceded it, and it introduced elements (vindictiveness, hell, atonement, etc.) which brought it down to the degraded level of the mediæval Church. By that time, however, the *rise* of the gods or of God had culminated and the *fall* had begun. Atheistic Buddhism and Confucianism had captured the thinking minority in the great civilizations of Asia, and the disguised Atheism or non-Theism (since Atheism was a civic crime) of the early Greek thinkers had, through Epicurus, Zeno, and the Sceptics [see **Greeks**], supplied a purely humanitarian creed to the great majority of the thoughtful Greeks and Romans. We now know that it had been the same in Egypt [see]: we find it in the next efflorescence of civilization, the Arab-

Persian [see]; we see it in the modern and greatest development of culture. What the millions who bow to authority, who have neither the leisure nor the equipment to study such problems, profess is here irrelevant. We are compelled by the facts to formulate a Law of History: that disbelief in God or gods always increases with the spread of enlightenment and of freedom of thought and discussion. From facts already given [Culture and Religion, etc.] and to be given later [Nobel Prize; Science and Religion; Philosophy; etc.] we find, wherever a test can be applied, that the great majority of the men of higher ability and of the relevant qualifications—in science, history, or philosophy—no longer believe in God; and, since the qualifications are, by better education and an ampler literature, now in large part democratized, we find, as the law would lead us to expect, that until the Fascist-Clerical alliance reacted, Atheism [see] spread in our time a hundred times more rapidly than any religion had ever spread. "Only a small minority of people, even in Christian countries, possess such a belief: the majority have ceased to be interested in the existence of a Divine Being," says the Unitarian Dr. Tudor Jones (*The Reality of the Idea of God*, 1929, p. 12); yet we find other clerical writers still protesting that the belief is instinctive and common to normal men, and a distinguished scientific man like Dr. Millikan declares in the Press that he has "never known a thoughtful man who did not believe in God." Literary journalists give the public the same impression, and no encyclopædia conveys the truth on this point in the relevant articles.

(3) This very general and, wherever it is not checked by the Fascist-Clerical reaction, growing scepticism, which it is no longer possible to connect with moral causes—at least two of the nations which have poisoned modern life (Italy and Japan) have for ten years added considerably to the wealth and power of their Churches, while the Nazis of Germany [see] would give State-endowment to a "Positive Christianity"—is not so much due to science as to a remarkable collapse of what are called arguments

for the existence of God. The familiar or traditional arguments are regarded with disdain in the world of philosophy and even by large numbers of the better-educated Theistic writers; and this disdain is extended to the superficial endorsement of the arguments by occasional men of science (Lodge, Osborn, Millikan, A. Thomson, Pupin, etc.) or other distinguished men who, although they have not read a tithe of the serious literature of the subject, lend themselves to symposia ("What I Believe," "Has Science Discovered God?", etc.) in the popular Press. These arguments, which take the general form of inferences from certain features (seen with one eye closed) of nature, are dealt with in separate articles [Beauty in Nature; Chance; Conscience; Cosmological Argument; Design; First Cause; etc.]. They are repeated confidently, though the fallacy of them has been shown a hundred times, in all Catholic and Fundamentalist literature and by many writers who fancy they are high above that very modest level: Sir A. Thomson (*Concerning Evolution*, 1925); Dr. Warschauer (*The Atheist's Dilemma*, 1905); Prof. W. J. Moulton (*The Certainty of God*, 1923); Prof. A. L. Reys (*God and His Attributes*, 1929); Archdeacon Storr (*God and the Modern Mind*, 1931); Archbishop D'Arcy (*God in Science*, 1931); Dean Matthews (*The Purpose of God*, 1935), etc. The statement of some of these writers that they give a new form to the old arguments is negligible; the changes, where there are any, are slight or merely verbal.

Passing over such intellectually empty screeds as Beverley Nichol's *The Fool Hath Said* (1936), we next have a class of apologists who appeal to students or to believers of a middle cultural level and are aware that philosophy disdains the old arguments and science finds them based upon ignorance and illusion. These writers confess that the above arguments are "widely discredited" (Prof. Beckwith), have "gone" (Prof. D. S. Robinson), are "bankrupt" (Dr. M. B. Stewart), have "long since fallen into disfavour" (Sorley), and "there is now none so intellectually poor as to do them reverence" (Dr. J. A. Leighton). It is difficult to believe that such writers

are unaware that four-fifths of the people who believe in God hold, and are emphatically taught, that these are the solid, if not the only, grounds of belief. But the new line of argument which they would substitute for "our venerable friends" (as they say) is just as futile. Nearly all of them concentrate on the psychological argument: that "inner experience" has the same scientific right to be consulted as external experience, and that this internal witness emphatically proclaims the existence of God. This is the main argument of such works as Prof. G. D. Hicks's *Philosophical Basis of Theism* (1937); Prof. C. A. Beckwith's *Idea of God* (1923); Prof. D. S. Robinson's *God of the Liberal Christian* (1926); Dr. M. D. Stewart's *God and Reality* (1926); Canon Bodington's *God and Ourselves* (1930); Dr. W. H. Gray's *Finding God* (1931); Prof. W. A. Brown's *Pathways to Certainty* (1931); Prof. W. N. Horton's *Theism and the Modern Mind* (1931); Canon Streeter's *God Who Speaks* (1936); Dean C. A. Alington's *Can We Believe in God?* (1936); Sir A. Eddington's *Science and the Unseen World* (1929), and many others. It is an amazing reflection on the procedure of public instruction in our time, with its vast and variegated literature, that hundreds of thousands of readers can be taught to rely on a religious sense or instinct or intuition, or whatever the inner light is called, just at the time when the science of psychology has completely discarded these supposed means of perception. [See **Psychological Argument.**]

We have, in fine, a small group of philosophers, or a few scattered philosophers, who still concern themselves, as the great majority of philosophers do not, about God. In *Contemporary American Philosophy* (2 vols., 1930) we have the professions of thirty-four of the leading representatives of philosophy in America, and they were expressly invited to discuss their religious convictions. Only ten of them professed to retain the word "God," and only two of these seem to have meant by it a personal, infinite God. A point on which the minority of philosophic Theists agree is that they

build upon a religion of Values [see]—on the discredited principle that science studies facts and leaves values to religion and philosophy—but, as Prof. Taylor shows in the article "Theism," in the *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics*, they are most agreed in their disdain of the popular arguments, and their new arguments are unintelligible to the public and are often confined to the individual who ingeniously elaborates each of them. In his *Idea of God in the Light of Recent Philosophy* (1920), Prof. A. S. Pringle-Pattison (who really refers to the philosophy of fifty years ago) plays upon the most abandoned of mediæval arguments, the ontological. In his *Space, Time, and Deity* (1920), Prof. A. S. Alexander offers us a theory of a finite and evolving deity which seems to appeal to no other philosopher. Prof. John Dewey [see] gives the word "God" a meaning which other philosophers courteously regard as original and the clergy pronounce atheistical. Some (Absolute Idealists) would revive the amorphous spiritual and impersonal God of Hegel; others (Personal Idealists), like Prof. W. R. Sorley (*Moral Values and the Idea of God*, 1924), think that our moral intuitions infallibly involve a God, and they are completely indifferent to what psychology has to say about intuitions, and the science of ethics has to say about moral sentiments. The work of Bishop Barnes will be considered under *Science and Religion*.

It confirms one's impression of the complete collapse of the structure of reasoning on which the Theistic faith of thoughtful people has rested since the days of Socrates that many now plead that proofs need not be rationally invulnerable, while some would transfer the name "God" to a reality or an abstraction which is in the proper sense not disputed. It is not uncommon in recent works to find a protest that proofs of the existence of God need not be as cogent as the proofs which we use in science and history. So Streeter, in *The God Who Speaks* (1936), followed by Dean Alington in *Can We Believe in God?* (1936). The existence of God "cannot be proved," says Prof. W. L. Davidson

(*Recent Theistic Discussion*, 1921). "The idea of proving the existence of God in strict accordance with the canons of logic was given up long ago," says Prof. H. W. Wright (*The Religious Response*, 1929, p. 170); though in the ten years since he made this statement the writers for the great body of believers have continued to pour out "proofs" in the old triumphant mood. Some, who recognize that as long as the existence of God is stated as a fact it must be proved like any other statement of fact, urge us to regard it only as a hypothesis with which it is in practice better to conform. "It is the grand Perhaps of the universe," says Sir H. Jones in his Gifford Lectures. In Germany a theory which falls back upon Pascal's *il faut parier*—though it is greeted as very original—urges us to act "as if it were true" (Vaihinger's *Die Philosophie des Als-Ob*). A few philosophers and refined folk may do so. In America a number of professors (chiefly Prof. Ames in his *New Orthodoxy*, 1918, and Prof. C. H. Garman in *Studies in Philosophy and Psychology*, 1906) would transfer the name God to "the personified social spirit" or "the group-spirit"—a wit calls this new God "the cosmic Uncle Sam"—just as H. G. Wells at one time threw out the suggestion of a "Great Captain." Demos, for whom these despairing proposals are made, continues to drift into complete indifference to the subject. The situation provides the answer to another point that is raised in this connection. Hundreds of writers in the last fifty years have argued that belief in God will be easier and stronger than ever when the creeds and Churches pass away. "Soul and God stand sure," they repeat from Browning. But it appears that the foundations of belief in these crumble just as rapidly as the bases of all other religious beliefs; and it is notable that, as far as the present century is concerned, this is not so much due to Rationalist criticism or the impact of science as to the mutual criticisms of Theistic writers and the internal decay of the structure of proof. The Theistic works quoted above are only a selection of the most important or more popular from a large literature

of the kind; yet the only systematic and comprehensive Rationalist analysis of the literature and arguments published in the last thirty years is McCabe's small work *The Existence of God* (Thinker's Lib. ed., 1933). It is obvious that a steady supply of critical works on these fundamental topics in a form that would appeal to the workers would accelerate the dissolution of faith. That this would be a social gain and would make an end of the present confusion of moral standards is shown in the scores of articles in which we set forth the truth about "the Ages of Faith" and social progress in our "Age of Scepticism."

Goddess of Reason, The. Many writers give a solemn warning to our age, with its increasing substitution of reason and science for faith, by vague and totally inaccurate references to the horrors into which, they say, the French Revolution plunged after setting up a Goddess of Reason in the Catholic cathedral at Paris. They do not seem to be aware of the fact, which not a single history of the time omits, that the chief author of the Reign of Terror was a man, Robespierre, who believed firmly in God, loathed Atheism, and, as soon as he could, replaced the voluntary cult of Reason and Liberty by a compulsory cult of the Supreme Being. We have seen, however, in various articles [*Feast of Reason*; *French Revolution*; etc.] that all historians agree that what happened in the Feast of Reason and Liberty in Notre Dame is very falsely represented in religious literature. There was no "goddess," no use of the cathedral-altar, the lady (not a prostitute) who took the chief part symbolized Liberty not Reason, and the pageant was entirely decorous and impressive. See the above articles and Prof. Aulard's *Culte de la raison* (1892).

Godkin, Edwin Laurence, D.C.L. (1831–1902), American writer. He was the son of an Irish presbyterian minister, but during his studies at *Queen's College*, Belfast, was deeply influenced by the works of J. S. Mill. He migrated to America and became a lawyer, but left the Bar for journalism, and was one of the most powerful as well as the most

idealistic editors in the country. Under his editorship (1865-99) the *New York Nation* won world-repute. His biographer, R. Ogden, explains that he was a Theist, but had no other religious beliefs and stood apart from all the Churches (*Life and Letters of E. L. Godkin*, 1907, II, 35-9).

Godwin, Mary Wollstonecraft (1759-97), social reformer. She was a teacher who won a great name in the progressive world of her time by writing and lecturing. In 1790 she wrote an open letter to Burke (*A Vindication of the Rights of Man*), in answer to his attack on the French Revolution, which was greatly esteemed, and two years later she virtually founded the feminist movement in Great Britain by her *Vindication of the Rights of Women*. She married William Godwin in 1797, and died in childbirth in the same year. Kegan Paul wrote a biography of this able and eloquent Rationalist writer in 1879. Robertson has an excellent chapter on her in his *Pioneer Humanists* (1907).

Godwin, William (1756-1836), writer. He was a Nonconformist minister of very strict views until 1783, when he fell under the influence of the great French Rationalists and left the Church. His *Political Justice* (1793) is counted a classic of the reform movement of the eighteenth century. His radical colleague, Holcroft, converted him to Atheism, but in later years he succumbed to the influence of Coleridge, and might be described as a Pantheist. *William Godwin: His Friends and Contemporaries* (2 vols., 1876) by C. K. Paul.

Goethe, Johann Wolfgang von (1749-1832), Germany's greatest poet. He was trained in law, but took to letters and joined the rebels of the *Sturm und Drang* (or insurrectionary) period. He quickly earned a European reputation by his *Sorrows of Young Werther*, a very sentimental and delicately written story; but the responsibility of statesmanship, when the Grand Duke of Weimar made him his chief minister, put an end to his period of gaiety, and from a graceful poet and lively companion he became an idealist head of a small State. A few years in Italy kindled in him a passion for classical ideals, giving a more

severe beauty to his verse and a strongly aggressive mood against the Churches (*Römische Elegien* and, with Schiller's co-operation, *Die Xenien*). He had been a Pantheist from youth, and so remained to the end, saying, when asked about a future life, "the sensible man leaves the future out of consideration." His conversations, in Eckermann, and letters show that he believed neither in a personal God nor personal immortality; and in a letter written (March 30, 1831) in the year before his death he describes himself as an "eclectic." While he was the only poet of modern times whom any experts venture to rank with Shakespeare, Goethe was also a master of the science of his time. As early as 1780 he supported Buffon's theory of the evolution of the earth, and his interest in geology led him to make one of the earliest discoveries of the Ice Age. His large knowledge of biology enabled him to welcome the application of the principle of evolution to plants and animals, and he wrote with ability and originality on physical questions. The best study of his work in science is that of R. Magnus, *Goethe als Naturforscher* (1906); and a summary of this and study of his Rationalism will be found in McCabe's *Goethe* (1912). He had the broadest intellectual genius since L. da Vinci, and, like him, showed the complete compatibility of distinction in both art and science. His *Faust*, which expresses every side of his genius, was composed in sections during sixty years of his life.

Golden Age, The. That the first age of men was a Golden Age, a period generally conceived to be without suffering or evil, was a common tradition among ancient nations. Maspero traces the idea in Egypt (*The Dawn of Civilization*, 1896), and Prof. Jeremias (article "Golden Age" in the *Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics*) describes at length a similar belief in ancient Babylon ("the age of Perfection lies at the beginning"). He shows also that the Persians postulated a purely spiritual age thousands of years before matter and its attendant evils were created. The Greek version is well known. In Homer heroes are translated to Elysium, the Garden of the Gods on earth in

which men once lived, and in Hesiod's *Works and Days* the poet describes how in the Golden Age men lived in perfect peace and happiness under the rule of Kronos. The Stoics and Cynics, who discarded all legends, retained this idea in the sense (later developed by Rousseau) that civilization had brought evils upon a happier natural state. That the Romans had the same legend is well known from a familiar line of Virgil: "The Age of Saturn comes again." It is a natural expression not only of man's eternal longing for a state free from sickness, pain, and excessive labour, but of the feeling that a good and fatherly God *must* have made a good world and that man forfeited it by his sins. [See also *Eden and Fall*.]

Golden Ages. The periods during which one or other nation rose to the peak of civilization are commonly called by historians Golden Ages, and a study of the relative inspiration of religion and scepticism in the creation and dissolution of these periods should provide one of the most positive and exact answers to the general question of the relative value of such inspiration. This very important study is not made either in any of the post-graduate social-historical monographs which now appear in abundance, or in historical works on each period, or in sociological works which profess to discuss the factors of social progress or decay. A. Toynbee's learned *Study of History* (3 vols., 2nd ed., 1935) avoids this issue like other historical works; and his work is on various grounds severely criticized by Lord Raglan in *How Came Civilization?* (1939). S. Casson's much slighter work, *Progress and Catastrophe* (1937), also evades this point, and is too restricted in its field to be of any value in this connection. In McCabe's *Golden Ages of History* (1940) such evidence about religion and scepticism as is available for each of the greater periods of history is collected, and it is shown that Golden Ages were never periods of deep religious feeling, but almost always times of an exceptional spread of scepticism. Such periods are sometimes chosen by historians on purely literary grounds (the Augustan Age) or artistic grounds (the Renaissance in

Italy), or with too easy an acceptance of earlier and less critical historians (the Age of Louis XIV, for instance, which had no great art and was one of grave depravity and injustice). However, when a selection is made of the fifteen periods which the majority of historians call Golden Ages, and the test of social welfare is applied as well as measurements of art and wealth, it is found that history completely discredits the claim that religion, or the Christian religion in particular, is an important inspiration of progress. The greater ages, in quality of civilization as well as in art and culture, were nearly all marked by a considerable growth of Rationalism in the creative class. They are spread over 3,500 years of history, yet only three of them—the periods of Lorenzo de' Medici, Elizabeth, and Louis XIV—fall in the 1,500 years of Christian history or in Christendom; and these three have, if we apply all the tests of a high civilization, the feeblest title to be included.

Golden Rule, The. An amazing amount of space has been devoted in Christian apologetic literature to the myth that Jesus gave a unique counsel to the world in what is called the Golden Rule. Some give this in the form of the supposed words of Jesus: "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself." Most Christian writers, reflecting that this is a quotation from the Old Testament (*Lev. xix, 18*), and that on their view of Jewish literature the maxim is more than a thousand years older than Jesus, prefer the form: "Whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you, do ye even so to them" (*Matt. vii, 12*). Jewish literature, however, has the Rule also in this form: "What thou thyself hatest do to no man" (*Tobit iv, 18*; *Hillel, Shab. 31*; *R. Akiba, Abot of R. Nathan*, etc.). To the objection that the commandment is here in a negative form, Hirsch replies that this makes it superior, since in its positive form it suggests selfishness: to do a service in expectation of a return. Few sections of religious controversy are more misguided and aimless. The maxim is a fundamental principle of the utilitarian or humanitarian ethic, as Confucius [see] pointed out ages ago. Asked to give

his rule of life in one character, he replied with one which is translated "As heart" (or Reciprocity); and the Rev. J. Legge explained in earlier editions of the *Encyclopædia Britannica*—the Catholic reviser has cut this out of the last edition—that his counsel was meant both positively and negatively. It is superfluous to quote Aristotle (in Diogenes Laertius, V, 21), Epictetus ("What you would avoid suffering yourself seek not to impose upon others," *Fragments*, XXXVII), Plato, Isocrates, etc. If any moralist failed to use the expression in some form, we may conclude that he regarded it as an ethical platitude. The experience of common folk in all languages expresses itself in something like "Do as you would be done by." The modern social ethic divests it of mysticism and rhetorical exaggeration—we are not called upon to "love" unpleasant neighbours, especially in the same degree as we love ourselves—and presents it as an elementary condition of satisfactory social life. The Golden Rule is one of the chief grounds of claiming that the Christian ethic is unique, yet it is as platitudinous as the rules of elementary arithmetic.

Goldie, Sir George Dashwood Taubman, K.C.M.G., P.C., F.R.S. (1846–1925), founder of Nigeria. After some years as a Royal Engineer he travelled in Africa and won for the Empire the territory which is now Nigeria. He refused to have it named Golderia. He disliked publicity, saying: "The work's everything, the man's nothing." He was at one time President of the Royal Geographical Society and was in the Privy Council. Lady Goldie says in her memoir (*Sir George Goldie*, 1934) that he was an Agnostic, had "left England to escape from the sound of the Church bells" (p. 106). He had a great disdain of Christian doctrines and used to say that Christians had "always been hypocrites." Lady Goldie adds that she was in complete agreement with him, and that in her youth she and her brothers wanted to dedicate their lives to "the destruction of the Church."

Gomme, Sir George Lawrence, F.S.A. (1853–1916), folklorist. He was a Civil servant—Statistical Officer to the L.C.C. and Clerk to the Council—who, like

E. Clodd, Lord Avebury, etc., attained a position of distinction in science and letters. He was one of the chief authorities on Folklore and founder of the Folklore Society. He was knighted in 1911, President of the Anthropological Section of the British Association in 1916, and at various times editor of the *Antiquary*, *Folklore Journal*, and *Archæological Review*.

Gomperz, Prof. Theodor (1832–1912), Austrian philosopher. He was professor of classical philology at Vienna University, and his great work, *Greek Thinkers* (Engl. trans., 4 vols., 1901–12), gave him a European reputation, and is still a classic. It is also one of the most candid in dealing with the scepticism of the Greek philosophers, and in the Introduction Gomperz has some Rationalistic speculations on the origin of religion. He was a friend of J. S. Mill, and edited the German translation of Mill's works (12 vols., 1869–80).

Goncourt, Edmond Louis Antoine de (1822–96), French writer. Son of a French general who entered into a remarkable literary partnership with his brother Jules. They published a long series of exquisitely artistic novels, of the naturalist school, and a number of biographical and historical works. Both were Atheists and very caustic about religious beliefs, especially in their *Idées et sensations* (1877). They defined religion as "part of a woman's sex," and religion without the supernatural as "wine without grapes." Life they define, with resolute Materialism, especially for literary artists of the first order, "the usufruct of an aggregation of molecules." Edmond, who survived his brother, continued the work, and left the greater part of his fortune to found the Goncourt Academy and an annual prize. **Jules Alfred Huet de Goncourt** (1830–70), the younger brother, was less gifted but equally Atheistic. Edmond describes in *Les frères Zim-ganno* (1879) the warmth and harmony of their common home.

Good, The. Since Plato, who despised material nature, and did much to close the line of evolutionary thought which the Ionians had opened, said that the standards and origins of Truth, Beauty, and Goodness are in another

and spiritual world, it has been the fashion to speak of the abstract idea of goodness as the Good. This practice of literary, ethical, and philosophical writers leads easily to mystic inferences which defy modern evolutionary philosophy and scientific psychology. [See Ethics.] There is no more reason to speak of "the Good" than of "the Ugly" or "the Evil." Ethics and aesthetics are now sciences, and regard goodness (social excellence and moral idealism) and beauty as, like their opposites, normal products of the cosmic evolutionary process or abstract conceptions of such products.

Gorani, Count Giuseppe (1744-1819), Italian writer. A noble of ancient family who embraced the ideas of the French Encyclopædists. He was a close friend of Beccaria [see], and co-operated with him in spreading their humanitarian Rationalism in Italy, especially in its application to the reform of law, politics, and education. A man of lofty ideals and great sincerity, Count Gorani accepted the moderate principles of the French Revolution, and was expelled from Italy for trying to disseminate them.

Gordon, Adam Lindsay (1833-70), Australian poet. He was educated at Cheltenham and Oxford, but he emigrated to Australia and joined the mounted police. In 1865 he was elected to the Legislative Assembly of South Australia. Settling later in Victoria, he won a high continental reputation by his volumes of poems (*Sea Spray and Smoke*, *Bush Ballads*, etc.), which often express his Rationalism.

Gordon, Thomas (about 1684-1750), Scottish Deist. There is some evidence that he was admitted to the Scottish Bar, but he settled in London, and got from Horace Walpole a lucrative Civil Service appointment. He published a series of drastic criticisms of the clergy which D'Holbach turned into French, translated Tacitus, Sallust, and Cicero, and wrote *The Pillars of Priestcraft and Orthodoxy Shaken* (1752).

Gorki, Alexei Maximovich Peshkov (1868-1936), Russian novelist. "Gorki," his pen-name, means "bitter"—the other words are his real name—and it fits a prominent feature of the stories of

Russian life which carried the fame of "Maxim Gorki" throughout the world. He began to work at the age of nine, and led a wandering life (as painter, baker, porter, hawker, railwayman, and clerk), which made him familiar with every side of the brutalized life of the people under the Tsars. His first story, *Makar Chudra*, was written in 1892. He had a Nietzschean contempt of all religion, and supported the Soviet regime. Gorki had, however, acquired considerable culture, and his literary ruthlessness was due to the warmth and sincerity of his humanitarian sentiments. In his last volume of essays, *Culture and the People* (1939) he says: "Paradise is one of the crass fictions invented by high-priests and fathers of the Church, a fiction whose purpose it is to requite the hellish torments of people on earth with the soap-bubble of a hope of peace in another place" (pp. 74-5).

Gospels, The. The four Gospels—the word is said to be the Anglo-Saxon "Godspel," or "Story about God"—which form the body of the New Testament were selected out of a large number that circulated in the Church until the end of the fourth century. [See Apocrypha and Canon.] They are the only documents, apart from the Pauline Epistles, which give biographical details about Jesus; and the details given in the Pauline Epistles amount to only a few lines. Without the Gospels, therefore, a belief in the historicity of Jesus could be based only upon a broad historical view of the events of the first century. The Fourth Gospel may in this connection be left out of consideration, since there is a general agreement that it belongs to the second century, and is therefore historically worthless as regards any statements it contains which are not in the earlier Gospels. These first three, known as the Gospels of Matthew, Mark, and Luke, though the title is "according to Matthew," etc., are called the Synoptic Gospels. In 1774 Griesbach composed a synopsis of the contents of the three which showed a considerable amount of overlapping, and they thus came later to have the name of "the Synoptics." Research in the East has brought to light various

documents of early Christian days, but no new or earlier Gospel. The most important find was the discovery in Egypt, in 1934, of two torn leaves and a fragment of an unknown Gospel, and it was at first claimed that this belonged to the first quarter, if not the first decade, of the second century; and, since the text agrees very largely with *John*, and in some verses with the other canonical Gospels, though always with marked verbal differences, it was held that these scraps proved that there was a wide circulation of the four Gospels at the beginning of the second century. It is, however, now generally agreed that they must be dated about 150, and Biblical experts differ as to whether they are parts of an independent Gospel or of an attempt at a harmony of the Gospels, like the *Diatesseron* [see]. The British Museum publishes a shilling work on them (*The New Gospel Fragments*, 1935). We are thus thrown back upon the Synoptics for material with which we may decide the question of the historicity of Jesus [see].

Since the earliest manuscripts of the Gospels—the *Codex Sinaiticus*, the *Codex Vaticanus*, and the *Codex Alexandrinus*—belong to the fourth and fifth centuries, when religious forgery was rife, and the books themselves are anonymous—we consider presently the claim that *Mark* and *Luke* were written by men of those names—we have only two ways of testing their biographical value, which depends chiefly on their date. We saw in an earlier article [Bab, The] by a modern example, perfectly authenticated, how in the East a religious leader of the type of Jesus may even in modern times have his memory richly embroidered with fictitious miracles that were unknown in lives of him written within twenty years of his death. In the East of 1,900 years ago this could happen even more easily. The historian has therefore to inquire (1) whether any Christian writings testify to the existence of the Gospels in the first century and at what date, and (2) whether there is anything in the narratives themselves that suggests the date of their origin. Since nearly all the scholars who have applied themselves to the study are Christian theologians,

we can hardly look to these for a quite unbiased use of the requisite historical apparatus, and it is instructive that the verdict of a body of divines whose work came nearest to the historical standard was negative. At the beginning of this century the Oxford Society of Historical Theology appointed a committee of theologians and historians to ascertain at what date we first have evidence in Christian writers of the existence of the Gospels. In their report, *The New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers* (1905), they rightly state that we find no quotation from any of the actual Gospels before the year 130, or a full century after the date assigned for the death of Jesus. Words of Jesus are quoted in writings of the first century (in Paul, the Letter of the Romans to the Corinthians, the Epistle of Barnabas, the *Pastor*, and the *Didache*), but not as they are in the Gospels. If it be said that at least these quotations show that some documents or traditions relating to Jesus were in circulation in the first century, we have to point out that the existence of a list of sayings of Jesus [see Logia] in that century is irrelevant to the question of the value of the biographical details of the Gospels. On sound historical principles it suggests no more than that such a person existed. Writers on this subject are much too prone to claim that when they have given plausible reasons for believing that documents of *unknown contents* existed before *Mark*, this gives some sort of value, if not full value, to the statements of *Mark* itself.

Since it is now commonly and dogmatically said, in the literature of the subject, that the theories about the Gospels, of "the Tübingen School" and the Rationalists of the last century are abandoned, and that certain dates are "established" for the Gospels (*Mark* 65–70, *Luke* about 80, *Matthew* about 85), we have to examine the procedure. Of Rationalist authorities in this field Conybeare (*Myth, Magic, and Morals*, 1909) does not materially dissent—he dates *Mark* about 70 and *Luke* 80–95—Loisy (*Les origines du Nouveau Testament*, 1936) allows the appearance of *Mark* about 70, but puts *Luke* and *Matthew* in the second century. The

most widely accepted book representing Christian scholarship to-day is Canon Streeter's *Four Gospels* (5th ed., 1936), which is recommended as the best by the critical Anglo-American divine Prof. K. Lake in his *Introduction to the New Testament* (1937). On the question of the external witnesses to the Gospels, however, Streeter repeatedly makes claims which his colleagues disallow. His chief witness for an early date is Papias [see], who is quoted by all and is said to have written between 130 and 160 (Loisy says about 140). Streeter says that the lateness of the date is offset by the fact that the bishop tells us that he heard the account of the authorship of the Gospels from men of the apostolic generation. But the more learned Prof. Lake, who discusses Papias at length and quotes the passage in full from the *Ecclesiastical History* of Eusebius—it is upon this fourth-century work that we have to rely for the testimony of Papias and other witnesses—shows that Papias does *not* say that he learned this tradition from an apostolic source, and he reminds us that the passage quoted from Papias by Eusebius is so full of absurdities that he is in any case a poor witness. Streeter next adduces Ignatius, who was, he says, martyred in Rome in 115, which is too late, apart from questions of genuineness. The only firm testimony is that of Justin (between 130 and 150), who twice (*First Apology*, LXVI, 3, and *Dialogue*, 103) refers to "the memoirs of the Apostles which are called Evangelia." To refer us to Clement of Alexandria and Origen of the third century is superfluous.

We thus see the correctness of the Oxford Report that there is before Justin, about the middle of the second century, no evidence that the four canonical Gospels circulated in the Church. Even Justin's reference gives us no idea what interpolations or additions were made later, but from the neutral historical point of view we may conclude that in substance the four chief biographies of Jesus were received in the Churches by that time (150). From the same unbiased point of view, however, no historian would regard as reliable documents works written in that atmosphere a hundred years after the supposed

events. We have, moreover, as scarcely one of these writers ever notices, to take into account the strong negative evidence of the *Letter of the Romans to the Corinthians* [see] of about the year 96. Loisy is one of the few scholars who put it later and regard it as a forgery, but all the Christian writers on the Gospels accept—and ignore—it. In it we find long and very numerous quotations from the Old Testament, and only two or three quotations of words of Jesus, and these not as they are found in the Gospels. The main burden of proof is thus thrown upon the internal evidence; and, as we should expect, since it is essential for Christian scholars to bring the Synoptics well forward in the first century, this is painfully strained.

It is enough here to consider *Mark*. The two later Synoptics repeat 90 per cent. of the material in *Mark*, and it is agreed that they used it. Of the remaining material in them (and not in *Mark*), 200 verses are common to *Matthew* and *Luke*, and the experts deduce the existence of another or Q (Quelle or "source") document, chiefly giving the speeches of Jesus. Here, however, and in attempting to trace other sources and an earlier version of *Mark* (Ur-Mark), they differ sharply. Dr. Cadoux, who makes a very interesting study of the sources of *Mark* (which he finds full of "inconsequences discrepancies, and harsh collocations", in his *Sources of the Second Gospel* (1935), says that the theory of an "Ur-Mark" is to-day abandoned, and he makes an able attempt to trace three different sources of the Gospel, without using the "formgeschichtliche" method of analysis of recent experts, which he does not admire. This or any other analysis of *Mark* destroys the first two arguments of Streeter and most apologists, since these arguments suppose the *Mark* wrote what he learned from Peter. The first point is that in the First Epistle of *Peter* (v, 13) the author sends his greetings of "the Church that is at Babylon" and associates a certain Markos with himself. Streeter and many of his colleagues insist that Babylon here means Rome, and that since Mark is said to be there with

Peter, we have reasonable ground to accept the tradition that Mark wrote the Gospel at Rome and got the material from Peter. The second argument is, in fact, that Irenæus says that this was the origin of the Gospel. On such thin threads hangs the belief in the historicity of Jesus which our general as well as religious literature pronounces it folly to question. The identification of "Babylon" as Rome is by no means agreed upon by Biblical experts and is easily refuted; indeed, the majority of Protestant divines do not admit that Peter [see] ever was at Rome. Further, the genuineness of the Epistle itself is seriously disputed; and any neutral student who cares to read it will smile at the theory that it was written by a Galilean fisherman. Irenæus, on the other hand, testifies only that in the second half of the century the Roman Church possessed (or had fabricated) this tradition about Peter and Mark—a statement which nobody doubts.

The third and most confident point of those who say that at least the Gospel of *Mark* was written within about thirty-five years of the death of Jesus (whatever value that may give it) is that the famous speech of Jesus over the fall of Jerusalem (ch. xiii) must have been written as a shrewd forecast *before* the actual fall (in the year 70). They say that the corresponding version of the speech of Jesus in *Luke* and *Matthew* gives actual details of the siege and fall which *Mark* does not give, so we must put *Mark* before 70. The Christian reader seems to take such statements on trust. In point of fact the speech in *Matthew* and *Luke* is quite obviously only a very slight rhetorical expansion of Mark's version, the only added details being that armies encompass Jerusalem and the Jews are sold into captivity, which *Mark* implies. It is a very large inference from an imaginary feature; and it would of course follow that *Matthew* and *Luke* added details to the speeches of Jesus. We have here, in fact, an historical weakness which the apologists do not candidly confront. Even *Mark*, which is generally represented as a "simple" biography of Jesus written some thirty-five years after his death, devotes nearly 250 verses out

of 668 to casual remarks (including remarks he made in Gethsemane while all his followers were asleep !) or long speeches of Jesus; and in *Luke* and *Matthew* (some forty years still later) the speeches grow longer. There was, the divine says, a collection of the sayings of Jesus (from which no first-century writer quotes correctly) apart from the biographical sketches which *Mark* used. What was the origin of it? Shorthand was well developed at the time, but no one has ventured to suggest that stenographers took down the words of the prophet in Galilee and Jerusalem. Moreover, of the "simple" biography of *Mark*, 180 verses out of little over 400 (apart from speeches) describe *miraculous* incidents and expulsions of devils; and none of these learned Biblical scholars believe in such things. The point will be further elaborated under *Mark*, *The Gospel of*; and some attention will be paid to *Luke* and *Matthew* (which certainly have no historical value if *Mark* has not) under those titles. The suggestion is made that really simple and reliable sketches and memories of sayings of Jesus existed before *Mark*, but hypothetical documents of unknown content do not interest the historian. Separate treatment will be given to the Parables, where it will be shown that even those given in *Mark* are generally borrowed from the Rabbis, and the question of the historicity of Jesus will be discussed under *Jesus*. It is clear that, like the existence of God, the belief in the historicity, to say nothing of the supernatural character, of Jesus rests upon a basis which seems amazingly insecure when we consider the dogmatism with which it is asserted.

The chief recent works on the subject are given in the text. The simply-written chapters on the Gospels in Dr. Conybeare's book are recommended. Loisy's fine work is, like nearly all the best works of that great scholar, not translated. A short account of the moderately conservative position (Streeter, Lake, Burkitt, etc.) will be found in Guy Kendall's *Modern Introduction to the New Testament* (1938). D. W. Riddle, *The Gospels* (1938), is uncritical and diffuse.

Gothic Architecture. The Roman Catholic plea, which has become a convention of our general literature, that the Gothic cathedrals express the profound piety and other-worldly aspiration of the Middle Ages, and even Ruskin's semi-mystical speculations in the *Seven Lamps*, are not respected by modern writers on architecture. This is in no measure due to a modern prejudice. The name Gothic, which meant worthy of the Goths, or semi-barbarous, was given to the mediæval style by the great artists of the Renaissance, and the feeling remained until the Romantic Movement, skilfully exploited by Catholics, began in England and Germany at the beginning of the last century. But even when the modern expert is free from this prejudice, and recognizes the beauty of the structures, he excludes religious feeling in tracing the development of the style. The classical style, with its flat roofs and small windows, was unsuitable for the wintry conditions (heavy snowfalls, etc.) of the north, and the Gothic style was very slowly, during a century or more, developed on utilitarian as well as æsthetic lines. [See *Cathedrals* and works there recommended.] The old idea assumed deep piety and virtue in the people of the Middle Ages, and this we now recognize as a Catholic myth. Religious inspiration could, in any case, be invoked only as regards the architects of the cathedrals, and these are rarely known. Indeed, in some known cases—Speyer, for instance—they were clerics of loose and very secular life, while the abbeys of Northern France, which played the chief part in the development of the style, were generally corrupt at the time. Some cathedrals were built in stages spread over more than a century, with very varying conditions, and civic halls in the Gothic style were just as "inspired." What we do definitely know is that in general character—no one questions that there were many men and women of strict life—the people of the cathedral-period were at least as gross, particularly in regard to sex, as the general population in any equally long and notoriously loose period of civilization. [See *Chivalry*; *Feast of Fools*; *Middle Ages*; *Thirteenth*

Century; etc.]. The best account of the technical development is Dr. K. H. Clasen's *Die Gotische Baukunst* (1930).

Goths, The. While the Goths were, with the Vandals and Huns, responsible for the overthrow of the Roman civilization, the claim that they explain the appalling length of the Dark Age, and that the Popes made every effort to counteract their barbaric influence, is the reverse of the truth. Since the Vandals crossed Gaul and Spain and settled in Africa and the Huns retired to Asia, the chief burden of the complaint lies against the Goths. These were for the most part already Christians (Arians) when they entered the Empire, and large bodies of them had accepted Roman civilization. The best commanders of the Roman Army in the last years of the Empire were Teutons, and the sack of Rome by the Goths, in 410, and later by the Vandals, was far less savage and destructive than the sack of the same city by Christian (and mainly Catholic) armies of the Emperor in 1527. The Goths divided into two streams: the Western (Visigoths) and Eastern (Ostrogoths). Religious and some historical writers say that the Visigoths, who settled in Spain and accepted the Roman faith, constructed a very fair civilization, or restored the fine old Roman-Spanish culture. This tribute to the Goths who became Papalists is much too flattering. See S. Lane Poole's *Moors in Spain* (1897) for an expert characterization of them. But the misrepresentation of the work of the Ostrogoths, who settled in North Italy, but remained Arians and anti-Papal, is much more serious and wanton. While the history of the Visigoths is not well known, every common guide-book tells of fine monuments of the Ostrogothic civilization at Ravenna—almost the only Christian monuments of the sixth century—and Hodgkin's *Italy and her Invaders* (1896), as well as his biography of Theodoric, have been accepted as standard works for nearly half a century. Details will be given under *Theodoric*, the King of the Ostrogoths. It is enough here that in a single generation—for Theodoric was born in a rude Gothic camp on the Danube long before the fall of the Empire—the Goths

brought about "a time of unexampled happiness in Italy" (Hodgkin) and made a fine beginning of the restoration of Greek-Roman art and culture. A high official of the Greek Court, who hated him, said that Theodoric was "an extraordinary lover of justice," and he was just as zealous for art and learning. The only links which connect the old civilization with that which in North Italy opened the revival of Europe in the Middle Ages are the Kingdom of the Goths and the Kingdom, in the same area two centuries later, of the equally Teutonic Lombards [see]. Theodoric and his gifted daughter Amalasuntha, who tried to continue his work, were Arians who scorned the Papal system, though Theodoric was courteous to and tried to co-operate with the Popes. But the Popes intrigued with the Greeks and with the more reactionary of the Goths to wreck his work, as they afterwards wrecked the Lombard restoration of civilization.

Gould, Frederick James (1855-1938), writer. He was a London teacher who in 1896 resigned rather than give religious lessons and became a prominent worker in the Rationalist and Ethical movements. Gould was particularly interested in moral lessons without theology for children, and he was invited to give a series of model lessons in America in 1911 and 1913-14 and in India, under Government auspices, in 1913. He had joined the Postivist Church, which had a very small branch in London, and the policy of that body to co-operate with the other Churches, and regard the Roman Church as a model, weakened the critical element in his works (chiefly *A Concise History of Religions*, 3 vols., 1893-7) and disposed him to put too much faith in religious literature and assertions.

Gourmont, Rémy de (1858-1915), French novelist. A long series of novels, poems, and literary works put him in the front rank of French writers in the brilliant period of the second half of the nineteenth century, when scepticism ruled intellectual France. He is counted as belonging to the symbolist School, but this artistic description does not imply mysticism. He was an

Atheist, like most of his great colleagues, and despised all religion. See a number of the essays in his *Promenades philosophiques* (5 vols., 1905-8, Série III, Livre III). "While religion was always paganism to the crowd," he says, "paganism was almost always, in Europe, the religion of superior minds" (p. 89); and "God is not all that exists: he is all that does not exist" (p. 253).

Grail, The Holy. The legend of the quest of the Holy Grail, or the cup containing some of the blood of Christ, which many writers still take seriously, is part of the myth of the Age of Chivalry [see]. It began to appear in literature, especially in France, in the twelfth century, and first received a poetic expression in *Le Conte del Graal* of Chrétien de Troyes (1180-90). The theme was very popular with poets, and the character of Galahad, which Tennyson has made familiar, was fabricated to complete the Christianization of the old legend. Perceval (Parsifal) is admitted by all experts to have been a pagan hero of the old story, which simply described the very secular quest by rude soldiers in pagan times of a cup or dish that had magical qualities. Whether this old Celtic legend was indigenous to Wales or Brittany is uncertain, but modern scholars of Celtic literature show that all the ancient Celts were so licentious that locating among them a quest of the Holy Grail in the sense which Tennyson and Wagner have made popular in modern literature is amusing. An apocryphal gospel of the fifth century (the beginning of the Golden Age of Forgery) contained the story of Joseph of Arimathea taking the cup containing the blood of Christ, and this was used to manufacture a Christian version of the old legend. See A. Nutt, *Studies on The Legend of the Holy Grail* (1902), and E. Rhys, *Studies in the Arthurian Legend* (1906). Waite's *Holy Grail* (1933) is the occultist version.

Grant, Ulysses Simpson (1822-85), eighteenth President of the United States. As General Grant, in the Civil War, he was commonly credited in America with the chief part in the victory of the North, and he was later elected President (1868-77). A clerical

biographer, the Rev. M. U. Cramer (*Ulysses Simpson Grant*, 1897), who tries to refute the generally accepted belief that Grant was a Rationalist, can plead only that he "believed the *fundamental* doctrines of the Christian religion" (p. 28)—a statement, unsupported by evidence, which is usually made to cover scepticism—and that he "often prayed to God *mentally*" (p. 43). He quotes a letter in which General Halleck clears Grant of a charge of drunkenness and says that he was remarkably sober for "a man who is not a religious man." Another Christian biographer, E. D. Mansfield (*A Popular and Authentic Life of U. S. Grant*, 1863), omits all reference to his religious opinions. The standard biography, that of Hamlin Garland (*U. S. Grant*, 1898), says that he "subscribed to no creed" (p. 522). The clergy baptized him when he was unconscious and believed to be dying, but he recovered and said that he was "surprised." He probably, according to what General L. Wood told the present writer, used a much stronger expression.

Grant Duff, the Right Hon. Sir Mountstuart Elphinstone, M.A., F.R.S., G.C.S.I., P.C. (1829–1906), statesman. He was called to the Bar, but a few years later he entered politics and became Under-Secretary for India, Under-Secretary for the Colonies, and (1881–6) Governor of Madras. He had a high record of valuable and conscientious service. Apart from politics, Grant Duff was a man of fine culture and was Lord Rector of Aberdeen University (1866–72) and President of the Royal Historical Society (1892–9). He was a Theist, but agreed with Renan, whom he greatly admired, that it is "impossible to control the human intellect by creeds or articles of any sort or kind" (*Ernest Renan*, 1901, p. 2).

Great Britain, Religion in. There is no other leading country in which religious statistics are more abundant or nearer to reliability—in the United States [see] they are supplied by the Churches and are often derided by Christian writers—than they are in the case of Great Britain. They provide a firm ground for the statement that it is one of the least religious countries in the

world, and that the Churches have suffered amazing losses in membership and influence in the last fifty years. For London we have definite evidence of a considerable decay of Church membership; and it must be kept in mind that the religious birth-rate is higher than the general birth-rate. In 1886 the *British Weekly* took a census of churchgoers in the metropolis, and returned them as 1,167,312 out of a population of 3,816,483, or nearly one-third. In 1903 the *Daily News* financed a very thorough count of churchgoers, and reported that though the area covered by the census of 1886 now had a population of 4,500,000, the number of churchgoers had fallen to 1,005,361, or less than one-fourth. For Greater London (6,240,336 people) the number was 1,514,025. These figures, given in the Report, which was edited by Mr. Mudie Smith—it gives also the figures for 1886—include "twicers" and must be regarded as excessive. In the case of Roman Catholics every attendant in the evening is a "twicer," since all are bound under pain of hell to attend Mass in the morning; yet the number of Catholic churchgoers was only 120,000, while the *Catholic Directory* claimed 300,000. Ten years later the *Daily News* proposed to repeat the census, but the clerical authorities dissuaded it. In 1939 the authorities of the Church of England appointed a committee to determine the number of worshippers (of all Churches) in England and Wales, and it reported that only 10 per cent. of Londoners and 20 per cent. of the remainder attended church or were in any real sense Christians. This gives a total of about 8,000,000, which agrees with the rather confused statistics of full membership, Sunday School pupils, etc., supplied annually to the *Statesman's Year Book*; but both are demonstrably excessive. Shortly after the publication of the report of the committee the Rural Dean of Sittingbourne, a backward and conservative district, took a census, and reported that, not 20 per cent., but less than 8 per cent., attended church in that area. Conditions in Scotland are much the same as in England, and Aberdeen is considered the most conservative city from this point of view. Yet when, in

1927, the *Aberdeen Press and Journal* took a census of churchgoers, it found that only 11.9 per cent. of the population attended church on Sunday morning and only 12 per cent. in the evening. York may be considered, from this point of view, a fairly conservative city, yet a recent census (B. S. Rowntree, *Poverty and Progress*, 1941) shows that only 12,770 out of 72,000 attended Church, or 17 per cent. instead of the assumed 20 per cent.

The optimism of the clerical figures is still more clearly seen in the case of the Roman Catholics. Of the 8,000,000 worshippers in England and Wales the Catholics claim 2,406,419 (one-twentieth of the population) and 614,419 in Scotland. It will be shown elsewhere [Roman Catholic Church] that even if we accepted this figure, we find, by comparing it with Catholic claims in the last century, and bearing in mind the very large Irish immigration and the swollen Catholic birth-rate, that it betrays a heavy loss. The true figure is, however, we shall see, much less than 2,000,000. Priests inflate their totals by including seceders, who are, on the law of the Church, "bad Catholics." The *Catholic Directory* claims 9 per cent. of the total of live births (based upon baptisms), 8 per cent. of the pupils in elementary schools, 6.6 per cent. of the national total of marriages, and about 5 per cent. of the total community, with only 2,500 churches and chapels (a large number of which have not 100 attendants) to these 2,400,000 members! But the peculiar figures will be examined elsewhere. The Church of England authorities are little less skilful in compiling statistics for general circulation. In the official *Year Book of the Church of England* (1940) it is candidly and precisely stated that confirmations have sunk from an annual average of 221,127, in the decade 1908-17, to 210,966 in the next decade and 183,662 for the last available year—in spite of the considerable increase of population and the high religious birth-rate. Baptisms, Easter Communions, and other indicative figures, also have decreased. This heavy loss is not reflected in the figures supplied to the public. We may safely conclude that in the whole country far

less than one-fifth of the population attend church or are in any real sense Christians to-day, the number of those who are Christians, yet never take part in worship, being certainly balanced at least by the very large number of people of no belief, who attend for social, domestic, or other reasons. In 1940 a Gallup Survey reported that a much larger number attended church, but in the *News-Chronicle*, Feb. 6, 1941, one of its chief officials, Tom Harrison, explained that they did not trust the figure—people just wanted to be "respectable"—and said that "actual count of churchgoers shows under one in ten at church regularly"—a figure which he accepted. This situation is concealed by the Press, which is to-day watched and intimidated by Church committees and refers constantly to "our Christian civilization" and decries "godless Russia" (where a higher proportion still go to church). Hence the ironic paradox of one-fifth of the community ruling the life of the four-fifths in many important respects. They dictate much of the law (in regard to marriage and divorce, Sunday opening of theatres and museums, criticism of religion, etc.), pay no taxation (throwing the burden upon others) on hundreds of millions worth of property, exact vast sums for the maintenance of their schools and enforce the Bible on children in the national schools, get a large annual endowment of their clergy (chaplains), compel employees in institutions and in public services to attend church, and so on. They then attempt to libel and injure economically any person who exposes this situation. What the proportion of religious people among the non-churchgoing four-fifths is has never been made the subject of serious inquiry. When the *Daily News*, in 1925, pressed upon its readers—and the clergy supported it—a questionnaire which ought to throw light on this, only about 15,000 readers out of some 600,000 replied; yet, of these, only 9,991 professed a belief in a personal God, which fairly corresponded with the number of members of Churches (9,585). An extensive inquiry would yield interesting results, but the above figures, all from clerical sources, show

that Great Britain is one of the least Christian countries in Europe, and America is most improperly called a Christian civilization.

Greek Church, The. It styles itself the Holy Orthodox and Apostolic Church and claims 145,000,000 followers, but as this figure includes most of the population of Russia (which was Christianized from Constantinople), it is now false. From the second century onward the Eastern bishops rejected Rome's claim of supremacy, and the acrid hostility of the two branches of the Christian Church culminated in a final breach of relations in 1054, when Pope Leo IX declared all the Greeks excommunicated. The breach follows the line of division of the old Roman Empire, from the Adriatic to the east of Hungary, most of the Serbs and Bulgars and the Greeks generally falling in the "Greek" or Orthodox Church. Besides rejecting the Pope's claim, it differs from the Roman Church in doctrine only on the profoundly important question whether the Holy Ghost "proceeds" from the Son as well as the Father—all three are said to be eternal—and on certain aspects of Purgatory. The ritual differs from the Roman, and the priests (popes) may marry and to a large extent live and drink like the peasants.

Greek Philosophers, Scepticism of the. Since history adopted scientific methods it gives us a rational explanation of the birth and development of philosophy in the Greek world. We consult environment instead of imagining racial genius. The migration, southward, of the ancestors of the Greeks from the Balkan or Danube region coincided with a growth of military imperialism in Egypt and Mesopotamia which broke the bonds of national traditions and, by a mingling of cultures, led to a considerable growth of religious speculation and inquiry. From this the semi-barbarous early Greeks were isolated for centuries, but the land in which they had settled was to so great an extent barren and mountainous that it became imperative for large bodies of them to migrate. The easiest and most attractive escape was over the beautiful islands of the *Ægean* Sea to the western coast of Asia Minor. The economic

and cosmopolitan developments of the age had, by the seventh century B.C., given this coast, especially its southern part (Ionia), a considerable importance for trade. The land route from Mesopotamia and Lydia led to it, and the sea brought Phœnicians, Syrians, and Egyptians. A number of large and opulent cities arose, and, in these, Greek immigrants mingled and intermarried with the merchants, and in time took their place among the leading citizens. They found themselves free from the narrow tyranny of priest and petty king which still ruled in the Greek homeland, and they were stimulated by the contrast of the rich culture of Egypt, Phœnicia, and Babylonia, with their primitive Aryan traditions. Many of them visited these homes of ancient learning and began themselves to speculate on the meaning of life and the world, on which conflicting and decaying creeds threw no light. So little of the late Egyptian, Babylonian, and Phœnician literature has escaped the early Christian vandalism that we cannot say what amount of real originality there was in the systems of the Ionian "wisdom-seekers" (philosophers); but the characteristic ideas of the school—the claim that there is one fundamental reality (water, air, fire, or a chaos of mixed elements), that it is composed of atoms, and that the contents of nature to-day arose from this fundamental reality by an age-long evolution—appear at first in a primitive form.

That these Ionian thinkers of the sixth century—we date their pioneer, Thales [see], by an eclipse which he predicted and astronomers put in 585 B.C.—rejected all the religions which were richly represented in their cities, no one has ever questioned, and they seem to have been Atheists. Cicero, centuries later, quotes Thales as saying that all things are "divine" or "full of Gods." It sounds like an evasion of the charge of Atheism which the more ignorant Greeks were always ready to fling, and in any case experts do not think that we have the exact words of Thales quoted 500 years after his death. His successor in the line of Ionian thinkers evidently did not believe in anything beyond nature, and the ethical maxims attributed

to Thales himself are purely humanitarian. This first large appearance of scepticism—for the sages were men of great influence in their cities—is in accordance with the historical law that Atheism always spreads in proportion to the growth of knowledge and freedom of speculation. But this line of thought, leading in the direction of modern science, was unhappily broken. The high-spirited Greek cities rebelled against the Persian despotism which spread over them, and their life was so blighted that large numbers of the best men emigrated. Athens, dominated by a religious and ignorant democracy, got a rich accession of commercial and artistic ability, but it held out no welcome to thinkers. The conditions for these were best found in the Greek colonies of South Italy and Sicily and in the northern colonies of Thrace.

In the Greek-Italian cities, which had at first enjoyed the same freedom as those of Ionia, philosophy entered upon a sterile development because it was now overshadowed by religion. There was about this time a religious revival, probably due to the rise to power of ignorant democracies, throughout the Greek world, and it is considered that, as in the contemporary developments in Egypt and Judæa, there was a more serious concentration on the belief in the immortality of the soul. The first purely spiritual philosophy, that of Pythagoras (an Ionian who flourished about the middle of the sixth century), now appeared in Greek Italy, and was a curious blend of mathematical science and ascetic spiritualism. The importance given to fire in the Pythagorean system suggests Persian influence, and it is a tradition of Greek literature that its founder visited Egypt. Whether or no this spiritualism was a foreign adulteration of Greek thought, the school of Pythagoras was very restricted both in extent and duration, except in so far as it influenced Socrates and Plato at a later date. Its asceticism offended the Greek sense of proportion. The second Italian development, that of the Eleatic philosophy (its centre was the city of Elea), also combined Ionian science with mystic language. But the poets (chiefly Xenophanes, Parmenides, and Zeno),

who led the school were so vague—in the manner of philosophizing poets—that some describe them as Pantheists, and others as Materialists. They were, in fact, especially Parmenides, the ablest of them, Materialists. They openly rejected the popular gods, and their Pantheistic language may have been an evasion of the charge of Atheism. Xenophanes is reported to have said that "if God exists he is the All"; which recalls Schopenhauer's definition of Pantheism as "Atheism in a silk hat."

Gomperz, one of the highest authorities, says (*Greek Thinkers*, I, 216) that nine-tenths of the Greek thinkers were Materialists, but asks us to remember that there was not in their minds the sharp antithesis of matter and spirit which we recognize to-day. This, surely, is incorrect after the time of Pythagoras, who certainly did not admit that the soul was composed of a refined variety of matter; and the only thinkers before Pythagoras were Materialistic Ionians. At all events, Plato, writing soon after the year 400, has in all his works a very sharp contrast of matter and spirit; yet apart from Aristotle [see], who invented the compromise of the "immaterial" (something that is not material, but is incapable of existing apart from matter), a few Stoics of the religious wing who departed from the dogmatic Materialism of their founder, and the Neo-Platonists, all the Greek thinkers after Plato rejected his idea of spirit. The Ionian tradition was preserved in its purity in the northern colonies, especially at Abdera, in Thrace, where it inspired an important school among the refugees from Asia Minor. Heraclitus, from Ephesus, worked out the principles of the school there while Pythagoras was adulterating them in Italy. He was followed by Leucippus and Democritus [see], men of the highest ability and character, who greatly expanded the atomic and evolutionary principles. Since the work was almost entirely speculative and exposed to criticism, there arose a rival school, the Sophists, or what we should now call philosophical Agnostics. The word "Sophist" [see] then meant merely a professional teacher of philosophy, but the most common tenet of the school

was that the mind could not go beyond experience and attain higher knowledge. Protagoras of Abdera, the first leader, is reported to have opened one of his books with the sentence: "About the gods I cannot say whether they exist or not." Owing to their activity, philosophy was studied very widely in the large and prosperous Greek cities, and the Sophists wandered from one to the other and were held in great honour. Protagoras had a princely success until he reached Athens, where, in spite of the warm friendship of Pericles and his group, he was threatened with a charge of blasphemy (Atheism) and driven out; and the next visiting philosopher at Athens, Anaxagoras [see], although he introduced a mystic element into the Ionian system, was equally threatened and exiled.

It is important to realize that this was the situation at Athens even in its Golden Age, in spite of the fact that Pericles [see] led the democracy and he and most of his brilliant friends were sceptics. The city had no scheme of general education, and the ignorant voters were roused against the philosophers by Aristophanes and the priests. The atmosphere of the greatest city of the world was such that the life of a philosopher could be threatened for saying that the sun was a very large material body at a vast distance from the earth. It is interesting to see in this light the disparagement by the first Athenian thinkers, Socrates and Plato, of the pursuit of science, and the diversion of philosophy into the barren fields of mysticism. Anaxagoras, conscious of the weakness of the Ionian evolutionary philosophy, had suggested that perhaps there was a cosmic Mind (Nous) of some finer sort of matter directing the evolution of nature. In Socrates this becomes God: in Plato God becomes a pure Spirit, and matter is treated with contempt. Encyclopædias, and religious and many other writers, represent this as the peak, if not the final word, of Greek philosophy, whereas it was the creed of very few even at the time, and it had very little influence on the seven centuries of Greek-Roman life that followed. That this was the fate of the teaching of both

Plato and Aristotle (who, nevertheless, rejected Plato's idea of spirit) all historians of Greek philosophy agree. It is the beautiful literary style of Plato and his close agreement with Christianity about God and the soul that have given him so large a place in studies of Greek thought; and it is the encyclopædic genius of Aristotle and the usefulness of his anti-Materialist compromise to the mediæval Arabs and Persians which preserved his works, though these almost perished in the first few centuries of full Christian domination. Nearly all the works of the other philosophers, before and after Plato and Aristotle, were destroyed in the ghastly holocaust of art and literature that followed the fall of paganism.

But, after this short and very restricted spiritualist phase, Greek philosophy returned to Materialism and science. The schools of Plato and Aristotle soon developed a new scepticism or dogmatic Agnosticism, and Epicurus and Zeno came to Athens to found new Materialist schools. The writers who represent the success of Epicurus [see] as a symptom of the debility into which Athens had fallen inconsistently praise Stoicism [see], which was contemporary, as the highest ethical system the Greeks had reached. The truth is that, as the Rev. Prof. Mahaffy shows by contrasting the comedies of Menander and of Aristophanes (*Social Life in Greece*, 1894, p. 6), the general character of Athens had improved and the old and cruel religious fanaticism was dead. A few of the Stoics reverted to Theism, but the more influential remained humanitarian moralists and dogmatic Materialists and blended with the Epicureans. The Ionian philosophy had reached its last stage, as we find it in the famous poem of Lucretius [see], and, apart from a very restricted spread of a debased Platonism [see Neo-Platonism] centuries later, it dominated most of the educated Greeks and Romans in the later and more humane centuries. Modern historians of philosophy give these facts, but the true development which they indicate is obscured by their devoting most of their space to Plato and Aristotle, since their works alone survive, and failing to correct the reader's

impression that these two philosophies must have been the most influential. See special articles in this work on most of the philosophers and schools here mentioned.

Green, John Richard (1837-83), historian. Green was a zealous High Churchman when he went to Oxford, but in the course of two years there he became "irreligious" (*Letters of J. R. Green*, 1901, p. 18). Dean Stanley nevertheless persuaded him to take orders and work for a time in the ministry. He abandoned it, left the Church in 1869, and began to write his *Short History of the English People* (1870). In his works he is reticent about his opinions, but in his letters he says that we must "fling to the owls and the bats these old and effete theologies of the world's childhood" (p. 292), rejects Christianity, and admits that he has "no real faith in a hereafter" (p. 312).

Greenaway, Kate (1846-1901), painter. She won great distinction as a painter of child life in the second half of the last century; and Ruskin, in *Praeterita* and *Fors Clavigera*, has high praise of the delicacy of her art. In their biography of her, Spielmann and Layard give many letters that tell her Rationalism. She describes herself as "religious in my own way" (p. 189). She had no belief in a future life and was apparently not a Theist; and she thought it "strange beyond anything I can think to be able to believe in any of the known religions" (p. 190).

Greenwood, Sir George (1850-1928), politician. A London lawyer who entered Parliament in 1906 (as Liberal M.P. for Peterborough) and was knighted in 1916. He was a member of the R.P.A., and in 1902 published, under the pen-name "George Forester," a book in defence of Agnosticism (*The Faith of an Agnostic*, 2nd ed., 1919).

Gregorovius, Ferdinand (1823-91), German historian. He was trained in theology and philosophy, but turned to history, and his *History of the City of Rome in the Middle Ages* (Engl. trans., 8 vols., 1900-9) is the standard work on its subject. He wrote also studies of Tiberius, Hadrian, and Lucretia Borgia, and a history of the city of Athens in

the Middle Ages (2 vols., 1889) which did not rise to the rank of its predecessor and is not translated. The Municipal Council of Rome had his history of the city translated and put him on its roll of honour, and it appeared in many languages. He was a broad Theist, but the Baroness von Suttner tells us that he once wrote in her Album: "Priests push themselves between man and the Deity only as shadows" (*Memoirs*, I, 67). His history is an invaluable record of the character of the Popes and the long struggle of the Romans against them, particularly of the gross conduct of the Popes in the tenth and eleventh centuries and the two-century fight of the Romans for self-government, and the way in which the Papal city lagged in the wake of European progress until the fifteenth century.

Gregorian Calendar, The. Catholic writers always include this supposed achievement of Gregory XIII, a worldly Pope and the one who rejoiced over the St. Bartholomew Massacre [see], among the proofs that the Popes patronized science. The truth is that by the sixteenth century the defective calendar had led to such confusion of the ecclesiastical dates that an astronomical correction of it was imperative. This was done about 1575 by Luigi Ghiraldi, an obscure astronomer who had studied in Naples, where Arab culture lingered. All that the Pope did was to have it submitted to various bodies in Italy and abroad and then adopt it (1582). Gregory was, it is true, interested in the promotion of culture and education, but his methods of raising money for the purpose caused the greatest distress and a spread of banditry in Italy; and in Rome he so far permitted a return of the corruption which the Counter-Reformation is supposed to have abolished that a single courtesan made £150,000 (mostly from higher ecclesiastics) in his time (E. Rodocanachi, *Courtisanes et buffons*, 1894).

Gregory I ("the Great," ruled 590-604), Pope. Gregory is one of the "good Popes" who, though less in number, are offered as an offset to the "bad Popes," and it is material to understand that, like his saintly colleagues, he did not use his power and

virtue to promote civilization. He was a Benedictine monk of ascetic life and infinite credulity (see his *Magna Moralia* and *Dialogues*), yet a shrewd business man. He expected the speedy end of the world, which was not conducive to efforts to reform the appalling social order—the entire civilized world was then at the lowest level it had touched since the beginning of history—and the large landholders whom he persuaded of this left their estates and slaves (then almost the only form of wealth) to the Papacy. It became the richest owner of land (from 1,400 to 1,800 square miles) and slaves in Europe, and is estimated to have reached an income of about £400,000 a year (or five times that sum in modern values). He maintained in full the institution of slavery, which St. Augustine had found just, and the few cases in which Catholic writers quote him rejoicing over the manumission of slaves (not his own) are cases of men who had inherited money and promised to leave it to the Church. His use of the wealth was severely impersonal, if sometimes questionable in ethic, but in many ways he hindered the restoration of civilization. He paid fulsome compliments to the most vicious and brutal rulers of the time—Queen Brunichildis of Gaul (*Epp.*, I, 74) and the Emperor Phocas (XIII, 31, 38, and 39)—when they promised to help the Church, and shockingly rejoiced in their murders of good men who opposed the Papacy. He reaffirmed the law of religious compulsion and the law that no slave could be allowed to enter the clergy; and he heavily rebuked a Gallic bishop for attempting to restore education (VI, 54). Against this the chief Catholic historian of the Papacy at this date, Mgr. Mann, quotes some praise of learning by Gregory in his supposed *Commentary on the First Book of Kings*. Even the Benedictine editors of his works had pointed out that this is spurious. The charge that Gregory burned the last surviving books and destroyed the statues of pagan Rome is often described as quite baseless. It is, in fact, given by the learned bishop, John of Salisbury, as a clerical tradition of Rome itself, and seems likely enough. A summary study of Gregory's character

and work, based upon his extraordinarily numerous letters, will be found in McCabe's *Crises in the History of the Papacy* (1916, ch. IV).

Gregory VII (ruled 1073–85), Pope. Another example of the deep injury done to civilization by “good Popes.” He is more frequently quoted by his pre-Papal name, Hildebrand, a stern ascetic who fought fiercely for imposing celibacy [see also *Patarnes*] upon the clergy and monks. He wore a monastic dress, but whether he ever was a monk is disputed (Dr. W. Martens, *War Gregor VII Mönch?* 1891). To purify the Papacy, which had been debased for a century and a half [see *Iron Age* and *Popes*], he induced the Lateran Synod of 1059 to deprive the Roman people and clergy of the right to elect a Pope and confine this to the cardinals, but he himself accepted election, in 1073, by “popular tumult” (Letters of his friend Abbot Didier I, 1). This was the keynote of his stormy career: the good (power) of the Church overrode all scruples. Döllinger (*Das Papstthum*, 1892, ch. II, § 2) shows that he and his saintly lieutenants freely used forgeries, and Gregory tampered with the text of decrees he quoted. He started or encouraged wars—“Cursed be he that refraineth his sword from blood,” he would quote—in most countries to make princes feudatories of the Church (in the literal sense), and there was not a country in which he was generally respected. A German synod of bishops and abbots declared him deposed, and in his last year even the Romans, infuriated by the brutality of his Norman hirelings, drove him into exile. For his one supposed spiritual triumph, over Henry IV, see *Canossa*. It is mythical. Catholics smiled in those days at his dying lament, “I have loved justice and hated iniquity, and therefore I die in exile.” He was piously unscrupulous, very ignorant, and a man of fiery temper; and the end of his life opened the most licentious period in the life of Europe [see *Age of Chivalry*] and the terrible corruption of the monks and priests whom he had forbidden to marry. See Bishop A. H. Matthew, *The Life and Times of Hildebrand* (1910). For a summary study, with contemporary

evidence, see Ch. VIII of McCabe's *Crises* (1916).

Gregory, Sir Richard Arman, D.Sc., LL.D., F.R.S. (b. 1864), astronomer. He was an assistant to Sir Norman Lockyer from 1889 to 1893, editor of *Nature* from 1919 to 1939, President of the British Association (1940) and of various learned societies, and author of valuable works on science. Sir Richard is an Hon. Associate of the R.P.A. In *Religion in Science and Civilization* (1940) he accepts the word "God" in an impersonal sense, and the conventional estimate of Jesus.

Gregory, Sir William Henry, K.C.M.G. (1817-92), statesman. Though educated at Harrow and Oxford, he entered Irish politics, and was M.P. for Dublin (1842-7), and for Galway (1857-71), which did not prevent him from expressing his Rationalist views and strongly advocating the Sunday opening of museums, and other reforms. From 1871 to 1877 he was Governor of Ceylon, and so judicious and beneficent that the natives called him "our God." We read, in his *Autobiography* (1894), that "there were few who took more advanced views than he" (166), and that he was "eminently latitudinarian and indifferent to dogmatic religion" (167).

Gregory, Prof. William King, Ph.D., Sc.D. (b. 1876), American palæontologist. He has been, since 1921, Curator of the Comparative Anatomy section of the American Natural History Museum, and since 1925 Professor of Vertebrate Palæontology at Columbia University. He was Vice-President of the American Association for the Advancement of Science in 1931, and President of the New York Academy of Sciences 1932-3. Gregory belongs to twenty-five learned societies in America and Europe and has published authoritative works on the evolution of the higher mammals (*Our Face from Fish to Man*, 1929; *Man's Place Among the Anthropoids*, 1933, etc.); and he has rendered very valuable service in refuting the mysticism of Dr. H. F. Osborn and others of his colleagues, and accurately presenting the facts about the evolution of man during the Fundamentalist reaction.

Greville, Charles Cavendish Fulke (1794-1865), writer. He was clerk of

the Privy Council from 1821 to 1859 and on familiar terms with many of the great men of the period. This makes his *Memoirs* (8 vols., 1875-87) of particular interest to Rationalists, because he gives their views about religion, which would otherwise remain unknown. Greville was himself very hostile to religion, as he frequently shows (III, 212-15; V, 215; VIII, 47, etc.). Sir H. Taylor says that he was "avowedly Epicurean" (*Autobiography*, I, 315).

Grévy, François Paul Jules (1813-91), President of the French Republic. A Paris lawyer who took part, on the anti-clerical side, in the Revolution of 1848 and afterwards rose to the highest political offices. For a time after the *coup d'état* of Napoleon III he abandoned politics and became President of the Advocates of Paris. Returning to politics after the Fourth Revolution, he succeeded Thiers as head of the Liberals and a moderate anti-clerical. He was President, with great prestige, from 1879 to 1885, the period of the final collapse of Catholic power.

Grey, Albert Henry George, fourth Earl Grey (1851-1917), statesman. He entered Parliament in 1880, was Administrator of Rhodesia 1896-7, and Governor-General of Canada 1900-4. Grey was a warm friend and supporter of G. J. Holyoake, and in a letter to him in 1900 said that Christ, Mazzini, Robert Owen, and Holyoake are "the four men who have opened the eyes of mankind most widely to the truths of human brotherhood" (*Life and Letters of G. J. Holyoake*, 1908, II, 303): three Rationalists and a semi-mythical person who cannot be proved to have taught anything. Grey was regarded as one of the most idealistic statesmen in British public life in the last century.

Griffin, Sir Lepel Henry, K.C.S.I. (1838-1908), statesman. He entered the Indian Civil Service and became in time Superintendent of the Kapurthala State, Chief Secretary of the Punjab, and agent to the Governor-General of Central India. On his return to England, in 1889, he became Chairman of the Imperial Bank of Persia. Griffin was an Agnostic, though he occasionally uses Theistic language in a loose sense. In his section on "Sikhism and the

Sikhs," in *Great Religions of the World* (1901), he says that Brahmanism "provided conceptions of the Deity as noble and exalted as those to be found in any religion of the West" (p. 140), and he recommends "that state of suspension of judgment which is somewhat inadequately designated Agnosticism" (p. 148).

Grimm, Baron Friedrich Melchior von (1723–1807), German writer and statesman. He was born in Germany, but settled in Paris, and was an intimate friend of Rousseau, Diderot, D'Holbach, and D'Alembert. His very voluminous letters give his Deistic views as well as a valuable picture of the times (*Correspondance littéraire, philosophique, et critique*, 16 vols., 1877–82). He left Paris at the outbreak of the Revolution, and was appointed Counsellor to Catherine the Great.

Groos, Prof. Karl (1861–1937), German psychologist. He was professor of philosophy at Giessen and, after 1892, at Basle University; but he was mainly interested in psychology and æsthetics, on which he became a leading authority. His works on the psychology of play (*Die Spiele der Thiere*, 1896, and *Die Spielen des Menschen*, 1899) are classics. Groos followed the Pantheistic philosophy of Schelling.

Grote, George, D.C.L., LL.D. (1794–1871), historian. He entered his father's banking house, and at the same time devoted himself to the study of philosophy and economics. At the age of twenty-five he became a close friend of Bentham and James Mill, and in 1822 Bentham and he wrote, under the name of "Philip Beauchamp," and published a scathing Atheistic work, *An Analysis of the Influence of Natural Religion on the Temporal Happiness of Mankind*. Bentham provided the material, and Grote wrote this interesting monument of the turning-point of British Rationalism in passing from Deism to Agnosticism and Atheism. Grote worked devotedly in the cause of reform and education, especially in the founding of a purely secular university for London; as it was intended by its founders that University College should be. He left the Council of the College when a liberal clergyman was appointed to the

chair of philosophy. At the age forty-three he retired from the bank and took up the writing of his *History of Greece* (11 vols., 1846–53), the fine work on the subject that had appeared. At his death he left £6,000 to endow a chair of philosophy in the University College. His gifted wife **Harriet Grote** (1792–1878), supported him in his work and was one of the chief intermediaries of her time between France and England (*Dict. Nat. Biog.*; the writer might have said between the advanced thinkers of France and those of England. She wrote *The Personal Life of George Grote* (1873) and other works. When one of her nieces entered the Church of England she sent her "a sarcastic, cutting letter" (*Three Generations of English Women*, 1893, p. 442).

Guerrini, Olindo, D.-ès-L. (1845–1916), Italian poet. A lawyer who turned to poetry and letters, and his various volumes of poems (*Postuma, Polemica, Nova Polemica*, etc.) put him at the head of the Naturalist School. He was a Chevalier of the Crown of Italy, though an avowed Atheist. "I do not believe in God," he says in the Preface to the volume *Nova Polemica*.

Guggenberger, Louisa Sarah Bovington (1845–97), poet. She was a Quaker lady of ability and high culture who promptly accepted Darwinism and its Rationalist implications and embodied them in poetry. Darwin, who rarely read poetry, greatly appreciated her *Keynotes* (1879) and *Poems, Lyrics, and Sonnets* (1882). Mrs. Guggenberger—she married the artist Ignaz Guggenberger—was a notable figure in the intellectual society of her time and contributed Agnostic articles to *The Nineteenth Century*, *Mind*, and other reviews.

Guignebert, Prof. Charles. He is professor of history at the Sorbonne (Paris University), and one of the leading authorities on the Greek-Roman world about the beginning of the Christian Era. Of his many works on the period, two have been translated into English: *Jesus*, 1935, and *The Jewish World in the Time of Jesus*, 1939. For his views on the historicity of Jesus see article under that title. Prof. Guignebert is an Honorary Associate of the R.P.A.

Guilds, The Mediæval. Catholic literature always includes the formation of the Guilds among the (imaginary) services which the Church rendered to the workers. It not only did not inspire them, but for more than a century it made every effort to suppress them and, when it found the workers unconquerable, brought them under its influence by giving them a religious form. Expert writers on them, who reproduce very little about the action of the Church in their early days, dispute whether they were formed by abbot-employers (for which they do not quote a tittle of evidence), or developed from native German associations of workers, or were a continuation of the old Roman *Collegia* [see]. It is not disputed that they were at first very pagan in their character. "The Church," says Dr. Gross, "naturally fostered the early growth of the Guilds and tried to make them displace the old heathen banquets." Although Dr. Gross is recommended as the leading authority on them, he here completely ignores the evidence. The "heathen banquets" were functions of the Guilds, and it is so stated in the contemporary laws. This earliest evidence is in the *Capitularies* (book of laws of the eighth century) of Charlemagne, and the work is equally ignored by Walford and Eberstadt, the other authorities to whom religious writers appeal. A *capitulum* or decree of the year 779 threatens severe penalties against men who "conspire together in Guilds" (*gildoniæ*) and take oaths to them. The law is repeated in 805 and 821, with savage penalties. These laws were the work of bishops as well as other royal counsellors, but we have clearer evidence of the Church's attitude in the *Capitula Synodica* of Archbishop Heinmar of Rheims. A synod of the year 852 (seventy-three years after the first attack) complains that priests attend the "heathen banquets" of the Guilds and get drunk and sing disreputable songs at them. All this suggests that they were a continuation of the Roman Colleges or unions of workers of which the monthly supper was a common feature. The historians who complain that we can trace no connection—it was an age of

appallingly scanty literature—have missed a reference to the "Schools" which formed part of the procession of the Romans to meet Charlemagne in 774 (*Liber Pontificalis*, "Hadrian I"); and Jules Nicole, in 1892, discovered evidence, in an imperial edict, that the Colleges survived in the Greek world in the tenth century. That the Guilds rendered service to the workers, as the number of craftsmen rapidly multiplied with the revival of trade, in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, is agreed, but the apologists conceal the fact that even at this stage 90 per cent. of the workers of Europe had no Guilds. In many places the prostitutes had their Guild, with banners and an honourable part in the processions on Saints' Days; but the agricultural workers, the great majority of the people, had none, and were terribly exploited. The suggestion which is made sometimes that Protestantism put an end to these beneficent fraternities is wanton. All the authorities agree that they died in the course of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, because they had become injurious to the workers and to trade. See C. Gross, *The Gild Merchant* (2 ed., 1927), and C. Walford Gilds (1888). The *Capitularies* of Charlemagne, of which these writers take little or no notice because they show the true action of the Church, are in the Migne Collection of the Fathers, vol. 97.

Guimet Museum, The. A museum established at Lyons and later transferred to Paris, where it still is, to spread Rationalism by an exhibition of objects illustrating comparative religion. It was founded in 1879 by Étienne Guimet, a distinguished chemist, an officer of the Legion of Honour, who devoted his life to the study of comparative religion and made a rich collection, in the East, of objects to illustrate it.

Gull, Sir William Withey, Bart., M.D., F.R.S., D.C.L., LL.D. (1816-90), physician. He lectured at Guy's Hospital 1843-56, was Fullerian Professor of Physiology at the Royal Institution 1847-9, and physician and lecturer at Guy's from 1856 onwards. He was also Censor of the Royal College of Physicians, member of the General Medical Council, and physician to the Queen, and Galstonian Lecturer, Har-

veian Orator, and Hunterian Orator. Gull was a friend of James Hinton [see] and shared his Pantheistic views. See his Introduction to *Life and Letters of James Hinton* (1878).

Gurney, Edmund, M.D., LL.D. (1847-88), writer on psychical research. Gurney was a very versatile scholar, graduating in both medicine and law and quitting them for philosophy and psychology. He is often quoted as if he were a Spiritualist, because he helped to found the Society for Psychical Research and co-operated with Myers in writing *Phantasms of the Living* (1886); but in his *Tertium Quid* (2 vols., 1887) he rejects the idea of a personal God and expresses only a hope of a future life.

Guyau, Jean Marie (1854-88), French writer. He won the Academy Prize at the age of nineteen by an essay on utilitarian morality and published several well-known books on ethics without religion. His Atheism is best seen in *L'irreligion de l'Avenir* (1886). Guyau was a writer of sound philosophical and sociological erudition.

Guyot, Yves (1843-1928), French economist. In his earlier years he edited the Rationalist periodical *La Pensée Nouvelle*, but entered politics and became Minister of Public Works. He had a high position in economics and was Vice-President of the Society of Political Economy, President of the Anthropological Society and the Statistical Society, and member of the British Royal Statistical Society and the American Academy of Political and Social Science. He was nevertheless an outspoken and advanced Rationalist. See his *Études sur les doctrines sociales du Christianisme* (1873) and *Le bilan de l'Église* (1883).

Gyllenborg, Count Gustaf Friedrik von (1731-1808), Swedish poet. A noble of high culture who embraced the ideas of the French Rationalists and became a Deist. He was one of the first members of the Swedish Academy, and at one time Chancellor of Upsala University. His satires, fables, and odes are full of Rationalism.

H.

Haddon, Prof. Alfred Cort, M.A., D.Sc., F.R.S. (1855-1940), ethnologist. He began his distinguished career as professor of botany at the Dublin Royal College of Science and became University Lecturer (1900-9) in Ethnology, later University Reader in Ethnology, at Cambridge. His works and papers gave him one of the highest positions in his science, and he was President of the Royal Anthropological Institute and of the Ethnological Section of the British Association (1902-3). Dr. Haddon was, until his death, a member and cordial supporter of the R.P.A.

Hadrian, the Emperor (76-138), the greatest of Roman monarchs. He was born in Spain of a Roman-Spanish family, but was sent to Rome for the finest education, especially in Greek literature, that its schools could give. Being a very handsome and robust youth, he was taken up by the Emperor Trajan, was his close companion in his campaigns, and succeeded him in 117. The practice of counting him one

of "the Stoic Emperors" is very incongruous. He was an Epicurean, and at the request of Trajan's gifted wife Plotina, who also was a serious student of the Epicurean philosophy, he founded a chair at Athens for teaching it. For ten years before his accession to the throne he had held the highest offices in Rome, and the city owed to him the erection of magnificent buildings and the great extension of philanthropic work which is attributed to Trajan. During the twenty years of his reign he, however sensual and artistic he may have been in personal taste, worked as few emperors did for the improvement of the Empire, doing more for the provinces than all the other so-called Stoic Emperors put together. He travelled—to a great extent walking afoot with the soldiers—through every province, seeking grievances to redress and ordering innumerable libraries, aqueducts, baths, theatres, etc. He engaged Æmilianus to humanize the laws, improving the condition of the slave and abolishing

torture, and he drastically purified the courts and the administration. Schiller rightly calls him "the Empire's first servant," and Gibbon, though rather prejudiced against him by the injustice which then lingered in history, speaks of his "vast and active genius," his "equity and moderation." Few more unselfish and more beneficent rulers ever existed, yet until recent times it has been customary to dismiss him as a selfish sybarite. The writers who diltate on his boy-friend (for a few years) Antinous and the legendary orgies at his villa at Tivoli do not mention that it was only in the later years of his long and laborious life that he lived at Tivoli, and he was then an elderly and failing man. Almost with his last breath he put his scepticism into a poem about the future of his "pale little soul." B. W. Henderson's *Life and Principate of the Emperor Hadrian* (1923) is the best biography, but not free from the taint of the old prejudice.

Haeckel, Prof. Ernst Heinrich, M.D., Ph.D., Sc.D., LL.D. (1834-1919), German zoologist. He graduated in medicine, but never practised, and for a time he wavered between the attractions of art—all his life he had considerable skill in drawings and water-colours—and science. In 1862 he became Extraordinary, and in 1865 Ordinary, Professor of Zoology at Jena, which he refused many times to leave for richer appointments. He was already a Rationalist when the *Origin of Species* reached Germany, and he became Darwin's most devoted apostle on the Continent. In the meantime he issued large and authoritative works—chiefly *Die generelle Morphologie der Organismen* (2 vols., 1866), *Natürliche Schöpfungsgeschichte* (1868: Engl. trans., *The Natural History of Creation*), *Anthropogenie* (2 vols., 1874: Engl. trans., *The Evolution of Man*), and *Systematische Phylogenie* (3 vols., 1894-6)—which put him in the front rank of European science and brought him four gold medals and seventy diplomas from scientific bodies. He wrote about forty other works, but religious writers seem to have heard only of a popular work *Die Welträtsel* (1899: Engl. trans., *The Riddle of the Universe*), which was

merely a scrapbook he had written in leisure hours. No one was more astonished than he when it ran to about 3,000,000 copies in more than twenty languages. He gave the profit to the Museum of Evolution which he built at Jena. It was the unhappy development of Germany at the end of the last century that gave the book a satirical note at times, but with the new century he recovered his fine, generous, and idealist character. He at first censured England during the 1914-18 war, but recognized before he died that his Government had deceived him (information from mutual Swiss friends).

A legend of *Haeckel's Forgeries* still circulates in religious literature—to its grave discredit, since the myth was exposed in 1909. A popular lecturer of the Kepler Bund (the German Christian Evidence Society), Brass, charged Haeckel with "falsifying" (not forging) the illustrations of embryos in his books. Prof. Keibel, one of the leading embryologists and not a friend of Haeckel, indignantly repudiated the charge after a careful examination of the incriminated drawings (*Medizinische Wochenschrift*, No. 8, 1909) and retorted that Dr. Brass had in his works "done precisely the same thing as Haeckel." Prof. Rabl, another leading embryologist, stated in the Press (*Frankfurter Zeitung*, March 5, 1910) that, while the charge against Haeckel was false, it would be true against Brass himself, against whom he had publicly warned his students. Prof. Hertwig declared that Brass had been driven out of the field of science, and, as the Churches still pressed the charge, forty-six of the leading embryologists and zoologists of Europe sent to the Press a signed repudiation of the charge. The Kepler Bund issued a manifesto excusing itself and condemning Brass's "unfortunate procedure," but they could not get one eminent man of science to sign even this. A full account is given in Prof. H. Schmidt's *Haeckel's Embryonenbilder* (1909), and a summary of the facts was given in the *Literary Guide*, October 1919. The best biography of Haeckel is that of Prof. W. Boelsche, *Haeckel, his Life and Work* (cheap ed. 1909), and an examination of the criticisms of the

Riddle will be found in McCabe's *Haeckel's Critics Answered* (1910) and *The Riddle of the Universe To-Day* (1934). *The Love Letters of Ernst Haeckel* (Engl. trans. 1930) is misleading in title, but illustrates the fine emotional nature of the man; and few men of science have had a higher tribute than the symposium dedicated to him by 123 European scientists and educationists on his 80th birthday (*Was Wir Ernst Haeckel Verdanken*, 2 vols., 1914).

Haldane, Prof. John Burdon Sanderson, M.A., F.R.S. (b. 1892), biochemist. A son of Dr. J. S. Haldane, he had a brilliant career at Eton and Oxford and was appointed reader in biochemistry at Cambridge in 1922. He was Fullerian Professor of Physiology at the Royal Institution 1930-2 and Professor of Genetics at London University 1933-7. Since that date he has been Professor of Biometrics at London University. He has a remarkable range of knowledge in science and an intense social idealism. In recent works he advocates Materialism. His father, **Dr. John Scott Haldane** (1864-1936), physiologist, with whom Dr. H. F. Osborn and other religio-scientific writers strangely confuse him, was anti-Materialistic and in a broad sense an advocate of Vitalism, but otherwise a Rationalist.

Halévy, Jacques François Fromentel Élie (1799-1862), French-Jewish composer. He was a professor at the Conservatoire, and he composed several operas which gave him a high position in the musical world. He was a Commander of the Legion of Honour and a member of the Academy. Halévy was an intimate friend of Renan and shared his Rationalism. His brother **Léon** (1802-83) gave up the Jewish faith early in life and joined the Saint-Simonians. He was a man of immense erudition—he translated Homer, Æschylus, Herodian, and Shakespeare and wrote a large number of works on travel and history—and was professor of literature in the Polytechnic. His son **Ludovic** (1834-1908), a dramatist and novelist, and equally Rationalistic, so sustained the brilliance of the family that when he died Mr. Bodley wrote in the *Athenæum*

(May 16, 1908) that his death "made the greatest gap in the French world of letters since that of Dumas fils." Another son, **Joseph** (1827-1895), was one of the most learned Orientalists of his time, and a Rationalist.

Halley, Edmund, M.A., F.R.S., D.C.L. (1656-1742), astronomer. He was admitted to the Royal Society at the age of twenty-two, but in spite of his brilliance Oxford University refused to make him Savilian Professor, in 1691, because of his declared heresies. He got the chair in 1703, however, and is counted one of the greatest astronomers who ever occupied it. His name still reaches the general public in references to "Halley's Comet." Although he was a man of very moderate means, he helped Newton, personally and financially, to publish his *Principia*. Halley does not discuss religion in his writings, but Chalmers says in his *Biographical Dictionary*: "That he was an infidel in religious matters seems as generally allowed as it appears unaccountable."

Halls of Science. The followers of Robert Owen were accustomed to give this name to the halls they used, and, as many of the early Secularists were Owenites, the name passed on to them. The first, a small workshop, was the meeting-place of the Birmingham Owenites, at which Holyoake presided for a time. By 1840 there were many, including one in City Road, London, and the religious fanatics tried to get them suppressed. As Owen then called his system "Rational Religion," they met the attack by pleading that they held religious services. At the collapse of Owenism, in the forties, many were sold, but some became Secular Societies and survived into the present century.

Hamilton, Lord Ernest William (1888-1939), writer. A son of the Duke of Abercorn who, after a career in the Army and seven years in Parliament, wrote several novels and books on religion. He was a Theist, but rejected all Church doctrines and the idea of a future life. "Church dogmas are doomed," he wrote (*Involution*, 1912, p. 21).

Hammurabi Code, The. In 1901, while theologians were still describing how the Hebrew religion had brought

the idea of justice into the ancient world, and preachers and popular writers were shuddering at the repute of Babylon, a copy of a very early code of Babylonian law was discovered in Persia. It was carved on an eight-foot block of black stone, and seems to have been removed from some temple at Babylon by the Persians. At the foot, King Hammurabi, one of the earliest Babylonian monarchs (1958-1916 B.C.), tells that he is its author. A carving at the head represents him standing before the god Shamash with a sceptre in his hand, and some—the error got into Wells's *Outline of History*—erroneously said that it figured the King receiving the code of law from the god. It is more interesting that, in point of fact, Hammurabi expressly says that he compiled the code himself, thus excluding religious influence. The entire code, which is more than a thousand years older than the first Hebrew prophet, is more strictly and comprehensively based upon principles of justice than any known code until modern times. From certain archaic features—the inclusion of the *lex talionis* (an eye for an eye) and the death-penalty for adultery—experts conclude that the laws are much older than 2000 B.C. and go back to the Sumerians; and it is an ironic comment on the Hebrew “genius for morality” that in borrowing from the Babylonian for the so-called Mosaic Code, 1,300 years later, the Jews omitted the best features (justice to woman, minimum wage for the workers, etc.) and retained such principles as the *lex talionis*. In the Hammurabi Code priests have no privileges and are mentioned only as citizens; and it is noteworthy that, while the Code envisages every aspect of life and work, there is no reference in any clause to the compulsory prostitution in temples before marriage which religious writers quote, in spite of the warning of experts, from Herodotus. On the other hand, sex-crimes are the most heavily punished. Even in case of adultery, which civil law very rarely treats as a crime, the penalty is death (§ 129) unless the King forgives the man, and the husband forgives his wife: which suggests that it is an old law that was not strictly enforced. The penalty for

incest and rape also is death; and a priestess who incurs suspicion of looseness is condemned to death. These penalties, however, do not mean that, as in the Semitic world generally, the wife is a man's property and treated as such. Justice to woman, who in Babylon, as in Egypt, was the equal of man, is a conspicuous feature of the Code. If a man divorces his wife, or even a concubine, he must return her dowry (§ 137); a wife may on liberal grounds divorce her husband, and she retains her dowry (§ 142); and a man cannot divorce his wife to marry a concubine (§ 144). There are sixty clauses regulating marriage, divorce, and property on a basis of justice. Forty-four clauses secure justice and a minimum wage to workers of all classes (§§ 234-77). British and American law was, until less than a century ago, barbaric in comparison, while the notion that Hebrew prophets began to teach the world justice twelve or thirteen centuries after the time of Hammurabi is one which any writer ought now to be ashamed to repeat. An excellent translation, available in a cheap edition, is C. Edward's *Hammurabi Code* (1904). For comparison with the much later Mosaic Code see S. A. Cook's *Laws of Moses and the Code of Hammurabi* (1903).

Hammerton, Sir John Alexander (b. 1871), editor. After long experience in journalism he began to edit the Harmsworth serial publications (*History of the World*, 1907-9, *The World's Great Books*, 1909-10, etc.). He has planned and edited a long series of works, in cheap fortnightly parts, of great value in the cause of public instruction. Sir John is an Honorary Associate of the R.P.A.

Hamsun, Knut (1859-1930), Norwegian novelist and Nobel Prize winner. In his youth Hamsun was an enthusiastic admirer of the great Scandinavian Rationalists, Ibsen, Björnson, and Brandes. He worked in America as tram-driver, barber, etc., before he returned to Norway and became its leading writer. In his later years he was very retired and broody and might broadly be classed as a Pantheist, but he “holds no particular philosophy,” C. D. Marcus

says in his *Knut Hamsun* (1926, p. 221).

Hanotaux, Gabriel Albert Auguste (b. 1853), French historian and statesman. He was trained in law, but entered politics and had a high repute throughout the world as Minister of Foreign Affairs (1894-6 and 1896-8). He is a member of the Academy, an Officer of the Legion of Honour, and one of the most accomplished historical writers of modern France (*Histoire du Cardinal de Richelieu*, 2 vols., 1893 and 1903; *Histoire de la France contemporaine*, 1903, etc.). He is an Agnostic—see his Introduction to Despagne's *La République et le Vatican* (1906).

Hanson, Sir Richard Davies (1805-76), Chief Justice of South Australia. Trained in law in England, he emigrated to Canada in 1838, and from there to New Zealand, where he became Crown Prosecutor. In 1846 he passed to South Australia and was Advocate-General (1851), Attorney-General (1856), and Chief Justice of the Supreme Court (1861). In 1874 he was Chancellor of Adelaide University. In spite of his position, Hanson was an advanced and outspoken Rationalist and published a number of critical works (*The Jesus of History*, 1869, *Letters to and from Rome*, 1869, *The Apostle Paul*, 1875, etc.).

Harborton, Viscount. [See Pomeroy, E. A. G. P.]

Harper, Song of the. [See Song of the Harper.]

Harrison, Prof. Frederic, M.A., D.C.L., Litt.D., LL.D. (1831-1923), Positivist. He was a lawyer by profession and Professor of Jurisprudence and International Law to the Inns of Court from 1877 to 1889; also Rede Lecturer at Cambridge (1900), Washington Lecturer at Chicago (1901), and Herbert Spencer Lecturer at Oxford (1905). He was, however, better known as one of the leading literary men of his time and Chairman of the English Positivist Committee (1880-1905). Harrison abandoned Christianity in 1857 (*Autobiographical Memoirs*, I, 250) and adopted Positivism in 1862. His views on religion, from the Positivist standpoint, are found in his *Creed of a Layman* (1905) and *The Positive Evolu-*

tion of Religion (1912). His son, **Austin Harrison** (1873-1928), for many years editor of the *English Review*, was a more robust Rationalist, and preferred Nietzsche to Comte.

Harrison, Jane Ellen, LL.D., Litt.D. (1850-1928), Hellenist. Miss Harrison was a Lecturer on Archæology at Cambridge University and wrote important works on Greek religion (especially *Prolegomena to the Study of Greek Religion*, 1912). She was a member of the Hellenic Society and of the Committee of the British School of Archaeology at Athens. Her Rationalist attitude is expressed in her Conway Memorial Lecture 1919: "The old orthodoxy is dead and may well be buried," she said. She admitted an Immanent God who is "nothing but the mystery of the whole of things." She was an Honorary Associate of the R.P.A.

Harte, Francis Bret (1839-1902), American novelist. Son of a Roman Catholic professor, he led a rambling life (as teacher, miner, compositor, and journalist) until, in 1870, he was appointed professor of literature at California University. He had already published a number of the mining stories which made the name of Bret Harte famous. He was American Consul at Crefeld 1877-80 and at Glasgow 1880. His biographer, T. E. Pemberton (*The Life of Bret Harte*, 1903), says that "in his later years he was content to worship God through his works" (p. 77) and, in his own words, "never voiced a creed" (p. 343).

Hartland, Edwin Sidney, LL.D., F.S.A. (1848-1927), anthropologist. He was Registrar of the Gloucester City Council and District Registrar of the High Court, yet attained considerable distinction in the science of comparative religion (especially by his *Legend of Perseus*, 3 vols., 1894-6) and folk-lore. He was President of the Folk-Lore Society 1899. Dr. Hartland was an Agnostic and an Honorary Associate of the R.P.A.

Hartmann, Prof. Karl Robert Edward von (1842-1906). German philosopher. Son of a general, he served in the Army until 1865, when, he said, he "adopted thinking as his profession." His chief work, *The Philosophy of the Uncon-*

scious (Engl. trans. 1869), was discussed all over Europe. His Rationalism is more strongly expressed in *Die Selbstversetzung des Christenthums* (1888). He called his system "concrete Monism," and professed that it reconciled the Spirit or Idea of Hegel with the Will of Schopenhauer and showed that Christianity and Buddhism were one religion. Few now read his works, and he is quoted by theologians as a Materialist, and by Fundamentalists as an anti-Darwinian. The latter always omit to state that he wrote on the subject seventy years ago. He emphatically rejected belief in a personal God and immortality.

Harun-al-Rashid (763-809), 5th Abbassid Caliph. The practice of calling him "the Just" (al Rashid), a title which orthodox Moslem writers gave him because of his zeal for the faith, illustrates the slovenliness of our literary traditions when religion is involved. He ruled at a time when the sceptical Persians had lifted their Arab-Persian civilization near to its height. Sir W. Muir (*The Caliphate*, 1890) exaggerates when he calls his reign "the most glorious chapter in the history of Islam." That title properly belongs, as far as the Persian Caliphate is concerned, to the reign of his sceptical son Mamun [see]; and it is undisputed that Harun, in his later years, fell with a revolting cruelty and injustice upon the Persian nobles who had made Bagdad great. The slaughter of the chief Persian family, the Barmaki, has, through one of the tales of *The Arabian Nights*, been incorporated in a proverb ("a Barmecide feast") of world literature; though it is not historical that he invited all the members of the family to a banquet and treacherously murdered them. The facts are brutal enough. He had married his daughter to a son of the house, stipulating—either from jealousy or a more discreditable motive—that the marriage should remain nominal. The women tricked the prince (in drink) into violating this, and Harun, apparently influenced by the fanatics who urged him to make peace with Allah by crushing the infidels (as most of the educated Persians were), or jealous of the prestige of the family, had them all

imprisoned or executed. Even on his deathbed he had a man butchered (literally, by a butcher) before his eyes. It is acknowledged by all modern authorities that he had until his last years been very sensual, and G. Audisio, in the best recent study of him (*Harun-al-Rashid*, 1931—not translated), shows that while he was punctilious during the day in the discharge of his religious duties, he indulged night after night in drinking orgies and debauch in a secret room of his palace with his daughter and other ladies and nobles. His son Mamun retired in disgust to a remote province until Harun died, and then proved a really great ruler [see].

Hauptmann, Gerhart (b. 1862), German dramatist. He was trained as a sculptor, but left that field for science, and eventually devoted himself to letters and became one of the foremost writers of Germany. Under the influence of Ibsen he wrote a number of social dramas (*Die Weber*, 1892, etc.) which had a European reputation, but in later years he leaned to a moderate mysticism or symbolism and was broadly Pantheistic. There is a collected edition of his works in English (1913), an honour reserved for very few German writers.

Havet, Prof. Ernest Auguste Eugène (1813-89), French writer. He was Professor of Greek Literature at the École Normale and later of Latin Eloquence at the Collège de France. He boldly defended Renan's *Life of Jesus* (1863) in an article in the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, which was not yet Catholic, and entered upon the profound study of Christianity which he gives in his great Rationalist work, *Le christianisme et ses origines* (3 vols., 1872-84). Havet was a member of the Legion of Honour and of the Academy of Political and Social Science.

Hawthorne, Nathaniel (1804-64), American novelist. He worked in the Civil Service at Boston while he wrote his early books, but *The Scarlet Letter* (1850) put him in the front rank of American literary men. It is a powerful and sombre description of the Puritanism in which he had been reared, but he had discarded the faith at college, and never afterwards attended church (F. S. Sears, *The Life and Genius of Nathaniel*

Hawthorne, 1906, p. 422). "His own family," Stearns says, "did not know what his opinions were" (p. 423). He had joined the Boston Transcendentalists and accepted God (rejecting immortality) only in the impersonal sense of the school.

Haynes, Edmund Sidney Pollock (b. 1877), lawyer and writer. He succeeded his father as head of an old-established firm of solicitors—Gibbon had been a client of the firm—and married a grand-daughter of Huxley. He has written a large number of books, particularly in defence of liberty and for the reform of the divorce-law. His Rationalism is found especially in his *Belief in Personal Immortality* (1913). He is an Agnostic and a life-member of the R.P.A.

Hazlitt, William (1778–1830), essayist. The son of a Unitarian minister, and in training for the ministry, he abandoned the Church and devoted himself to literature. He was a friend of Coleridge and Lamb, and his *Characters of Shakespeare's Plays* (1817) and *Table Talk* (1821–2) raised him to their rank. Thackeray considered him "one of the keenest and brightest critics that ever lived" (*Cambridge History of English Literature*, XII, 178). He was a Theist, but did not believe in a future life; and he wrote ("My First Acquaintance with Poets") with some disdain of the Bible, which caught "the lack-lustre eyes" of his father.

Hearn, Lafcadio (1850–1904), writer on Japan. He had an Irish father and Greek mother, and they gave him his first name after one of the Ionian Islands. He soon shed the Catholicism in which he had been educated and became an Atheist. After some years in American journalism he went to Japan and became a professor at Tokio University and "the most brilliant of writers on Japanese life" (*Athenaeum*, October 1, 1904). He adopted Buddhism, and the high praise of Japanese character in his beautifully written works aims at showing its superiority to Christianity. The reader should, however, understand that, as Hearn's friend Robert Young told the present writer, he was short-sighted and not a good observer.

Heaven and Hell. From a study of the beliefs of the lowest peoples, which, when we eliminate adulterations, represent those of early prehistoric man, we learn that the shades of the dead, in which man soon learned to believe, were thought to hover about the hut or the village after death. [See Religion.] As man advanced he, possibly to explain why they were so rarely seen or their action felt, located them in the forest or beyond the mountains or seas. One can imagine that the primitive "priests" answered the sceptic by putting the shades farther and farther away until the idea that the shade was a spirit, and therefore invisible, was at length invented. However that may be, we see in the localization of the shades in the minds of savages—there is a full account in the article "Abode of the Dead," in the *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics*—when we take carefully into account (as is rarely done) the cultural position of each people and its possibilities of borrowing, the whole story of the evolution of heaven and earth. When earth-burial began, it was natural to put the home of the shades underground, and this remained for ages a dim and misty world of unknown features, but generally conceived as unpleasant. So we find in many peoples of the higher or middle savage level to-day, from Africa to Siberia and America. This idea was taken up into civilization, and was the general feeling of the Semitic peoples, including the Jews, as well as the early Greeks and Romans, who gave little thought to the shades of the dead. But an ethical discrimination sets in at a fairly low level of savage life, the shades of the "good" ascending to the bright and happy home of the gods in the sky, and the underworld having its unpleasant features increasingly made worse for the wicked. Exceptional conditions might alter this. For instance, to the Eskimo a warm hell might not be unattractive, and some thought the home of the good was a land of perpetual sunshine underground, while the wicked were punished with intense cold. Among the early Teutons Hel (a hollow place underground) was the common and very dim abode of all the dead except warriors, who earned residence in Val-

halla by ferocity in fighting. Other peoples put the shades of the good in beautiful islands (Isles of the Blest, etc.) across the sea. The general tendency was in the direction of an underworld of discomfort for all but a few who were particularly appreciated by the kings and priests, and these, naturally, went to the home of the great sky-gods. Some savage peoples regarded the rainbow as a bridge by means of which the shades mounted to the sky. Others believed that they went up in the smoke of the funeral pyre. How the Egyptians came at a very early date to have so definite a belief in immortality and an underworld is a matter of speculation, but their idea of an eternal reward—they had no idea of eternal punishment—had a profound influence on the evolution of religion. Whether the even more definite Persian (or Zoroastrian) idea of "the Kingdom" (heaven) for the pure and fire for the wicked, the beginnings of which we cannot trace, implies a debt at some unknown date to Egypt it is impossible to say. But by the second century B.C. the Persian and Egyptian idea spread all over the civilized world. The Jews, realizing the futility of their belief that Jahveh rewarded the good and punished the wicked in this life, adopted the other-worldly scheme, their religious leaders restoring confidence in Jahveh by promising a spiritual and eternal reward for their sufferings in their national disasters. The founders of Christianity accepted the barbaric side of this doctrine ("the fire that is not extinguished") as fully as the attractive side, while other movements of the time (Eleusinian Mysteries, Mithraism, Manichæism, etc.) held out to the Greeks and Romans only the brighter prospect; and the debased Buddhism of the Middle Ages emulated Christianity in adding horrors to the repulsive doctrine of hell. See Mrs. Bradlaugh-Bonner, *The Christian Hell* (1913). The better-educated divines in all Churches except the Roman (which still permits no departure from the mediæval idea) and the Fundamentalist now acknowledge with a shudder that the whole post-mortem scheme is an error and the doctrine of hell repulsive; though this

does not prevent them from retaining the dogma that a Holy Spirit has guided the Church for the last 1,900 years. "The local Heaven and Hell of mediæval fancy has passed away," says Bishop Barnes in *Should Such a Faith Offend*, 1927 (p. 179). "The Jewish Gehenna, which became the mediæval hell, is untrue," says Bishop Masterman in *The Christianity of To-morrow* (1929, p. 58). Less responsible Christian writers than bishops use more violent language, but they almost invariably avoid the fact that Jesus and Paul and all the Fathers, scholars, divines, and mystics of all branches of the Christian Church accepted, until the last century, what they call the repulsive mediæval doctrine of hell. Most Christian scholars now leave the complexion of the next world open, and many begin to question immortality [see].

Hebrew Language, The. Archaeological discoveries of recent years have taught us that alphabetic writing, the beginning of which, from Egyptian or Phœnician sources, was always conjectural and disputed, is older than was at one time believed. In 1904 and 1905 Sir Flinders Petrie found in the Sinai Peninsula inscriptions in an archaic language which he dated about 1500 B.C. Other inscriptions, in a primitive Canaanite alphabet, were discovered in 1929–35. Prof. S. Langdon, in a letter to the *Times* (October 5, 1935), claimed that these inscriptions gave us the oldest specimens of a Western Semitic alphabet, and that they belonged to the fifteenth century and showed that written language (besides the Egyptian and the Babylonian characters) was in use in Palestine at that time. Bibliolaters (Sir C. Marston, *The Bible Comes Alive*, 1937, etc.) at once announced that another Rationalist myth of the last century had been demolished, and that this was the language in which the Mosaic books had been written. Apart from the fact that others date the inscriptions two centuries later than Langdon, and decline to call the language early Hebrew, Rationalist criticism of the Old Testament is not in any degree based upon the obscure question of the origin of alphabetical script. Even if we find that

people were writing in such a script in Palestine, in 1500 B.C. or earlier, the legends of *Genesis* remain Babylonian in origin, the patriarchal age and its wonders (longevity, etc.) are as mythical as ever, and not one line is altered of the immense research of the higher critics (almost all Christians), which proves that the Old Testament as we have it is a compilation, largely fraudulent, of the sixth and fifth centuries B.C., and that if the Hebrews had any documents at all before the eighth century B.C., we do not know their contents. It has generally been assumed that the historical books embodied something like "annals" (in a vast amount of fiction) of the Hebrew people. Whether they were written or oral is not material.

Hebrews, The. Prof. C. Roth says, in his *Short History of the Jewish People* (1936), that "nothing in literature is quite so conservative as Jewish historiography." He seems to illustrate his own criticism when he proceeds to accept as historical the stories of Moses, Joshua, Saul, David, and Solomon (and his "magnificent temple"); and the great majority of manuals of the history of the Hebrews, Jews, or Israelites before the eighth century B.C. certainly incur that reproach. Fortunately, the only interest of the Rationalist, as such, in the Hebrews is their claim that they were more advanced than other ancient nations in regard to religion and ethics, and this claim is completely destroyed by the dates which are now assigned for their religious-ethical books. The claim was formulated at a time when the various monotheistic periods and the high ethic of Egypt and Babylonia, long before the appearance of the first Hebrew prophets in the eighth century, were unknown, and it ought not now to be advanced by any serious writer. A score of articles in this Encyclopædia tell the facts, and a summary will be found under the title *Old Testament*.

On the strict lines of modern history we know nothing about the Hebrews before the fourteenth century B.C., when the "Amarna Letters"—dispatches of Egyptian officials to their Court—speak of trouble in Palestine with the "Habiru." This is interpreted "the

folk from across the river" and is understood to refer to Semitic invaders or marauders from the desert, amongst whom we may agree to include the ancestors of the Jews. However many tribes of them may have been in Palestine at that time—experts conclude that they drifted in at various dates between 1500 and 1000—they had not, as far as we know, any common name or political cohesion, but the Greek form of the name which the Egyptians gave them, the Hebrews, came to be their common denomination and, for the early part of their history, seems preferable to Israelites (which assumes that the absurd legend of Jacob in *Genesis* is true) or Jews (which occurs late even in the Old Testament). Archaeological research has up to the present—and it has been so thorough that new finds are unlikely—not discovered a sojourn of any of these tribes in Egypt, much less a common origin of them in North Arabia or Sumeria. Even H. H. Rowley's *Israel's Sojourn in Egypt* (published by the Rylands Library, 1938) is a strained and feeble attempt to find traces of them in Egypt, and all such claims are rejected or disputed by Egyptologists. There is, as Prof. Kastein says, far too prompt a disposition to say, now that the divinity of the Old Testament is discarded, that its early stories are "doubtless based upon a tradition which the Hebrews had." No one questions that the Hebrews would, like other peoples, have traditions of the tribe; nor are we interested in the extent to which unimportant statements in these presumed traditions are verified. But the stories of Abraham and his singular descendants, of Joseph, Moses, Joshua, David, and Solomon, have *not* been thus vindicated and may be part of the rich fabrications of the final "redactors" of the Old Testament or, like our story of King Arthur, fictional expansions of a dim recollection of primitive sheiks. As to the local colouring which is sometimes said to give credibility to such stories as that of Joseph, a Jew writing long afterwards would have access to literature that provided it—as it is obviously provided in the pleasant story of Joseph and Potiphar's wife from the Egyptian "Tale of Two Brothers"

—and Egyptologists find even more instances of *false* colouring than of correct details.

The leading experts broadly conclude that, as is suggested by the Old Testament itself, the Hebrews mingled with the Canaanites and shared their cults and their vices. The large and prominent nose which distinguishes about 75 per cent. of the Jewish race was not a Semitic trait, but a feature of the Hittites [see], who had already mixed with the Canaanites. Then, the authorities say, at some period which cannot be determined, a group of tribes came in from the desert with the cult of a strange god named something like Jahveh, apparently a mountain or sky-god. In the region from which they came—it is a widely accepted speculation that they got their deity from the Kenites near Sinai—the priests seem to have had a monopoly of the cult of this god, as sometimes happened, but here we have to be on guard against a tendency to wish to prove that the tribes were from the first monotheistic, which is very disputable. However that may be, the Old Testament, even after all the manipulations of the Ezra school, clearly shows that in the historical period down to the time of Josiah the Hebrews shared the polytheism of their neighbours, particularly the worship of phallic nature-deities and sacred prostitution. The violent and crude language of the prophets about their “whoring” testifies to this, and the fact that the priests were so bitter against the prophets confirms it. A mountain or sky-god is in the evolution of religion very apt to develop into a guardian of morals, but the ethical note which is most prominent in the “half-savage morality,” as Bishop Barnes calls it, of the prophets [see], justice, is rather in the nature of what preachers now call Bolshevism. The adoption of the civilized ways of their neighbours had led to the appearance of rich merchants and luxuries, and it is against the contrast of this wealth with the general poverty that the prophets inveigh. We do not, as a rule, call it a sublime morality when a spokesman of the poor rails against the rich. If the prophets represent the highest moral level of the Hebrews in the eighth and

seventh centuries, as we are told, it is clearly far below the level exhibited in the Hammurabi Code [see], more than a thousand years earlier, or the Maxims of Ptah-hotep [see], centuries before that.

For the development which is dramatically and untruthfully crystallized in the story of the finding of the Law under Josiah (620) see *Deuteronomy*. By this date the Hebrews were in close contact with the older and higher civilizations, and the rise of the ethical note in their literature is an elementary historical phenomenon. The myth of the Hebrew “genius for morality and religion,” which was substituted for the myth of revelation and inspiration, is based upon the old practice, now confined to the Fundamentalists, of dating the Hebrew books according to the plan of the fraudulent final revision of them. [See *Ezra*.] Later came the influence on the Hebrews of the Persians—the extent and date of this are much disputed—and of the Greeks, but the canon was closed in the fourth century and further book-writing forbidden by the zealots, so that the gradual education of the Hebrews in the higher morality is not so clearly traced; and the caricature of the ideals of the Scribes and Pharisees in the anti-Judaic Gospels helps to sustain the illusion of the less educated readers that a notable and abrupt moral advance appears in the teaching attributed to Jesus. It is, however, clear from many sources—the general adoption by the Hebrews of the idea of immortality, the religious revolt on moral grounds of the Jews of the Dispersal, the appearance of the Essenes and Therapeuts, the development in Jerusalem itself which culminates in the teaching of the Hillel school, etc.—that the Hebrew nation, now in touch through the Dispersal with all the best cultures from Alexandria to Persia, shared the general moral advance of the civilized world in the few centuries before Christ instead of remaining, as the Gospels suggest, in a narrow traditional groove from which a revolutionary Jesus would have to jolt them. [See *Dispersal*; *Gospels*; *Jesus*; *Parables*; *Talmud*; etc.] For the further history, in so far as Rationalism is interested in it, see *Jews*. For the settlement of the

Hebrews in Palestine see T. J. Meek, *Hebrew Origins* (1936); for the later period Prof. C. Guignebert, *The Jewish World in the Time of Jesus* (Engl. trans. 1939); for the Christian Era, J. R. Marcus, *The Jew in the Mediæval World* (1938), and M. Raisin, *A History of the Jews in Modern Times* (1919). Not only Graetz's classical *Popular History of the Jews* (Engl. trans., 6 vols., 1930), but most of the more recent manuals by Hebrew scholars (Kastein's *History and Destiny of the Jews*, 1933, Goodman's *History of the Jews*, 6 ed., 1939, Prof. Baron's *Social and Religious History of the Jews*, 3 vols., 1937, etc.) admit too much mythology in the first section.

Hedonism. Usually understood to mean an ethical system which makes pleasure the supreme good and the test of conduct. No moral philosopher ever taught this in the narrow sense in which it is commonly understood. Prof. Gilbert Murray, a moralist who is very far from being a hedonist, points out that the Greek word *hedone* means "sweetness" rather than sensual pleasure. In that sense it might be applied to the system of Epicurus or of Aristippus, or what is called the New Ethic; but Social Ethic is a less misleading term.

Hegel, Prof. Georg Wilhelm Friedrich (1770-1831), German philosopher. He was a teacher of philosophy at Jena 1800-16, professor at Heidelberg 1816-18, then at Berlin University, where he won the repute of being the leading philosopher of his time. The system of thought expounded in his works (chiefly *Die Phänomenologie des Geistes*, 1807, and *Die Wissenschaft der Logik*, 3 vols., 1812-16) assumes that Mind (or Spirit) and reality are one and the same; a denial of the reality, as ordinarily understood, of the material universe which put philosophy in antagonism to science until this century. The terminology in which he described the evolution of "the Absolute" (the one reality) was taken over by the Dialectical Materialists, but Hegel had detested Materialism almost as much as he detested political or economic radicalism. His philosophy is so difficult to follow that the story ran in Germany that he said on his deathbed that only one man (himself)

had ever understood it. Hegel, however, though very conservative in politics and professing to be a Christian in a liberal sense, was an advanced Rationalist. His God (the Absolute) was impersonal, and he rejected all dogmas including that of immortality. See the account in A. W. Benn's *History of English Rationalism* (1906, I, 380). A few modern philosophers have subscribed to his system in a much modified form (Neo-Hegelianism).

Heidenstam, Verner von (1859-1923), "Sweden's Laureate," Nobel Prize winner. A youth of a noble Swedish family who turned from the study of art to poetry. His first volume (*Pilgrimage*), inspired by his extensive travels, contained heavy criticism of the clergy and their doctrines and professed Agnosticism. "Superstition and faith are the same," he says (in "The Wedding of the Sisters"), and "Man's God is the priesthood's money chest" (in "What shall I think?"). In later years he was more idealistic, but remained Agnostic. See *Sweden's Laureate* by G. C. W. Stark, with a translation of some of his poems (1919).

Heine, Heinrich (1797-1856), Jewish-German poet. He studied law and adopted Christianity in order to further his professional interests. "If the law had allowed me to steal silver spoons I would not have been baptized," he said (C. Putzfeld, *Heine's Verhältniss zur Religion*, 1912, p. 50). It proved of no avail, and he turned to letters and became the greatest German poet of the second third of the nineteenth century (*Buch der Lieder*, etc.); though he settled in Paris and became more French than German. In 1848, when he was bedridden with spinal disease, he said that he had begun to believe in God, though not in immortality. The conversion might, he told a friend, be due to "morphia or poultices." There are caustic reflections on all religion in his brilliant essays and his poems.

Hell. [See Heaven and Hell.]

Helmholtz, Prof. Hermann Ludwig Ferdinand von (1821-94), German physiologist. After years of teaching physics as well as physiology he became (1888) President of the Physico-Technical Institute at Charlottenburg. He

was an outspoken Agnostic, though one of the leading physiologists of Europe in his time. He was the first to formulate the law of the conservation of energy and occupies a commanding position in the history of nineteenth-century science.

Helvétius, Claude Adrien (1715–71), Encyclopædist. He made a large fortune in financial operations and as Farmer-General of the Finances, and he used this to promote advanced ideas, in which he had thoroughly educated himself. His house was one of the chief centres at which the great French Rationalists met. His work *De l'Esprit* (1758) was so Materialistic that it was, in 1758, burned by the public hangman. It "gave away everybody's secret," said the witty Mme. du Deffand [see]. His more important book, *De l'homme*, was published after his death and had a very considerable influence in Europe. Helvétius was an Atheist and Materialist.

Henley, William Ernest, LL.D. (1849–1903), poet. He edited in succession, *London, The Magazine of Art, The National Observer*, and *The New Review*, but it was chiefly as a poet that he attained a high position in British letters. Henley, like many poets and literary men, wavered in regard to religion, but though in later years he professed a firm Theism, he never believed in personal immortality or Christianity. Philosophic thinking was, he said, "like chalk in one's mouth." His famous Agnostic couplet (in *Poems*, 1898, p. 119), "I thank whatever Gods there be—For my unconquerable soul," was written in 1875 and ought to be supplemented by the sceptical couplet from the same poem: "Beyond this place of wrath and tears—Looms but the horror of the shade."

Henothism. A term proposed for religious systems in which one deity rises above a crowd of others and is specially worshipped (Ra in Egypt, Shamash or Marduk in Babylonia, etc.). As the word practically means the same as monotheism ("one God") it was not generally adopted.

Henry VIII and the Church. Under Catholic influence a false idea of Henry as an ignorant and unscrupulous sensualist has been extensively adopted

in popular literature. He was educated in the full culture of the Renaissance and proved, as Erasmus said, an accomplished pupil. After his accession (1509), however, his chief interests for many years were sport and naval affairs. That his breach with Rome began when an inflexible Pope rebuked his "lust" by refusing a divorce is nonsense [see *Catherine of Aragon*]. By 1526 he had begun to study the political situation, which was disquieting, very seriously, and the fact that he had no male heir was a better ground for seeking annulment of his marriage than the Pope (and Pope Clement VII himself, who was merely intimidated by Spain) had allowed in hundreds of cases [see *Marriage and Divorce*]. Pope Clement had been willing to grant it as long as the French protected him, but Rome had passed under the yoke of Charles V, who was determined that his cousin, Catherine, should not lose her title to the English throne by a divorce. From 1535 onwards the political conditions favoured the Reformers, who appealed to Henry, and he repudiated Rome and began to seize Church property. The monasteries were to a very great extent centres of idleness and corruption [see *Monasticism*], and accounts of the spoliation of the "good monks" which now circulate are mainly based upon the untruthful work of Cardinal Gasquet, *Henry VIII and the Monasteries* (8 ed., 1925), which Dr. G. G. Coulton has thoroughly discredited in several works. Henry knew his monasteries and the state of the clergy even in London. It seems likely, however, that, like Elizabeth [see], though not to the same extent, he had a healthy degree of scepticism. Professor Pollard says, in the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, that he "would readily have sacrificed any theological convictions he may have had in the interests of national uniformity," that his mind was "intensely secular," and that he was (as had been common with leaders of the Renaissance for two or three centuries) "as devoid of moral sense as he was of genuine religious sentiments." The latter characterization applies equally to the Popes of the time: Alexander VI, Julius II, Leo X, and Clement VII. See also the chapter

by the Hon. H. A. L. Fisher in Longman's *Political History of England* (1906, vol. V).

Heracleitos (c. 500-440 B.C.), Greek philosopher. An important link in the chain of Ionian thinkers. Born at Ephesus (Ionia), he took abroad the principles of the school and continued the search for a fundamental material reality. He decided that it was fire. Benn (*History of Ancient Philosophy*, 1912, p. 14) quotes him saying: "This universe, the same for all, was not made by any god or any man, but was, and is, and ever shall be, an ever-living fire." Like Democritus he held that the evolution of the fundamental reality was not fortuitous, but was ruled by law. The details of his speculations, not being based upon exact science, are easily criticized and are unimportant to-day, but Benn (an anti-Materialist) admits that Heracleitos was "a wonderful genius" and "a prophet if ever any man deserved the name." Contemporaries called him "the Weeping Philosopher," which means that he cherished so high an idealism that the aspect of life depressed him.

Hérault de Sechelles, Marie Jean (1759-94), French writer. A Parisian lawyer, for some years Advocate-General of the Paris Parliament, who became "a pupil of Diderot" (*Grande Encyclopédie*). He is interesting because he was a friend of Buffon and tells us about the scepticism which the great naturalist dare not express in his works (*Visite à Buffon*, 1785, re-issued in 1829 as *Voyage à Montbard*). He accepted the Revolution and was a Judge and President of the Legislative Assembly, but he protested against the outrages of the extremists and was guillotined.

Herbert, Auberon Edward William Molyneux, D.C.L. (1838-1906), reformer. Son of the Earl of Carnarvon, he abandoned military service to study law, and he lectured on history and jurisprudence at St. John's College (Oxford). Later he entered politics and was well known in progressive circles. He was a Spencerian Agnostic (*Nineteenth Century*, Aug. and Sept. 1901) and a supporter of Bradlaugh.

Herbert, Edward, first Baron Herbert of Cherbury (1583-1648), founder of

English Deism. Military service and travel took him all over Europe, and in France he adopted the ideas of the advanced thinkers. In London he was a close friend of Ben Jonson, Selden, and Carew, and he began to write his famous Deistic work (in Latin) *De Veritate*. He was, in 1619, sent as Ambassador to Paris and published his book there five years later. It is very disdainful of Christianity, but its system of natural theology is Platonist and rather mystic.

Heredity. [See Genetics.]

Heresy. The word means "choice" and literally expresses the early and mediæval (and still canonical in the Catholic Church) Christian feeling that a man has wilfully and culpably "chosen" to differ from the Church on doctrinal points. Dissidence in regard to authority alone, not doctrine, is "schism." Heresy came to mean any rejection of one or more of the doctrines of a Church or religion to which a man had belonged. In the Canon Law of the Catholic Church it has a special meaning. When that Law claims the right to put "heretics" to death [see *Death Sentence*] it means men who were baptized in the Church and are therefore, with characteristic arrogance, supposed to be "in bad faith," since no one who really knows "Catholic Truth" can honestly reject it!

Herriot, Édouard (b. 1872), French statesman. After a brilliant academic career and a few years as a provincial professor, he became a popular lecturer on literature. In 1905 he was elected Mayor of Lyons, and this opened the political world to him. He "reached the front rank of French statesmen" (*Enc. Brit.*) and was everywhere respected for his fine oratory and "lofty standpoint." In 1924 and 1932 he was Premier and Minister of Foreign Affairs. Herriot is an Honorary Associate of the R.P.A.

Hertzen, Alexandr Ivanovich (1812-70), Russian writer. Like many of the Russian revolutionaries and Rationalists, Hertzen is quite falsely imagined to have been a poorly educated worker. He was a son of Prince Jakoslav and was rich and very accomplished, but at an early age he adopted revolutionary ideas and was banished (1846). He lived in

London for a few years, then Switzerland, and from there he issued his famous periodical *Kolokol* ("The Bell"). His works were collected and published in 10 vols. (1875) and often express his Atheism.

Hertzogenberg, Heinrich von (1843–1900), Austrian composer. He was professor of composition at the Berlin Royal High School of Music, and his chamber and choral pieces were greatly esteemed. He was an intimate friend of Brahms and, like him, an Atheist, though he had been brought up a Catholic. Near the end of his life he wrote to a friend: "I believe nothing" (*Letters of Johannes Brahms: the Hertzogenberg Correspondence*, 1909, p. 416).

Hervey, John, Lord Hervey of Ickworth (1696–1743), Lord Privy Seal. A son of the Earl of Bristol who crowned a distinguished political career by becoming Lord Privy Seal (1740). He was an intimate friend of Queen Caroline [see] and, like her, a Deist. The Right Hon. J. W. Croker, in his introduction to Hervey's chief work, *Memoirs of the Reign of George III* (2 vols., 1847), so describes him, adding that he had "a peculiar antipathy to the Church and Churchmen" (p. xxvi), and Hervey freely confesses this in the *Memoirs*, especially Ch. XXIII. He is believed to have been the author of a Deistic defence of Mandeville (*Some Remarks on the Minute Philosopher*, by "A Country Clergyman," 1722).

Hetherington, Henry (1792–1849), publisher. A London printer who fought superbly for freedom of discussion and the spread of knowledge in the reactionary years. In protest against the Stamp Act he set up a press in his own house and issued *The Poor Man's Guardian* (1831–5) at a penny. He was twice imprisoned for selling it, and he was imprisoned again in 1840 for publishing a "blasphemous libel." He himself wrote *A Few Hundred Bible Contradictions* and other small works. See G. J. Holyoake, *Life of H. Hetherington* (1849).

Hexateuch, The. Many modern scholars dislike the traditional practice of marking off the first five books of the Old Testament from the remainder as

the Pentateuch (*pente* = five). The book of Joshua is a continuation of the fifth, so they prefer to speak of the Hexateuch (*hex* = six).

Heyse, Paul Johann Ludwig von (1830–1914), German novelist and Nobel Prize winner. His short stories (which fill 24 volumes), 10 novels, 50 plays, and several volumes of verse, made him one of the most popular German writers of his time, and King Maximilian invited him to settle on a pension at Munich. In several of his novels, notably his *Kinder der Welt* (1873), he truculently criticizes the Churches. He was awarded the Nobel Prize in 1910.

Hibbert, Julian (1801–34), reformer. A wealthy and cultivated follower of Robert Owen who, besides taking part in them, gave generous help to reform-movements. On one occasion he gave £1,000 to Richard Carlile, and he often helped Hetherington, Watson, and other Rationalists. Hibbert founded a British Association for the Promotion of Co-operative Knowledge and set up a press in his own house on which he printed several Greek works. He began to compile a *Dictionary of Anti-Superstitionists*, but died before completing it. In 1833 he was subpoenaed to appear in a London court, but refused to take the oath on the ground that he was "an Atheist." The magistrate drove him contemptuously from the court and the people hissed him.

Higgins, Godfrey (1773–1833), writer. He studied law, but, inheriting a fortune from his father, he devoted himself to comparative religion. His research is embodied mainly in his *Anacalypsis* (2 vols., 1836), which makes one of the first attempts at a series of Pagan and Christian parallels; but its quotations are better verified before use. Higgins called himself a Christian, but was a Deist.

Higher Criticism, The. The study of the various early versions and manuscripts of the Bible in order to ascertain the original text is called the Lower Criticism. Study of the contents of each book in order to check its authority and discover the authorship or date of composition, and later adulterations, is the Higher Criticism—a word first used by Eichhorn in 1787. He started from

the analysis of *Genesis* by Astruc [see]. To this work we owe the discovery of the complete falsification—the Higher Critics prefer to say “redaction”—of the Old Testament by the Ezra School and the accepted real chronology of the various books. It helps Rationalism that nearly all the leading Higher Critics against whom Fundamentalists and Catholics fume (De Wette, Kuenen, Wellhausen, Reuss, Baur, Graf, Robertson, Smith, Cheyne, Black, etc.) were divines. The *Encyclopædia Biblica* embodies their results and theories.

Hildebrand. [See Gregory VII.]

Hillel (1st cent. B.C.). A Babylonian Jew who settled in Jerusalem and was so esteemed that he became head of the Sanhedrin. He brought with him the liberal spirit of the Dispersal, and the sayings attributed to him in the Talmud show that what is assigned to Jesus as a new and higher morality was well known amongst Jews of the Hillel School before the Christian Era began. He (like most moralists) gave the Golden Rule in the form: “What is unpleasant to thee do not unto others” (Sabbath, 31a, in the Babylonian Talmud). See the account of him in Graetz's *History of the Jews* (II, 9, 37, etc.).

Hinduism. “Hindu” is said by philologists to be a Persian word adopted by the natives of India from their Aryan conquerors. The word “Hinduism” really covers the social and other institutions as well as religion, but it is commonly used of the religion, or collection of very varied religions which are followed by three-fourths of the population. As we now know that civilization is as old in western India as in Mesopotamia, that the Aryans brought their nature-religion (described in the Vedas) into a world with an organized religion already 2,000 years old, and that by the seventh century B.C. the educated Hindus had a highly abstract Monotheism (Brahmanism) with Atheistic reactions (the Sankhya School, Buddhism, and Jainism) [see articles], while the mass of the people clung to their polytheistic and very phallic cults, we understand the plurality of religions. Brahmanism, the chief and more refined part of Hindu religion,

regards the Brahma (the creative principle) as an all-embracing spirit. It was always very tolerant and it allows the people to consider Vishnu (the conservative principle) and Siva (the destructive principle) as other aspects of the deity (or, on the Christian model, consubstantial persons of the Trinity). Krishna is allowed to be an incarnation of Vishnu. The elaborate details of Hindu religion do not concern us here. Buddhism, which degenerated into a religion, died out in or was expelled—there is here much dispute—from most of the provinces and to-day counts only 12,786,806 in the total population of 335,000,000. The Muslim claim about 77,000,000.

Hinton, James (1822–1875), philosopher. A surgeon by profession, a specialist in ear-diseases, who attracted a good deal of attention at one time, and is still often quoted, by a work *The Mystery of Pain* (1866) in which he developed a broad and rather mystic Pantheism. He rejected the idea of a personal God.

Hird, Dennis, M.A. (1850–1920), writer. He graduated in science with honours and became tutor and lecturer at New College (Oxford). He took orders in the Church of England, but was deprived of them for writing a novel entitled *A Christian with Two Wives* (1896) and for his Socialist views. From 1899 to 1909 he was Principal of Ruskin College, Oxford, and he then helped to found the Central Labour College at London and was its first Principal. He wrote several popular works on evolution and was an Agnostic and a member of the R.P.A.

History, The falsification of. It will be gathered from a large number of articles in this *Encyclopædia* that the great gain of the adoption of scientific methods in modern history and of extensive discoveries in archæology is offset by a lamentable falsification owing to concessions to religious writers or sectarian influence. It has gravely increased the difficulty of the Rationalist education of the public that, just when science has generally succeeded in silencing “the drum ecclesiastic” (in Huxley's phrase), history is increasingly listening to it. Recent issues of the

leading encyclopædias [see] have permitted very serious alterations of historical articles or invited clerical writers to contribute articles on subjects on which they could not be expected to be impartial or accurately informed. Serious attempts have been made even to impose the new spirit of accommodation upon teachers of history in universities, colleges, and the national schools. Poynter tells of an amazing plot of this nature in his *Roman Catholics and School History Books* (1930). However one may analyse the motives or the influences, conscious or subconscious, the evil begins with a number of professors or writers of history of some distinction, especially in the United States. [See, for example, the articles *Arabs*; *Christianity*; *Dark Age*; *Democracy*; *Middle Age*; *Monasticism*; *Papacy*; *Philanthropy*; *Reformation*; *Rome*; *Thirteenth Century*; and subsidiary articles mentioned in them.] The intellectual and moral status of pre-Christian civilizations is vindicated against ancient calumnies by virtually all modern authorities; yet in the case of Rome, while Protestant writers like Dr. E. Reich and Sir S. Dill have been generous in stating the truth, a number of recent historical writers, men who show no command of classical literature and the inscriptions, have used language in conformity with the old prejudices. This encourages theological writers to repeat their discredited claims that the Gospels brought a new and higher type of religion and ethic into the contemporary Roman world; that the Christians generally exhibited a superior type of character which attracted thoughtful Greeks and Romans; and that the acceptance—in reality enforcement—of the Christian religion was followed by a social and moral improvement. But greater evil is done by a falsification of the social history of the Christian, or at least the Catholic, era. In this respect Catholics have had a remarkable success in adulterating history. On the plea that the Protestant and Rationalist historians of the last century were moved by a prejudice against Catholicism, or that the development of psychology and of economic and social science gives the historian a

new equipment for the study of earlier peoples, some historians—this does not apply to the *Cambridge Mediæval History*—profess to give a new and sounder estimate of the period of solid Church influence. The title given to the first half, the Dark Age, is, largely on the quite false ground that it means the whole of the Middle Ages, declared to be unjust, and the second part, the Renaissance in the broader sense, is described more or less in harmony with the claims of Catholic writers. The historians in question betray that they have no command, as the historians of the last century had, of mediæval literature. They ignore completely the immense literature which tells the licence and coarseness of life of the clergy, monks—all that they say of monasticism is to give a description of the *ideal* of a Benedictine abbey or describe Francis of Assisi—and people of all classes; and they profess that it is a mark of liberality to follow Catholic writers on the work of Gregory VII or Innocent III, the Massacre of the Albigensians and the Hussites, the Inquisition and the Reformation (See Coulter's *Sectarian History*, 1937). Admirable as it is to trace neglected social, political, and economic factors in this stretch of history, the deliberate suppression of its many evil features falsifies history and the sociological valuation of institutions. The same tendency is seen in the deliberate depreciation of the Arab-Persian civilization, which conceals the real source of the European Renaissance and confirms the preposterous claim that the Roman Church inspired it. Even in the modern period we find the same grave departure from the canons of history in the indiscriminating condemnation of the French Revolution, the suppression of the terrible injustices of French life which led to it, and especially the concealment of what Lord Acton called the savagery of the Roman Church in its fight against progress from the fall of Napoleon to 1870 (in Spain and Russia until recently). This falsification of history, at least by the suppression of facts and of relevant but distasteful contemporary documents, is one of the most unfortunate features of

modern culture. The scores of articles in this Encyclopædia in which it is exposed show that a new and thorough history of the Christian era is urgently needed.

Hitler and the Papacy. The frequent conflict of Hitler and the Catholic Church, the disintegration of that Church in Germany [see] during the last ten years, and the fact that Hitler was an apostate from it and would have liked to see its prouder features destroyed by an amalgamation with Lutheranism in a Positive (unsectarian) Christianity, dispose many to listen to the Catholic claim that the Church is the inflexible opponent of Nazi brutality. The broad fact is that neither the Vatican nor the German prelates ever condemned the foul principles and practices of the Nazi Government, but only its interference with Church authority and organization; and that both the late and the present Pope helped Hitler to attain power and made repeated and unceasing efforts to contract an alliance with him. In the article *Germany*, the facts about the Roman Church and Hitler's success at the election of March 1933 are given. Von Papen's mediation between Hitler and the Vatican after the preceding election, when his Party was in despair (*Annual Register*, 1932, p. 167), is told by himself in the published speech *Der 12 November* (1933). Hitler promised the Pope a favourable Concordat, and the Pope ordered German Catholics to desist from opposing him (*Annual Register*, 1933, p. 169, and a Catholic article in the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, January 15, 1935). No Catholic leader in Germany or at Rome denounced the treachery and the horrors that followed the Nazi success at the polls, the sermons of Cardinal Faulhaber on the *Jews* (*Judaism, Christianity, and Germany*, 1934) being doctrinal and not a condemnation of outrages. No thunder came from the Vatican even when the infamous Blood Purge, in which several Catholic leaders were murdered, occurred in June 1934. For, although Hitler had refused to pay the price he had offered for Papal support, as was his custom, the Vatican still hoped to persuade him to do so and refrained from

denouncing his crimes. In 1936, when the appalling exposure of monastic vice [see *Germany*] began, the Pope made a desperate effort to get an alliance with Hitler. The Nazi organ, the *National Zeitung*, published on September 12th, as the London Press reported, a letter (read on the following day from all Catholic pulpits) signed by the German bishops and begging Hitler to accept their co-operation in crushing Bolshevism "in Spain, Russia, and Mexico." Mussolini was persuaded by the Vatican to support the appeal (*Times*, November 4th, 1936), and Hitler received Cardinal Faulhaber on the subject (*Times*, November 13, 1936), but refused to make any concession. The Pope wanted privileges for Catholic schools and organizations, and probably a cessation of the arrests of priests and monks for sodomy, in return for his full support. The present Pope—who, indeed, as Secretary of State under the late Pope had controlled the policy throughout—made a new approach in 1940 according to the London Press. Even the savage treatment of the Poles, who stormed Rome with entreaties and are the most Catholic folk in Europe, extracted only a tempered and restricted protest. The Vatican was not merely ready, but eager, for an alliance with Hitler at any time; which, in view of its alliance with Fascism and its acceptance of £19,000,000 from Mussolini [see *Italy*], should surprise no one. Hitler's views on religion have nothing to do with the situation. He had, it is true, abandoned the Catholic faith, so that on the Canon Law no Catholic ought to have negotiated with him, but he was a Theist—he repeatedly stated this in public speeches—and claimed to be a Christian.

Hittites. The, a people, believed from their language to be of the Indo-European stock, who dominated nearly the whole of Asia Minor from about 2000 to 1200 B.C. We first trace them in that region in the first half of the third millennium B.C. Until recent years they were treated as an obscure and almost negligible people on the fringe of civilization, but it is now realized that they had a considerable influence on Syria and even Egypt in the second millennium. From the religious point

of view they are interesting because they continued to give supreme honour to the Mother-Earth goddess, Ma, and her priestesses are now believed to have been the women whom early Greek sailors misunderstood and called Amazons. The best work on them is L. J. Delaporte's *Les Hittites* (1936), but J. Garstang's *The Hittite Empire* (1929) is valuable.

Hobbes, Thomas (1588–1679). He began to learn Latin and Greek at the age of six, and after completing his education at Oxford, was tutor to Mr. Cavendish (later the Earl of Devonshire), and in travelling with him he met many of the more advanced thinkers on the Continent. His works (*The Leviathan*, 1651, etc.) chiefly aimed at establishing political principles and he was reticent about religion and resented the charge of heresy. J. M. Robertson shows that he was at the most a Deist and must have found the doctrine of immortality inconsistent with his psychology. (*Short History of Freethought*, II, 71–3).

Hobhouse, Arthur, First Baron Hobhouse of Hadspen (1819–1904), judge. His brilliant legal career culminated in his elevation to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council (1881–1901) and his becoming a Law Lord (1885). Lord Hobhouse was a man of high ideals and great authority in public life. He figures in the list of Benefactors of the R.P.A., and in his letters to Holyoake he shows himself a drastic Rationalist. In a letter to a clergyman written shortly before his death he says that the more deeply he reflects "the more my mind is led away from *your* objects and fixed upon others" (*Lord Hobhouse: A Memoir*, by L. T. Hobhouse and J. L. Hammond, 1905, p. 258). He believed in God only as "a great [impersonal] ruling power of the universe." His nephew Prof. Leonard Trelawne Hobhouse, Litt.D. (1864–1929), son of Archdeacon Hobhouse, was one of the leading British sociologists. He was professor of sociology at London University and editor of *The Sociological Review*. His *Mind in Evolution* (1901) and *Morals in Evolution* (2 vols., 1906) are works of great value, but his Rationalist views are best given in

Development and Purpose (1913). He defines God as "that of which the highest known embodiment is the distinctive spirit of humanity" (p. 371). See L. T. Hobhouse, by J. A. Hobson (1931).

Hobson, John Atkinson, M.A. (1858–1940), economist. He was a classical master in his early years, and from 1880 to 1887 a University Extension Lecturer. In later years he was greatly esteemed as a Liberal writer on economic and political questions, a contributor to the *Manchester Guardian*, and a regular lecturer to South Place Chapel. He was quite austere in his character and ideals.

Hodgson, Brian Houghton (1800–94), Orientalist. Years in the Indian Civil Service—at one time as Assistant Resident of Nepal—led him to make a thorough study of comparative religion. Burnouf called him "the founder of our Buddhistic studies." He was an Agnostic. When he was asked about his own religious views he said: "I do not care to talk about the unknowable" (Sir W. W. Hunter, *Life of B. H. Hodgson*, 1896, p. 332).

Hodgson, Shadworth Hollway (1832–1912), philosopher. He devoted his life to philosophy and was President of the Aristotelian Society from 1880 to 1894. His *Time and Space* (1865) and *The Metaphysics of Experience* (1898) had a high place in British philosophic literature. He is seen to be an advanced Rationalist in his *Philosophy of Reflection* (2 vols., 1878, especially Ch. XI). He says that "the notion of a soul as an immaterial substance is exploded" (II, 258) and that God is only "the Spirit of the Whole."

Höfding, Prof. Harold, Ph.D., LL.D., D.Sc., Litt.D. (1843–1921). Danish philosopher. Höfding studied for the Church, but abandoned the creed and became professor of philosophy at Copenhagen University (1883–1915). He was a member of the Royal Danish Academy of Science and Letters, corresponding member of the Institut de France and the Academia dei Lincei (Italy), and corresponding fellow of the British Academy. The European interest in his work was chiefly on account of his proposal of "a religion of values."

He was a Monist in the spiritual sense, rejecting the idea of a personal God and personal immortality, and suggested, rather on the lines of the Ethical Movement, that religion should be a cultivation of Beauty and Goodness without doctrinal bases.

Hogben, Prof. Lancelot, M.A., F.R.S., Sc.D. (b. 1895), physiologist. He has been Regius Professor of Natural History at Aberdeen University, Lecturer in Experimental Physiology at Aberdeen (1923-5), Assistant Professor of Zoology at McGill (1925-7), Professor of Zoology at Capetown (1927-30), Professor of Social Biology at London University, and Professor of Zoology at Birmingham University. He holds the Gold Medal of the Royal Society of Edinburgh and has written several popular scientific works (*Mathematics for the Million*, 1936, etc.) besides physiological works of importance. Prof. Hogben took part in the International Freethought Congress of 1938.

Holbach, Baron Paul Heinrich Dietrich von (1723-89), Encyclopædist. A wealthy German who settled in Paris, where his home was one of the chief centres of cultural contact, especially for Rationalists, in Europe. He wrote a number of articles for the Encyclopædia, and under a pseudonym published several drastic anti-Christian works (*Le christianisme dévoilé*, *De l'imposture cléricale*, etc.). His *Système de la Nature* (2 vols., 1770), an Atheistic and Materialistic work that shocked Voltaire and Frederic the Great, is one of the classics of the time and had immense influence. Holbach was a man of very temperate and refined life and had a passion for liberty and enlightenment.

Holberg, Baron Ludwig von (1684-1754), "the Molière of Denmark." He was educated for the Church, but abandoned it and became professor of metaphysics, later of rhetoric, at Copenhagen University. His brilliant comedies won a comparison with Molière, while his satirical poems led many to compare him to Voltaire. His anticlerical Deism is particularly seen in his satire *Nicolai Klimii Iter Subterraneum* (1741). The King checked his outspokenness by making him a baron and professor of history.

Holcroft, Thomas (1745-1809), dramatist. A poor boy who, after years as a stable-boy, shoemaker, teacher, and actor, earned a considerable repute by his plays. In 1794 he was indicted for his sympathy with the French Revolution, and he went to France. On his return he set up a press and published his works and translations (including works of Frederic the Great). He was an Atheist, with wavering traces of Deism in his later letters, and disbelieved in immortality. Lamb, who knew him, said that he was "one of the most candid, most upright, and single-minded of men." His Rationalism is well seen in the poem *Human Happiness, or The Sceptic* (1783).

Holism. A theory or attitude suggested by Field-Marshal Smuts of South Africa. The title, which means "wholeness," sufficiently indicates that the author chiefly opposed Materialism on the ground that it does not embrace the whole of Nature. He holds the mystic view that "the whole is greater than the sum of its parts." In the long article which he was permitted to write on the subject in the last edition of the *Encyclopædia Britannica* he carries out the idea through the various branches of science and philosophy (which, again, are one "whole"). He writes in a conciliatory and attractive manner—see his *Holism and Evolution* (1926)—but can quote in support only writers of mystic leanings (mostly dead) like J. S. Haldane, Lloyd Morgan, and Whitehead.

Holland, Lord. [See Fox.]

Holmes, Oliver Wendell, M.D. (1809-94), American physician and author. He abandoned the study of law for medicine and was, after a few years of practice at Boston, Professor of Anatomy at Dartmouth College (1838-40) and Parkman Professor of Anatomy and Physiology at the Harvard Medical School (1847-82). His distinction in his science is generally forgotten because of the immense circulation of his popular works (*The Autocrat at the Breakfast Table*, 1858, *The Professor at the Breakfast Table*, 1859, etc.), and too little notice is taken of his small work *Mechanism in Thought and Morals* (1871). It is entirely Materialistic in its implications, but Holmes believed in

an impersonal God, though not immortality (W. D. Howells, *Literary Friends and Acquaintances*, 1901, p. 45).

Holy Ghost. The third person of the orthodox Christian Trinity, a part of what many theologians now impatiently call "the damnable heritage" of the Church from the days of the Greek Fathers. "Holy Spirit of God" was a not uncommon phrase in older religions. The Persian Avesta very frequently speaks of the Spirit of Ahura Mazda, and in the Old Testament, where the Hebrew word literally means "breath," it is used in several senses. The Greek Mysteries and the religious Stoics also used the expression. In the New Testament the usage continues, and in the early Christian literature we find the transition from the impersonal to the personal meaning of the word until, in the long and truculent process of transforming New Testament abstractions into mysterious personalities, the Holy Spirit—translated for the Anglo-Saxons "Holy Ghost" (analogously to the German *Geist*)—becomes the third person of the one God, "proceeding" from the Father and the Son (in the Latin Church), but being one eternal nature with them. In modern theology, except Catholic and Fundamentalist, the Holy Ghost is again a figure of speech, Canon Streeter (*The Spirit*) calls it a "scholastic abstraction." Modern liberal theologians are now too apt to obscure the fact that such dogmas were held by and imposed as essential upon the universal Church nine centuries before the time of the Scholastics. The dogma of the three persons was formulated by the Council of Constantinople in the year 381.

Holy Roman Empire. The Greek Emperors conquered a large part of Italy and Roman Africa after the Western Empire collapsed, but by the eighth century their authority in the West was in complete decay owing to the increasing corruption and demoralization at Constantinople. The Lombards [see] were taking over their territory in northern Italy, with every promise of restoring civilization, but the Popes summoned the half-barbaric Franks to win the territory for Rome on the strength of a blatant and universally

acknowledged forgery, the Donation of Constantine [see]. To ensure the protection of it by the Franks, the Pope crowned Charlemagne Roman Emperor, which was not much more than a title as far as Italy was concerned, in the year 800. Charlemagne's monk-biographer says that the Pope took him by surprise in St. Peter's and annoyed him, as he did not want to owe his crown to the Papacy. His Empire, however, fell into ruin in the sordid quarrels which followed his death, and the title was revived in the tenth century at the time when the German monarchs set out to purge Rome of a corruption that had dominated it for more than a century. Modern historians date the beginning of the Holy Roman Empire at the coronation of Otto I in 962; though there was no moral reform of either the German princes or the Papacy for nearly another century. As soon as the Papacy was reformed, under Gregory VII, it entered upon a bitter and bloody struggle with its German-Roman Emperors. In the twelfth and thirteenth centuries they were locked in the still more grisly struggle of the Guelphs and Ghibellines; and as late as 1527 the "Holy Roman Emperor" sacked and raped Rome with a savagery beyond that of the Goths. Dr. J. Bryce (*Holy Roman Empire*, last ed., 1927) has the support of all historians when he observes that it was neither Holy, nor Roman, nor an Empire. The name and shadow of it lasted until Napoleon defeated the Austrians, to whom the imperial title had passed. See also the Hon. H. A. L. Fisher, *The Mediæval Empire*, 1898.

Holy Water. Water is so naturally the means of purification or cleansing that we find a ritual use of it even in savage religions. It occurs as such in the Old Testament, and the Essenes were greatly addicted to the use of it. There was an acrid controversy among the Jews before the beginning of the Christian era as to whether baptism, which was now common, ought to be by aspersion or immersion; of which the story of John the Baptist, whether or no it has an historical nucleus, is a reminiscence. The Greeks, Egyptians, and Romans used "lustral water" in

their ceremonies, so that it was one of the commonest articles in ceremonial use when the Church began to amplify its simple creed with myths and rites. Belief in demons had at the same time become so common that it was natural that the priests should have the task of expelling devils from the water before they used it for so solemn a rite as baptism. The "holy water" into which Catholics dip to-day is water from which the priest has driven out devils by conjuration and the addition of a little salt: a ceremony that goes back to at least the fifth century and flourishes in the churches of Mayfair and Fifth Avenue to-day.

Holy Week. In Catholic usage the week in which Good Friday occurs. Athanasius speaks in the early part of the fourth century of Christians fasting during "six holy and great days," but says nothing about elaborate services in church, and we may safely assume that there were none, as paganism still flourished and the cult of the Great Mother had its "Holy Week" at exactly that date. The Christian services began, as we learn from the *Peregrinatio* of Etheria (about 388), in remote Eastern churches, where the pagan parallel would be little known, and spread to the West as the suppression of paganism proceeded. We have here one of the most blatant instances of the Church borrowing from the religions it suppressed, for the Holy Week, as the Church adopted it, agrees remarkably with the week of ceremonies at the same period with which the votaries of Cybele and Attis [see] publicly celebrated the death and resurrection of the god and the grief of his mother. Augustine himself describes how the processions through the streets were events in the Roman calendar. It is quite clear, from his description of the pagan ceremonies he saw at Rome, that the Christian Church would not have dared to borrow the "Holy Week" until the pagan religions were suppressed by law. [See Attis; Cybele; Paganism.]

Holyoake, George Jacob (1817-1906), reformer. Son of a Birmingham mechanic and, except for a few evening classes, a self-educated man, he attained high distinction, both social and literary,

in the course of the nineteenth century. He joined the Owenites as a lecturer in 1838, and in 1842 he was imprisoned for "blasphemy." He had said that in view of the state of the world it was time to "put the Deity on half-pay." For this he suffered six months in jail under conditions that drove many to suicide. He then settled in London and won a remarkable circle of friends, including Gladstone and many of the most distinguished men of the time. Developing the broad ideal of Owen, he was the virtual founder (or Father) of the Co-operative Movement, the originator of Secularism [see], and one of the most esteemed and most valuable workers in the struggle for a free Press, the education of the workers, the rights of woman, the liberation of oppressed nationalities, arbitration and peace, and other reforms. He was an attractive though not a robust speaker, and he had (very unlike Owen) a sparkle and geniality of style, reflecting his fine personality, which won a wide circulation for his works. He wrote 160 books and pamphlets, and in many of these and through lectures and debates for the early Secular Societies, which he organized, he contributed materially to the rapid progress of advanced thought in Great Britain, his high character and wide range of reform-interests doing much to remove the violent prejudice against Free-thinkers. When the plan of founding the R.P.A. was mooted he co-operated cordially, and was its first Chairman. See McCabe's *Life and Letters of G. J. Holyoake* (2 vols., 1908).

Home, Henry, Lord Kames (1696-1782), Scottish judge. A lawyer who was, in 1752, appointed Ordinary Lord of the Session, taking the name of Lord Kames, and in 1763 Lord of the Judiciary Court. In spite of his splendid prospects, and the profound reaction of the times, Home was an outspoken Rationalist. A charge of heresy, in 1751, for publishing *Essays on the Principles of Natural Religion* lapsed as the petitioner died, but he is just as Deistic in his *Sketches of the History of Man* (1774). He rejects free will, miracles, prayer, and the value of sacrifices (Bk. III, Sketch III, ch. III).

Homoousios. A Greek word mean-

ing "of the same substance," which was the rallying cry of the orthodox, or Athanasians, of the fourth century, who insisted that Christ was consubstantial with the Father. The Arians retorted that he was only "of similar substance" (homoiousios): much as Renan (like many Modernists) said that Jesus was "divine" but not God. Gibbon's genial comment that it was "a quarrel over a diphthong" is well known, yet his history shows that it caused half a century of such violence and hatred that thousands lost their lives, and "sacred virgins" on both sides were subjected to shameless tortures. Probably the majority of the more learned theologians of our time reject the word "substance" and all dogmas that were based upon it [see Trinity], yet continue to claim a divine guidance of the Church.

Hooker, Sir Joseph Dalton, O.M., G.S.G.I., M.D., Sc.D., F.R.S. (1817-1911), most famous of British botanists. After service as Assistant Surgeon and Naturalist on the *Erebus*, in its exploration of the Antarctic (1839-43), and three years in India, he was appointed assistant to his father at Kew and succeeded him in 1865. He was President of the British Association in 1868 and of the Royal Society in 1873; and he had nineteen gold medals and more than 100 honours from foreign societies. The assistance which this most distinguished botanist of his time gave to Darwin, of whom he was an intimate friend, in writing *The Origin of Species*, was very valuable. That he was himself an Agnostic appears in many passages of his *Life and Letters*, by L. Huxley (1918). "I distrust all theologians," he says; "their minds are those of women" (II, 57); and: "Theism and Atheism are just where they were in the days of Job" (67). He held that the ultimate power of the universe is "inscrutable" (119), that Jesus was an Essenian monk (336), and that we must have "a religion of pure reason" (337).

Horder, Lord Thomas Jeeves, M.D., Sc.D., D.C.L., F.R.S. (b. 1871), physician. He is consulting physician to the Cancer Hospital, Fulham, and other hospitals, and very prominent in

the promotion of public welfare. Among his many honours Lord Horder, who was created a Baron in 1933, has been President of the Harveian Society, the Medical Society of London, and the Eugenics Society, etc. He is an Honorary Associate of the R.P.A.

Hormones. [See Glands.]

Horsley, Sir Victor Alexander Haden, M.D., Sc.D., F.R.S., F.R.C.S. (1857-1916), surgeon. From 1884 to 1890 he was professor at and Superintendent of the Brown Institution, and he attracted European attention by his experiments in brain-localization and the function of the thyroid. Later he was Professor of Pathology at University College, Croonian Lecturer, and Fullerian Professor at the Royal Institution. He had the Gold Medal of the Royal Society, the Lannelongue Prize, and many other honours. Horsley was one of the most brilliant surgeons of his time, a prominent worker in the field of reform, and an Agnostic. Stephen Paget tells, in his biography (*Sir Victor Horsley*, 1919), that he rejected all religious beliefs from boyhood until death. He says: "If he had cared to be labelled, he would have written the label himself, Agnostic . . . popular theology and sham metaphysics were utterly distasteful to him" (p. 261).

Horus. A very ancient sky-god in Egypt, where we trace the cult back to the time of the earliest kings. G. A. Wainwright says, in a recent special study (*The Sky Religion in Egypt*, 1938), that he is the oldest of the sky-gods and particularly connected with rain, which in Egypt is more welcome and beneficent than the fierce sunshine. When the small kingdoms of prehistoric times were absorbed in the single kingdom of Egypt, and their gods had to be adjusted, Horus was identified with the hawk-god. When further affinities of the gods had to be invented to suit rival priesthoods, Horus became the Son of Osiris (the principle of fertility) and Isis, with the discredited Seth, originally a rival sky-god, the villain of the story. The absurd details of the final myth do not concern us. In later Egypt Horus was definitely a solar divinity, and was honoured in mid-winter by the figure of an infant (the reborn sun) in a manger in

the temples with a statue of his mother, Isis, beside it, exactly as the birth of Jesus is represented at Christmas in Catholic churches to-day. So the early Christian document *The Paschal Chronicle* (Migne, XCII, 385). The cult of Isis and Horus had a very material influence on the development of the Christian myth.

Hospitals, The Christian Church and. Almost all the apologists who boast of the social services which Christianity inspired, they say, in the ancient world contend that it was the first to build hospitals. It is suggested, as proof of the callousness and selfishness of the Romans, that they made no provision for the sick poor and workers until the Church opened hospitals for them in the fourth century. This statement is not only as reckless as the claim that Christianity "gave the world schools and broke the fetters of the slave," but any apologist who cared, as they do not, to glance at a Classical Dictionary would discover in five minutes that it is wholly false. The chief authority on such matters in the last century, Smith's *Dictionary of Greek and Roman Antiquities* (1891), doubts if it is correct to say that the Greeks and Romans had "hospitals." There were, of course, none in the modern sense of the word in the ancient world. But it is an undisputed and notorious fact that there was in Greece and Rome, in ancient India and Mexico, and in Moslem lands, a provision for the sick poor that puts to shame the entire Christian record until modern times—that is to say, until the faith began to break down. Asoka [see], the great Buddhist King of the fourth century B.C., made such provision on a most generous scale, as did other enlightened princes in India and in China. Assyriologists assure us that the sick in Babylon were not left to such a fate as Herodotus describes. Bancroft describes hospitals in ancient Mexico (*Native Races of the Pacific States*, 1875, II, 596). The Arab-Persians [see] of the eighth and later centuries carried medical and surgical science to a point far beyond that at which Galen had left it, and in Persia, Egypt, Spain, and Sicily, made remarkable provision for the sick. But our

concern here is with the Roman world, which is supposed to have learned from the Church to care for the sick. Smith's *Dictionary* explained, fifty years ago, that in Greece and Rome the temples of Æsculapius were the centres to which the sick poor went for treatment; that there was apparently some sort of annexe or house in which graver cases were kept for treatment; that the Roman municipality paid doctors to give free treatment to the workers in the poorer quarters; and that the household physician attended to slaves, who were too valuable property for even selfish owners to neglect. In the article "Hospitals," in the 11th edition of the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, Sir H. Burdett told these facts, but in the present edition the anonymous X (a Catholic) has been permitted to mutilate the article and suppress facts. The audacity or ignorance of the apologist becomes more astonishing when we find that the only basis for his positive claim is that, according to Jerome (*Ep.* LXXVII), one of his pious pupils, Fabiola, was "the first to establish an infirmary, in which she used to gather patients from the streets." Whether this means both Christian and pagan patients is not clear, but in any case the Christian Emperors had by this time, as Smith's *Dictionary* pointed out, confiscated the revenues of the temples, and the Church was bound to find some substitute for its own members for the priests of Æsculapius. It, or one Christian lady, provided one private house, with unknown medical attendance (if any) instead of the great temple on the Island and the municipal doctors. But the insincerity of the apologist is still more clearly seen by the sequel. Sir H. Burdett shows or showed—for the Catholic reviser of "errors of date" has struck it out—that after this one modest experiment in charity, which would perish at the fall of Rome thirty years later, if not at the death of Fabiola soon after it was opened, there were no hospitals in Europe until the Arabs began to build them five or six centuries later. We will not forget the economic collapse of the Empire; nor forget that early in the seventh century the Papacy [see Gregory I] became the richest capitalist in Europe. In regard to the

charge that modern sceptics "never build hospitals" see **Philanthropy**.

Houghton, Baron. [See **Milnes, H. M.**]

Housman, Laurence (b. 1865), writer. The mild Rationalism of this distinguished literary man, in which we see the influence of Blake, is found best in his *Gods and their Makers* (1897), in a published correspondence with Dick Sheppard (*What Can We Believe?* 1939), and in his Conway Memorial Lecture, *The Religious Advance Toward Rationalism* (1929). It is a vague Theism or Pantheism, not based upon philosophy, and an ethical admiration of Christianity not based upon history.

Howells, William Dean (1837-1920), American poet. A boy in a printer's shop in his early years, he began to write, and had such success with *A Life of Lincoln*, in 1860, that he was appointed Consul at Venice. On his return to America he published a number of brilliant novels and volumes of verse. Howells had been brought up a Swedenborgian, but he abandoned the creed in youth and became a liberal and rather sentimental Theist ("Lost Beliefs" in *Poems*, 1886, p. 31). In his *Literary Friends and Acquaintances* (1901) he gives us valuable information about the Rationalist views of the leading American writers. He told his Agnostic friend Parton that there came into his life a new light "by which I saw all things that somehow did not tell for human brotherhood dwarfish and ugly" (p. 143).

Huguenots, The. The derivation of the word is obscure, but it was applied to the Protestants of France from the sixteenth century until they were suppressed. The ideas of the Reformers spread in France more extensively than in England, and were checked and ultimately extinguished only by violence. Literary speculation about how the "Latin temperament" kept France loyal to Rome is unhistorical rubbish. Calvin, who was a Frenchman—Cauvin was his real name—had hundreds of thousands of followers and was on good terms with the royal family before he was expelled. But the Protestants, or Huguenots, were still so numerous and distinguished that they formed a power-

ful military party under the heads of the Bourbon family, King Henry of Navarre and the famous Prince de Condé, and held their own so well in a series of civil wars that they won toleration in the Edict of Nantes [see]. The corrupt Catherine de Medici, who had at first favoured them for political reasons, had fallen under the influence of the Jesuits, and the savage St. Bartholomew Massacre [see] had followed. They were, however, still very powerful in the provinces, and when their champion, Henry of Navarre, had diplomatically accepted absolution as the price of the throne, he had promulgated the Edict. They again became so numerous and powerful that Richelieu, though no bigot, destroyed their fortified cities, holding that they formed a State within the State; but he did not further interfere with their liberties. Louis XIV [see], the most openly dissolute prince in Europe, was content, under his Jesuit confessors (who condoned his three decades of adultery), to nibble at the provisions of the Edict. His officials and priests harassed the Huguenots so cruelly that large numbers emigrated to England, Holland, and the American Colonies. When at length the gross scandals of his Court, and his failing health, persuaded Louis to enter upon the paths of virtue, he, by "one of the most flagrant political and religious blunders in the history of France" (*Ency. Brit.*), revoked the Edict (1685). It is estimated that in addition to those who had already gone, at least 300,000 left France, with their industries, thus inflicting upon it an economic blow from which it did not recover until the Revolution restored religious liberty. Professor Grant says, in the *Cambridge Modern History* (vol. V), that the expulsion "contributed materially to the rise of the anti-clerical movement of the next century which made the repetition of such an incident for ever impossible in Europe." It was rather the hypocrisy of the persecutors and the gross corruption of the Church that led to the growth of Rationalism, but it is more material to note how Prof. Grant overlooks the fact that there was in France (and other Catholic countries), in the last century, an even more savage fight

against critics of the Church. [See **Democracy and White Terror.**] See also J. W. Thompson, *The Wars of Religion in France* (1909).

Hugo, Victor Marie (1802-85), French writer. The famous poet and novelist was an anti-clerical of the diminishing Deistic school and was compelled to flee from France at the failure of the Revolutions of 1830 and 1848. His moderate Rationalism is seen in many of his poems ("Le Pape," "Religions et Religion," etc.). Grant Duff says, in his *Ernest Renan* (1901), that in conversation with him a few years before his death Hugo predicted that Christianity would soon disappear, but men would still believe in "God, Soul, and Responsibility." Like most poets and literary men, Hugo had more confidence than depth in his opinions about religion, and expressed them with an emphasis that scientific men usually avoid.

Human Nature. It is one of the many pathetic illustrations of the inadequacy of public instruction in Great Britain, when religious issues may be involved, that nine-tenths of current literature still makes a fetish of "human nature." Whenever a war occurs we have discussions whether it is possible to "change human nature," and the general opinion is that it presents a formidable if not insuperable problem. Yet at least four out of five of the authorities in the branch of psychology which makes a serious inquiry into the subject declare that there is no such thing as human nature in the sense here assumed. The development of psychology inevitably leads to this conclusion. "Soul" disappeared from the text-books half a century ago, and "mind" has now generally followed it into limbo. For some years, under the influence of Genetics and Eugenics, we seemed to have found a new "unchangeable human nature" in our inherited equipment of nerves, glands, and other organs; but that dogmatism is now very greatly modified. Nine out of ten psychologists now say that the subject of their science is human behaviour, and a new branch of the science, Social Psychology [see], has been formed to investigate the causes of this behaviour.

The experts discover plasticity instead of unchangeability. British psychology is in this respect far behind that of America (as in psychology generally), where the works of Folsom, Bogardus, Park, Reckless, Burgess, Krueger, Ewer, and others have shown that, if we are to speak at all of human nature, we must regard it as, in the words of Professor Dewey, "a product of social experience." The environment—the home, school, street, playing-ground, club, church, papers, books, cinema, theatre, etc.—determines behaviour, and it changes with changes of the environment. What amount of reserve we must here make for the inherited mechanism of behaviour we do not yet know, but the amazing transformation of whole nations (Russia, Germany, Italy, and Japan) that was effected in a single generation in our time gives massive support to the men of science. For further discussion see **Social Psychology.**

Human Sacrifices. "There are few races and few religions which can show a history free from the stain of human sacrifices" is the opening sentence of a lengthy article on the subject in the *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics*, and to that and Ch. XIX of Prof. Westermarck's *Origin and Development of the Moral Ideas* the reader may be referred for details, which are here irrelevant. One point that is generally overlooked is that the lowest peoples, which have no gods, have no human sacrifices. Further, it is not clear that in every case the practice was carried on to the stage of civilization. It is doubted if the Babylonians (except in the sense that the early Sumerians buried servants with a monarch) and the Persians had human sacrifices, and the authorities are not agreed about the early Egyptians. There is a strong presumption that the prehistoric Romans had, the dolls which they hung on trees at midwinter being apparently substitutes for former sacrifices of children to Saturn, just as the paper images burned at a Chinese funeral have replaced living victims. The Phœnicians, like the Amerindians, notoriously had ghastly sacrifices, and even the drastic revision of the Old Testament by the Ezraists has not entirely obliterated

ated traces (Abraham, Jephthah, etc.) of them among the early Hebrews—traces which are clumsily inconsistent with the myth, in its final form, that even Abraham was intimate with Jahveh and received almost daily instructions from him.

Humanism. The literary men of the classical Renaissance of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries were known as Humanists—possibly because what was later called “profane” as distinct from “sacred” literature was then known as “the more human literature.” Since there was practically no profession of Atheism among them, the name must not be taken in the modern sense as meaning one who would replace pre-occupation about God by concern about the interests of man. Some of them were sincere Christians. They opposed the monopoly of learning in most of the universities by theologians who drew out to its last futile refinements the logomachy of the Schoolmen. When the development of science began, the literary professors were just as hostile to it as the theologians, and the name became incongruous. It was revived in the present century by British philosophers, chiefly Prof. F. C. S. Schiller, who adopted with some modification the Pragmatism [see] which had been widely accepted in America, but felt that the name was unsuitable. See Schiller's *Humanism* (1903). Prof. John Dewey, in America, also adopted the name. It was understood to mean that in the formation of sound beliefs or opinions we must consult the whole of human nature (sympathies, interests, desires, etc.), and not merely intellect, logic, or reason. In philosophy the school has not secured a large place, and the obscurity of Prof. Dewey's works seems to lay a strain upon his pupils. In recent years a new meaning of the word “Humanism” has been put forward in America. It designates a small non-theological religion or group of societies closely analogous to the Ethical Culture Movement. In definition it means the same as Secularism, but it excludes criticism of Christianity or Theism and claims to be a religion co-operating with the Churches.

Humanitarianism. An expression

that is linked with the word “humane” rather than “human.” It applies to any movement which seeks to prevent as far as possible the infliction of pain or suffering, whether of animals or men.

Humboldt, Baron Alexander von (1769–1859), German naturalist. As Superintendent of Mines he had to travel extensively in South America, and the contrast of the beauty of nature and the degraded condition of the people and their clergy made an end of his creed. Settling afterwards in Paris, he published his conclusions and views in about thirty volumes (chiefly *Ansichten der Natur*, 2 vols., 1808, and *Kosmos*, 4 vols., 1845–58), which were greatly esteemed throughout Europe. He shared the Pantheism of his friend Goethe, but in letters to his more aggressive friend Arago [see] he uses strong language about the Churches and Christianity, referring even to Luther as “that diabolical reformer” (*Correspondence d'A. de Humboldt avec F. Arago*, 1807). His brother, **Baron Karl Wilhelm von Humboldt** (1767–1835), was a Councillor of Legation and for some years a neighbour and close friend of Goethe and Schiller. He was later Prussian Minister at the Papal Court (1801–8, when his despatches are valuable), Minister of Education for Prussia (and founder of Berlin University), and Plenipotentiary at the Vienna Congress of 1814. At the restoration he was dismissed because of his progressive views. He was a philologist of distinction, a generous patron of art and science, and a Pantheist like his brother.

Hume, David (1711–1776), Scottish historian and philosopher. Hume's early life is obscure, but we know that he lived in France 1734–7 and developed his Rationalist views there, writing most of his *Treatise on Human Nature* (2 vols., 1739, 3rd vol., 1740). This work and its successors (*Essays, Moral and Political, Essay Concerning the Human Understanding, and Enquiry Concerning the Principles of Morals*) attracted little attention, though they were the ripe fruit of “the acutest thinker in Great Britain in the eighteenth century” (*Dict. Nat. Biog.*) and had a profound influence later. Hume became libra-

rian to the Faculty of Advocates and turned to the writing of history. In 1763 he was appointed Secretary to the British Embassy at Paris, where he met the great French Rationalists of the time. He professed a belief in God, but his theory that all knowledge is subjective really shattered the basis of natural theology and had much to do with the transition from Deism to Agnosticism in England. In history also Hume was a very able and conscientious worker, and he and Gibbon emancipated it from its subservience to theology. Christian writers told the same untruths about his last hours as about those of Voltaire, and suppressed the fact that he was dying of cancer. Sir L. Stephen observes, in the article on him in the *Dictionary of National Biography*, that "a man dying of cancer may have been sometimes out of spirits," but shows that Hume died "with great composure." It is interesting to add that Stephen also died of cancer; but the present writer, visiting him shortly before his death, found him facing the end not only with composure, but with a remarkable cheerfulness.

Huneker, James Gibbons (1860-1921), American writer. He taught music for some years at the New York National Conservatory and was musical editor of the *Sun*. From musical he turned to literary criticism, and his Rationalist views pervade his *Iconoclasts* (1905), *Visionaries* (1905), and *Egoists* (1909). It is significant that nine out of ten of the men whom he selects as world-figures were Rationalists.

Hunt, James Henry Leigh (1784-1859), poet and essayist. A London journalist who, as editor of the *Examiner*, raised the standard of British journalism. Shelley and Byron were among the writers who rallied to him, and he was three times prosecuted for attacking abuses. He got two years in prison in 1812 for criticizing the egregious Prince Regent. He was a Deist, strongly opposed to Christianity (*The Religion of the Heart*, p. viii). Literary men still occasionally say that Leigh Hunt is the Harold Skimpole of *Bleak House*, but Dickens warmly denied this and described him as "the very soul of honour and truth" (*Dict. Nat. Biog.*). His

son, **Thornton Hunt** (1810-73), a very influential and fine-minded journalist, was an Agnostic and was associated with G. J. Holyoake in founding the *Leader* (*Life and Letters of G. J. Holyoake*, I, 161-9).

Hunter, Sir Thomas Alexander, K.B.E., M.A., D.Sc. (b. 1876), philosopher. He was born in London, but educated in New Zealand, and appointed professor of philosophy and psychology at New Zealand University in 1909. He has been Vice-Chancellor of the University since 1929 and President of the Australasian Association of Psychologists and Philosophers. Sir Thomas is an Honorary Associate of the R.P.A. and President of the New Zealand Rationalist Association.

Hunter, Prof. William Alexander, M.A., LL.D. (1844-1898), jurist. He was professor of Roman Law at London University College, 1869-78, and of jurisprudence, 1878-82. While M.P. for North Aberdeen he strongly supported Bradlaugh in the House, and he gives his advanced Rationalist views in a lecture delivered for the London Sunday Lecture Society, *The Past and Present of the Heresy Laws* (1878).

Hussites, The. The followers of John Hussinecz (abbreviated by himself to John Hus, 1369-1415), a professor of philosophy and theology at, and at one time Rector of, Prague University. In 1382 the sister of the King of Bohemia, which was then one of the most promising civilizations in Europe, married Richard II of England, and there was cordial intercourse between the two countries. Hus thus learned the ideas of Wycliffe, whose works reached him in 1401. A man of austere and uncompromising character, he had long deplored the corruption of the Church and the vices of the clergy and monks. He agreed with Wycliffe in condemning also the unscriptural doctrines of papal supremacy, transubstantiation, indulgences, purgatory, etc. He was lured to the General Council for the Reform of the Church, which met at Constance in 1414, by receiving a safe-conduct from the Emperor, and he was treacherously arrested and burned at the stake. Some Catholic writers excuse this (as in the case of the Albigensians) on the frivolous

ground that his doctrines were socially injurious—a remarkable plea in so corrupt a world—while others say that the Emperor was unaware that he was accused of heresy; in which case there was not the least ground for asking for a safe-conduct. But all of them and many other writers conceal circumstances which make the martyrdom of Hus peculiarly revolting. There were at the time three Popes, each clinging to the tiara from sheer greed in spite of pressure from all sides, and the Roman and generally recognized Pope, John XXIII [see], was one of the most brutal and licentious men who ever sat on the Papal throne. This scandal of multiple Popes and their sordid squabbles had lasted thirty years, and Europe had called upon the Emperor Sigismund to end it and reform the Church. Sigismund was himself a man of such brazen vice that he would dance almost naked in the street with prostitutes, and the 446 prelates, abbots, and learned doctors who were summoned to Constance to help him to reform the Church were at least so mixed a body that, reliable contemporaries tell us, more than 1,000 prostitutes flocked to the small city for the duration of the Council. See E. J. Kitto's sound work, *Pope John the Twenty-Third and Master John Hus of Bohemia* (1910). Moreover, while the austere and learned Hus was savagely burned at the stake, Pope John, who was found guilty by the Council of every known vice and crime, was sent into a comfortable exile; and the new Pope, Martin V, did nothing whatever for the reform of the Church, which presently passed, especially at Rome, into its longest and foulest period of corruption.

Hus's followers, the Hussites, were men of the same stern character as he, and they soon had a movement which was the second large-scale attempt at a Reformation since the reawakening of Europe. It included 452 nobles, and the Emperor temporized. At his death, in 1419, they were compelled to resort to civil war, and the clergy, whose luxurious and vicious ways were threatened, adopted measures which their successors have used in our time. The Hussites had broken into parties, as all reformers do when the question of the degree of

reform arises, and the more democratic of them called for political and economic reform. The clergy succeeded in detaching the more conservative and fell truculently upon the other two parties. It was then easy to crush the moderate Hussites whom they had duped. Their spirit, however, lingered in Bohemia, and in the titanic conflict of Catholics and Protestants, two centuries later—the Thirty Years War [see]—it took one of the fiercest campaigns of extermination in modern history to crush the Czechs. The Hussites still live, in fact, in the ascetic communities of the Bohemian and Moravian Brethren. See J. Loserth, *Hus and Wycliffe* (Engl. trans., 1884).

Hutton, James, M.D. (1726–97), Scottish geologist. He abandoned the study of medicine for chemistry and geology and became “the first great British geologist” (*Dict. Nat. Biog.*). His *Theory of the Earth* (2 vols., 1795) is counted one of the chief foundations of the science, and the study had the usual effect upon Hutton himself. In 1794 he startled the orthodox by publishing a Deistic work in three volumes, *An Investigation of the Principles of Knowledge and of the Progress of Reason from Sense to Science and Philosophy*.

Huxley, the Right Hon. Thomas Henry, M.D., Ph.D., LL.D., D.C.L., F.R.S. (1825–95), physiologist. After four years (1846–50) as naval surgeon on the *Rattlesnake* he was appointed Lecturer in Natural History at the Royal School of Mines. A few years later the *Origin of Species* appeared, and Huxley opened his superb fight for the recognition of the truth and, as he said, “to smite all humbugs.” In 1863 he boldly applied the principle of evolution to man (*Evidence as to Man's Place in Nature*), and his distinction in science was now such that in spite of his defiance of the Churches he was in the same year appointed Hunterian Professor at the Royal College of Surgeons and Fullerton Professor at the Royal Institution. He was awarded the Copley Medal, the Darwin Medal, the Wollaston Medal, and honours from more than forty learned bodies abroad. He retired to Eastbourne in 1890, and was called to the Privy Council two years later. His Agnosticism [see], which was based

upon Hume's theory that the mind cannot reach realities beyond the phenomena of sense, runs through most of his work and correspondence. See *The Life and Letters of T. H. Huxley* (2 vols., 1900) by L. Huxley, who shows the absurdity of the current religious legend that Huxley once told a friend that he "wished he could believe." Whatever Huxley may have said about the Christian ethic and the Bible—it is hardly surprising that in such a life as his he found no time for a thorough study of the ancient world—he disdained Christian doctrines. L. Huxley, among other evidence, tells us that five months before he died his father said to him that "the most remarkable achievement of the Jew was to impose on Europe for eighteen centuries his own superstitions." Mrs. Huxley, a Christian all her life, told the present writer the same. It was she who chose the Theistic lines for his tombstone, and she explained that his views were so well known that it did not occur to her that anybody could profess to misunderstand. She added, as a trait of his fine character, that during all their married life he had shown the most delicate consideration for her beliefs and never attempted to change them. **Leonard Huxley** (1860–1933) had not the strength of his father, though he had the same high character and loyally followed his creed and his example of outspokenness. In addition to the large biography of his father, he wrote an admirable small work, *Thomas Henry Huxley* (1920), the *Life and Letters of Sir J. Hooker* (1918), and other important works. He was an Honorary Associate of the R.P.A. **Julian Sorell Huxley**, F.R.S., M.A., D.Sc. (b. 1887) son of Leonard, biologist, filled a number of important academic positions (including that of Fullerian Professor at the Royal Institution) before he succeeded Sir P. Chalmers Mitchell as Secretary of the Zoological Society. He has attained high scientific distinction by his own work and has published, apart from science, a number of works in which he continues his famous grandfather's education of the public in Rationalism (*Religion without Revelation*, 1927, *The Science of Life*, in

collaboration with H. G. and G. P. Wells, 1929, *The Uniqueness of Man*, 1941, etc.). His brother, **Aldous Huxley** (b. 1894), is, like so many brilliant literary Rationalists, paradoxical or impatient of exact research, but there is no belief in God or Christianity behind his caustic attacks on modern thought.

Hybrids, The fertility of. Among the arguments against evolution we still find the claim that hybrids are always sterile. Few now pay any attention to a movement which conceals its real motive—the acceptance of the creation-story of *Genesis* in its crudest sense—by a ludicrous profession of scientific difficulties. In this case even the theological ground of the anti-evolutionist position is weak. It is absurd to suppose that an ancient Hebrew writer knew anything about "species," which are artificial creations of the modern botanist and zoologist, and refers to these in the phrase "after his kind." The absurdity increases when we find the Fundamentalists, with their very rudimentary and inaccurate smattering of science, venturing to challenge a position on which all the experts in six or seven major branches of science have been agreed for nearly half a century. [See *Evolution*.] In the recent and singular recrudescence of the movement there is one competent student of zoology, D. Dewar, and it is amusing that this one man with more than an elementary knowledge of the subject himself emphatically refuted, more than thirty years ago, this supposed argument from the sterility of hybrids. In Dewar and Finn's *Making of Species* (1909) there are nearly twenty pages (118–32) of instances of *fertility* in hybrid animals, and it is said that "in the case of plants the number of fertile hybrids between species is so large that we cannot attempt to enumerate them" (p. 118). In one of the best recent works on the subject (*Evolution*, 1936) Prof. Shull devotes several pages (214–19) to this point and shows that a large number of fertile hybrids are known in the animal world, and a very large number in the plant world. In some cases all the species of the same genus interbreed. Even the classic instance of the mule is, he says, incorrect. It

is not always sterile (p. 217). The cow and bison produce fertile females and sterile males. We are not told by anti-evolutionist writers why the Creator of species put only this partial and erratic ban on interbreeding and why it rules so much less in the plant than in the animal world. The truth is that none of them has ever studied the processes of sex-physiology, which make the matter broadly intelligible. Different seasons of mating, different recognition-marks of the sexes, different mechanisms of copulation, etc., bar interbreeding in large numbers of cases; but the main reason is the varying degree of attraction (probably chemical) of the ovum and the spermatozoa and the still more delicate process of the coupling of the genes in the fertilized ovum. From the scientific point of view it is not strange that types of animals which have developed and bred apart for, in most cases millions, in many cases tens of millions, of years should have peculiarities in the ultimate elements of their embryonic mechanism which cause confusion when sets of genes from different specific types are brought into contact.

Hymns. We have now so large a collection of hymns that were chanted in the ancient temples—Egyptian, Sumerian, Babylonian, Assyrian, and Persian—that it is surprising to find any religious writer with a pretension to culture claiming, as the writer on the Psalms even in the *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics* does, that the Hebrew prophecies and psalms are the first ethical and monotheistic literature. The Bulaq Hymn [see], which is clearly the original of the 104th Psalm, which commentators regard as one of the finest in the Bible, has been known to us for about half a century. Shorter hymns and prayers were given in Amélineau's *Essai sur l'évolution historique et philosophique des idées morales dans l'Égypte Ancienne* (1895) and Steindorff's *Religion of the Egyptians* (1905), and they are quoted in all later works on Egyptian religion. In one quoted by Prof. Steindorff Ra is thus addressed:—

Thou art the one God that hath no equal.

Thou hearest the prayer of him that calleth to thee.

All writers of Babylonian religion quote similar hymns and prayers (Prof. M. Jastrow, *Aspects of Religious Belief and Practice in Babylonia and Assyria*, 1911; Prof. T. G. Pinches, *The Religion of Babylonia and Assyria*, 1906; Prof. S. Langdon, *Babylonian Liturgies*, 1913, etc.). The Rev. Prof. Sayce quotes ethical-monotheistic hymns that were sung in the temples of Ur, he says, 3000 to 2500 B.C. Hymns and prayers to Shamash or to Marduk have been used in Modernist churches of the American Protestant Episcopal Church. Prof. Langdon shows in a special study of Ishtar (*Tammuz and Ishtar*, 1914) that in her final phase in Babylonia she was addressed by worshippers just as Mary is in Catholic churches to-day: "the Queen of Heaven," "the all-powerful Mistress of Mankind," the goddess who "hears the prayers of him who has sinned." While preachers still shudder at her name, we have (in Langdon) Babylonian literature that describes her wrath against loose women. The opening hymns of the Persian sacred book, the Avesta, which were written several centuries B.C. and have been known to us for a century, are purely monotheistic and as ethical as the Pauline Epistles. We have, in fine, many indications of the same character in the cults of Serapis, Isis, and Horus (in its last stage), Mithra, and Manichæism, and among the Theistic Stoics (see Benn's translation of the Hymn to Zeus of Cleanthes in his *History of Ancient Philosophy*, 1912, p. 119).

Hypatia (martyred A.D. 415), Greek philosopher. Kingsley's novel *Hypatia* (1853) has wantonly detracted from the dignity of her position in history. As the declared purpose of the book was to attack "old foes with new faces" (or modern pagans), he deliberately misrepresented the most venerated figure of the last pagan days as a young woman of superficial and superstitious mind and of weak (though virtuous) character. She was not a "young woman"—J. M. Robertson here incautiously follows Kingsley in his *Short History of Free-thought* (I, 233)—at the time when the

monks and Christian people of Alexandria, fired by their archbishop, tore her flesh from her bones with broken crockery, but, in the words of Johannes Malalas and other contemporaries, "a woman of advanced age." She was the daughter of a celebrated Greek mathematician and astronomer, Theon, and, while she was head of the Neo-Platonist school, the little that has survived about her in contemporary writers, after the great holocaust of pagan literature, shows that she had none of the superstitions which Kingsley attributes to her

and must not be classed with the earlier Neo-Platonists [see]. Bishop Synesius, who had been one of her pupils, wrote appreciative letters to her and mentions her writings on mathematics. She seems to have been eclectic (sceptical) in philosophy, and one of the most respected citizens of Alexandria, and a friend of the Prefect. It was this position, which maintained the prestige of paganism, that infuriated the archbishop. The article about her in the mediæval Lexicon of Suidas is regarded by all authorities as worthless.

I.

Ibsen, Henrik (1828-1906), Norwegian dramatist. He was an apothecary's apprentice in early years and took up the study of medicine, but a play he had written was so successful that he devoted himself to writing. He was appointed Director of the Norwegian Theatre at Christiania, and *Brand* (1866) and *Peer Gynt* (1867) opened up the series of plays which made him the greatest dramatist of his time. Prof. Aall (*Henrik Ibsen*, 1906) tells us that he abandoned Christianity before he was twenty, but retained a sympathetic attitude to religion until he met Georg Brandes [see], when he became a militant Atheist, and so remained until his death. In 1871 he wrote Bjørnsen: "Bigger things than the State will fall . . . all religion will fall" (p. 215). It is the sentiment of his play *The Emperor and the Galilean* (1876), which aims to show the superiority of paganism to Christianity. His high character is reflected in the sombre atmosphere of his dramas, as he was impatient of all untruth.

"**Iconoclast.**" A pen-name used by Bradlaugh until 1868.

Iconoclasts, The. The word means "image-breakers," and is given to a powerful body in the Greek Church in the eighth century. The movement began as one of several protests from the fifth to the seventh century against the growing corruption of doctrine and life in the Byzantine world [see]. Statues were part of the religious

paraphernalia borrowed from the pagans, in spite of the protests of Augustine and others, and the general and dense illiteracy which prevailed in both East and West after the "triumph" of Christianity permitted a gross abuse of them. The Iconoclastic movement against them in the seventh century included in its programme also an attack on relics, monasticism, and the worship of the Virgin. This movement was taken up by Leo the Isaurian when he became Emperor, in 716; and since the soldiers adopted it with enthusiasm—orthodox writers say that this was because it gave them an excuse to loot churches, rape nuns, and oil and fire the beards of priests and monks—it was imposed, with great brutality, upon the entire Greek world, and led to a century of half-savage struggle. Leo was one of the barbaric adventurers who occasionally won the throne in a land which, though never ravaged by Huns and Vandals, had sunk to the same depth as Europe. Monks and nuns were forced to walk arm in arm round the Hippodrome and then marry. A pious archbishop of Constantinople was castrated and taken round on an ass while the people jeered and spat at him. Modern attempts to refine the movement are misplaced; and still worse is the Greek panegyric of the Empress Irene (780-802), who made an end of it. As is baldly stated in Ploetz's quite orthodox *Epitome of History* (revised American edition 1925): "Irene, who

out of love of power had her own son blinded, restored image-worship" (p. 210). Having the eyes of her son put out when he was old enough to begin his reign was only one of the grisly outrages committed by this "saint" of the Greek Church. Charlemagne greatly admired her, and entertained the idea of wedding his daughter to her son, but, instead of sharing her pious zeal for statues, he violently attacked Rome (in *The Caroline Books*) for the worship of images which it permitted. In the Greek Church the influence of the Iconoclasts remains to this day. *Ikons* (bas-reliefs), or pictures, must be used instead of statues, as in the Roman Church.

Idealism. In philosophy the theory that there are no material realities (Eddington, etc.); in ethics the possession of high standards of individual conduct or of the social order. As the ethical opposite, the lack of ideals, is often said to be materialism, this leads to an equivocation in religious controversy. Materialism [*see*] properly means the lack of a belief in or denial of spiritual realities, and the apologists play upon the double meaning of the word. All the men usually classed as Materialists (Haeckel, Czolbe, Büchner, Moleschott, Marx, etc.) were in a high degree idealists in the ethical sense. [*See the notice of each.*] The confusion will be better treated in the article **Spirit**.

Identical Twins. [*See Twins, Identical.*]

Ignatius of Loyola (1491–1556), founder of the Jesuit Society. A Basque of noble parents and very little education—he had laboriously to learn the elements of Latin at the age of thirty—he became a soldier, but was maimed and found the military career closed against him. Developing a religious mood in his convalescence, he determined to become a soldier of the faith and pour all the fire of his nature into the work. Catholic statements that he at once conceived the plan of a Society to fight Protestantism are false. Lutherans were at that time not a serious menace. Ignatius had a wild idea of going to convert the Turks, and his behaviour was so eccentric that he was imprisoned by the Inquisition. He then went to Paris

and began to form a group of disciples in almost melodramatic secrecy. They were to serve the Pope, and when he passed to Rome he further developed the characteristic Jesuit policy of deceiving in order to get power. His followers were to pose as helpers of the sick poor while they cultivated the rich. "Let us," he said, "avoid all relations with women except those of the highest rank." The Reformers made the vices of monastic bodies one of their chief points, and the few cardinals and prelates who wanted reform urged the suppression of all Orders instead of founding more. He therefore drafted a scheme of a non-monastic body, the Society of Jesus, and, after a long period of intrigue, got it sanctioned. [*See Jesuits.*] From the start Ignatius himself stamped its peculiarities—deception, intrigue, and pursuit of the rich—upon the Society. He was its first General, and, while professing his reluctance to occupy the position, which he at first refused, he, when another priest received many votes in a second ballot, made his own vote blank—the first Jesuit historian Orlandini tells us—and thus in effect voted for himself. *See McCabe's Candid History of the Jesuits* (1913).

Ikhnatén (ruled 1375–1360 B.C.). The name, meaning "devoted to Aten," was adopted by Amenhetep IV of Egypt. Aten is usually said to be the solar disk, but such relics of the Aten cult as the Bulaq Hymn [*see*], the original of the 104th Psalm, show that, as we should expect in Egypt's most enlightened age, the object of worship was a personal deity, a universal providence, that was most strikingly revealed in the splendour of the solar disk. Amenhetep III had been sceptical [*see Egypt*], and his vigorous wife, Queen Ti, had deserted the gods of Egypt for the solar deity of the Mitanni, an Aryan people of Asia Minor, and persuaded her son to adopt it. As Breasted says, we ought not, as our literature did at the time of the discovery of the tomb of Tuth-anh-amen, to single out Amenhetep IV as "the Heretic King," but to speak of the period of "the Heretic Kings." It was the Golden Age of Egyptian civilization, and was marked by the usual spread of scepticism. It is remarkable how not

only apologists, but some other writers, continued to speak of the introduction of monotheism by the Hebrews even after every daily paper had, apropos of the discovery of the tomb, discussed this attempt of Ikhnaten to impose monotheism five centuries before the first prophet appeared in Judæa; and the people, instead of perceiving it to be a higher truth, gladly joined with the priests in getting it suppressed and polytheism restored.

Ilive, Jacob (1705-68), Deistic writer. A London printer who took a very active and self-sacrificing part in the spread of Deism in the eighteenth century. He published a number of works criticizing Christian doctrines and delivered lectures on what he called the Religion of Nature. In 1756 he was sent to prison for three years on a charge of blasphemy. Ilive was, like most of the courageous Rationalist pioneers, an ardent humanitarian in an age of great cruelty.

Illegitimacy in Catholic Countries. Since social justice has obviously advanced in modern civilization in proportion to the decay of the Churches, and just as obviously requires no supernatural sanction, the apologist is apt to concentrate on sexual virtue as the quality for which we really need religion. The Catholic apologist is the most insistent in this regard, and his rhetoric shows how necessary it is for him to get facts suppressed on the ground that they are "offensive to Catholics." The solidly Catholic period of history, the Middle Ages [see], and particularly the thirteenth century [see], were the loosest in history. [See also *Chivalry and Monks.*] But there is no need to appeal to mediæval documents. We have for the last hundred years a mass of exact statistics of illegitimate births, and, in these, Catholic countries have a far worse record than what are called Protestant, and are in reality largely sceptical, countries. Mulhall's *Dictionary of Statistics* (1899) and Webb's continuation of it, *The New Dictionary of Statistics* (1911), make a mockery of the Catholic claim. In England and Wales the ratio of illegitimate to total births declined from 67 per 1,000 in 1841-50, to 54 per 1,000 in

1871-80, and there was not at that time any wide knowledge of contraceptives. Leaving aside countries (Russia, Greece, etc.) for which the statistics of that date are unreliable, we find only Holland and Switzerland with a better record at the latter date. Norway, Scotland, Sweden, and Denmark have a higher proportion of illegitimates than these, but every Catholic country shows a moral inferiority to England. Spain (with very imperfect records) has 55 per 1,000, Portugal 56, Italy 65, Belgium 71, France 74, Germany (chiefly in the Catholic provinces) 87, and Austria 135. In Germany Catholic Bavaria has 250 per 1,000, Vienna has 403, Prague 470, and Brussels 285. The later statistics in Webb give England 39 per 1,000, Austria 130, Bavaria 126, Saxony 127, Portugal 117, Rumania 95, and Hungary 97. The general tendency is a reduction of the statistics of illegitimacy, and both the *Encyclopædia Britannica* and the *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics* blandly attribute this to the "extended practice of the Christian religion." Seeing that the Churches themselves complain in every country of their decay in influence and numbers, and their apologists explain that the "increasing immorality" of our time is due to this decay, one is again reminded of the recklessness of statements in the interest of religion in our current works of reference. One does not need to be a student of sociology to know that the marked decrease of illegitimate births in recent times is due to a spread of the use of contraceptives and drugs, but it is enough that the statistics heavily discredit the Catholic claim. The special claim in regard to the virtue of Irish women, who for half a century have been accustomed to cross to Great Britain for the birth of illegitimate children, is treated in the article *Eire*.

Illiteracy and Religion. One of the most insolent claims of apologists is that the Church first provided schools for the children of the workers and has always been eager to give education. The appalling Christian record until modern times is given in the article *Education*; and under the heading *Culture and Religion* it is shown that

acceptance of the Christian faith is most widespread in poorly educated nations or sections of nations and least in the higher cultural strata. Vague statements about the zeal of the Jesuits on the one hand, and the Reformers on the other, to found schools after the middle of the sixteenth century have no weight in face of the broad fact that at the time of the French Revolution 85 to 90 per cent. of the people of every country in Europe except Prussia, where the Rationalist Frederic the Great had inaugurated a school-system, were still illiterate. Jesuit colleges had an exclusively sectarian aim, and Protestant enterprises, like that of Massachusetts in the sixteenth century, sought only to enable the young to read the Bible and religious literature. The Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge opened 2,000 schools in England in the eighteenth century, but they restricted their work to giving children an elementary capacity to read and write. The Bishop of London said, in 1714, that the first care of the Society was "to fit the child for its inferior station." Experts broadly conclude that on the eve of the French Revolution 90 per cent. of the people of Europe were illiterate, and at the close of the Napoleonic regime—the Atheist French leaders, their disciples abroad, and the great Rationalist pædagogists Pestalozzi, Froebel, and Owen having made an impression—about 80 per cent.; and the most densely ignorant States, apart from the Greek Catholic Balkans and Russia, were Papal Italy, Spain, and Portugal. The struggle, led almost entirely by laymen, who were largely sceptics, but never Catholics, to secure a national system of schools (which pagan Rome had had fifteen centuries earlier) is described in the article *Education*. As late as 1861 the cultural condition of the four most advanced countries in Europe was that in England and Wales 1 child in 7, in France 1 in 9, in Holland 1 in 8, and in Prussia 1 in 6 attended school. In more religious countries the proportion was much smaller, and the degree of illiteracy corresponded to the extent of clerical influence. When the Papal States were taken over by the Italian Government, in 1870, some of

them had already been for several years under secular administration, yet 70 per cent. of the people over the age of 7 were illiterate. In the table given by Mulhall for the year 1885 the countries with more than 80 per cent. of the population literate are, in this order of merit: Germany, Scandinavia, Switzerland, the United Kingdom (slowed down by the illiteracy of Ireland), and Holland. At the bottom of the scale are Austria (55 per cent. able to read—though the Liberals had effected an improvement), Italy (47, the new anti-Papal Government having done much), Spain (23), Portugal (20), Spanish America (10–20). The relative positions were much the same at the end of the century, according to statistics in the *Cyclopædia of Education*, published by Columbia University, and a report of the U.S. Commissioners of Education quoted by Webb for the year 1900. While at that date the proportion of illiterates had been reduced to 0·41 in Germany, 0·30 in Switzerland, 3·57 in Scotland, 4·0 in Holland, 4·90 in France, and 5·80 in Great Britain, it was still 7·0 in Ireland, 23·80 in Austria, 28 in Hungary, 30 in Greece, 38 in Italy, 61 in Russia, 68 in Spain, 79 in Portugal, 86 in Serbia, and 89 in Rumania. Although these statistics, furnished by a Government department of America, were available everywhere, American Catholic apologists continued, like those of England, to boast of the Church's zeal for education in all ages. Until five years ago all systems were under secular authorities, and the figures rose, but the triumph of clerical-Fascism has ruined education in Italy, Spain, Portugal, and Austria, and is debasing it in France. But the mere capacity to read and write is not enough. Progress depends on the matter taught in the schools and available for reading afterwards. Compare in this respect the fine system in Soviet Russia to-day, highly praised by Prof. Dewey and other authorities, and that of Italy and Spain under Fascism, or the school-life of Mexico to-day and that of Fascist Peru or Brazil.

Immaculate Conception, The. This Catholic doctrine is often, and quite wrongly, confused with the legend of the

miraculous birth of Jesus, or the Virgin Birth. It does not refer to the *birth*, and therefore to quote instances of parthenogenesis is futile. It means that at the conception of Mary herself by her mother she did not inherit the guilt of the sin of Adam (Original Sin). This very safe statement was nevertheless warmly disputed among the doctors of the Church for 1,000 years before Pius IX, in the Bull *Ineffabilis Deus*, declared it a dogma in 1854. Conybeare has a short account of its history in his *Myth, Magic, and Morals* (1909, pp. 228-9).

Immanence. In the article Deism it is explained that Modernist theologians, who virtually reject all Christian doctrines, try to dissociate themselves from the Deists by insisting that the God of the Deists was "transcendent" and that of the modern Theist is "immanent." The late Dean Rashdall (*Ideas and Ideals*, 1928) was scornful about this alleged advance, and Canon Raven warns his colleagues against it. The idea of transcendence is that God made the world and was not further interested or active in it, while the "immanent" God is active in every part of it. The distinction is baseless. The leading Deists, we saw, believed in an omnipresent and omniscient God—how otherwise could he reward the good and punish the evil?—just as theologians have always done. Some affect to discover that while the Gnostics believed in immanence ("Raise the stone, and there thou shalt find me," as Jesus says, rather ineptly, in the *Logia*), the Gospels tended to make God transcendent: a curious thing to say of a God who "marks the sparrow's fall" and counts the hairs of the head. Even children have always been taught in religious schools that "God is everywhere" and sees even their thoughts. The distinction is at the best founded upon the vague rhetoric of theologians like Schleiermacher and Ritschl. It has no application to the Deists: in fact, as Rashdall pointed out, a spirit has no place-relations and must be "nowhere."

Immermann, Karl Leberecht (1796-1840), German poet and dramatist. He held a high position in the State service—finally as Judge and Legal

Counsellor—but he had a wider influence, and was generally esteemed in Germany as poet and dramatist. For some years he was the Director of the Düsseldorf Theatre, and he raised the level of theatrical art. Immermann followed Goethe in his Pantheism (see the poem "Merlin," the novel *Die Epigonen*, etc.).

Immaterial, The. Properly, everything that is not material or quantitative (has no space- or time-relation). This is also the definition of spirit, and in order to distinguish between the immaterial which is supposed to be able to exist independently of matter (the "soul" of Plato and of Christian belief or Spiritualism) and what, though not material in itself, can exist only in union with a body (Aristotle's "soul," the vital principle of Vitalists, etc.) the word "immaterial" is generally used for the latter.

Immortality. One of the principal roots of all religion was the belief of primitive man that a part of him, which he seems at first—at least in a large number of cases—to have identified with his shadow, did not cease to exist at death, and this belief in survival is the chief basis to-day of Christianity, Islam, and popular Buddhism. Modernism develops in the direction of a mere ethical-culture movement with an Unknowable in the background, but, as the failure of all these modern sophistications of the Christian creed (Theism, Unitarianism, Universalism, Congregationalism, Positivism, etc.) evinces, the vast majority of people easily discard all religion when they begin to entertain doubts about "the future life." There is here question only of a literal personal immortality. Poetic glosses, as that we are immortal in our good works or in the memories of others, may be disregarded; and an impersonal immortality, or the merging of individual consciousness in some common fund of spiritual reality, interests few but philosophers. Yet this belief in the survival of the personal consciousness is more vulnerable than the belief in the existence of God—so vulnerable, indeed, that leading Christian writers despair of proving it and appeal to what they call "the Gospel promise," while some

divines treat it with open scepticism and seem to prepare the way for the retreat of the Church from its dogmatic position. An influential writer of the American Protestant Episcopal Church, Dr. S. D. McConnell, in a work on the subject (*Immortality*, 1930), quotes approvingly from Dr. Inge: "The hope of personal immortality burns very dimly among us. . . . The topic is mainly reserved for letters of condolence and then handled gingerly." He adds that "belief in a future life is being given up by intelligent men" (p. 100). The ablest and most distinguished American (or Anglo-American) divine, Dr. K. Lake, says in his Ingersoll Lecture (*Immortality and the Modern Mind*, 1913): "I see no reason for believing in a soul" (p. 34). A bishop (Slattery) writes: "I entirely ignore theology as to the future" (*Life Beyond Life*, p. 100); and another divine prefers to call his work *Immortality*, meaning that there is no such thing as a naturally immortal part of man, but by supernatural action the "gift" may be conferred upon the deserving. English religious writers are, apart from occasional rude remarks about the traditional heaven-and-hell legend, less advanced or more cautious, but the higher their culture the more reluctant they are to say that immortality can be proved. Streeter says that "the old mythology of a future state is grotesquely discouraging" (*Reality*, 1926, p. 311), and the Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity at Cambridge, Bethune-Baker (the chief instructor of Anglican ministers), doubts if all personalities have "survival-value" (*The New View of Christianity*, p. 141). Bishop Masterman calls the belief "a venture of faith" (*The Christianity of To-morrow*, 1929, p. 63). The old robust confidence in an ability to prove that man is immortal is now almost confined to Fundamentalists and Catholics.

Since the assertion that man is immortal is the really fundamental doctrine of Christianity, now that salvation by Christ in the supernatural sense is increasingly abandoned, and, as we show in many articles of this work, there is nothing distinctive in what is called the Christian ethic and it is

unsuited to our age, this collapse is one of the most significant religious phenomena of our time. It is due in large measure to a recognition of the worthlessness of the traditional proofs of immortality, but still more to the teaching of modern science. In their censorship-protected area, which reminds one of "bird sanctuaries" or "national parks for the preservation of expiring types," Catholic writers continue to advance the archaic "demonstrative proofs." They are correct in claiming that the only form which such proof can take is to show that the human "mind" is a spiritual reality, or not composed of parts (atomic or sub-atomic), like bodies, and is therefore incapable of disintegration; or, in other words, is naturally immortal. That nine modern psychologists out of ten refuse to admit the existence of mind does not matter to them in the least. It is an axiom of theirs that nobody thinks or reasons logically except a Catholic: that, as Belloc once said to the present writer, "the intellect of Europe has been warped since the sixteenth century." They are therefore quite indifferent to the fact that a modern psychologist or physiologist would, if he troubled to read them, regard as rather childish or hopelessly anachronistic their attempts to prove this "simplicity" or spirituality of the mind. The "I," they say, in the language of a pre-scientific age, persists and is identical throughout life, though the material of the body is constantly renewed; ignoring the fact that the structure of the brain, on which function depends, is never altered by these changes of material. They point out again that there is a unity in any "mental picture" of an object or a scene—that *something* perceives every part of it simultaneously, whereas it is, on the Materialist theory, spread over a number of percipient cells or molecules—as if we still regarded the mental presentation of an object as a picture like that on a photographic film or in a mirror. As to the evolution of mind, they blandly pronounce it, with Chester-tonian glibness, "a superstition of science."

When we ignore these "demonstra-

tions," which can impress only people who are forbidden under pain of hell to read "bad books" (critics), we have only a number of rhetorical considerations which are at the best appeals to the imagination and sentiments. They are richly elaborated in the works of Sir O. Lodge, whose knowledge of physiology was elementary and whose real reason for believing was that he was duped by obvious Spiritualist frauds. Is there not, we are asked, *something* in the mind of a Shakespeare, the intellect of an Einstein, the art of a Kreisler, that sets man quite apart from the beast? A moment's reflection shows that the perfect gradation we see around us from these higher minds down to the lowest savage deprives the argument of any value. Does not, he asks, science teach the persistence of energy, and therefore of mental energy? In *some* form, certainly; but if we accepted the argument in the form in which it is pressed—that a very complex form of energy must persist *as such* and not be dissolved into its elements—it would follow that the "mind" of every bird and mammal, to say nothing of reptiles or even machines, persists. Lodge insisted that whatever "really" exists must continue—a very poor piece of verbiage. In recent years an eccentric writer, J. W. Dunne (*The New Immortality*, 1938), was announced throughout the religious world to have found mathematical proof (on the basis of the principle of persistence) of immortality. The preachers and journalists omitted to add that his proof showed the immortality of everything, but he later indiscreetly published a book (*Nothing Dies*, 1940) insisting on this, and the flutter of hope was stilled. So with all these rhetorical arguments, which in every case appeal only to ignorance of physiology. Is not the soul like a musician playing upon an instrument? Have we not daily experience of the influence of mind on matter as well as of the influence of matter on mind? Dr. Joad presses this argument in *The Mind and its Workings* (1927), but any physiologist must smile at the idea that, for instance, a disturbance of digestion by anger or fear proves that spirit is working upon

matter. One part of the nervous system is interfering with others. Most apologists admit that these are, like Plato's ancient verbal embroidery, not "proofs" but suggestive considerations—if you happen to be ignorant of science.

For in this case science is in deadly hostility to the teaching of religion. Now that all the major Churches have organized the work of censorship and intimidation we naturally find most scientific men reluctant to point out the bearing of their teaching upon religious belief, but it is not necessary. The evolution of man is emphatically part of modern science, and it is so vital to religion to hold that the mind was *not* evolved from the mind of an ape that no Christian writer or apologist admits more than that the body was thus evolved. The Lambeth Conference of bishops, in 1930, directed that the teaching of science—and it expressly mentioned anthropology—must be accepted, but it is stated that Emergent Evolution [see] is part of this teaching. That theory of a few professors is already almost dead, and was always damned, in science. Even a clerical writer like Dr. McConnell asks sceptically (in the work quoted above): "At what stage in evolution did man attain to the capacity of immortality?" The distinction between body and soul, excluded from psychology, is quite foolish in evolutionary anthropology. We have [see *Prehistoric Man*] more skulls than other bones of early man, and these, as well as the perfectly graduated advance of stone implements during hundreds of thousands of years, leave no room for doubt that man's brain slowly and gradually developed from that of an ape-like ancestor. When we have, in addition, the great majority of psychologists rejecting the idea that mind is something more than a name for the higher aspects of behaviour, and physiologists confirming this by their study of the brain, we do not wonder that even apologists begin to exclaim that "a disembodied spirit is unthinkable" (Dr. McConnell). It is a vague and shuddering knowledge that this is what science now teaches which compels apologists to say to-day that immortality can be claimed only as some totally

unintelligible "gift of God" to virtuous people. To the world at large it is rather a relief. Most men will admit that there have been times when they looked upon a crowd of faces (at a dog-race, in a music-hall, etc.) and had qualms about the theory that we are all immortal spirits awaiting release from the body; and we make discoveries every decade—the action of the glands [see], new anaesthetics, drugs, transplanting or artificial culture of tissues, restoring life in the dead, etc.—which confirm scepticism.

It is, in fine, important to notice that the decay of the belief in immortality not only destroys the principal idea of the Christian religion, but deprives of all vital interest the controversy about "the spiritual nature of man" which agitates so many superior (and scientifically ill-informed) writers. Spirituality is of practical import only if it means immortality. The implied suggestion that we will not cherish ideals or culture unless we believe them or the mind to be spiritual is so feeble that we are bound to regard the whole of this "sham fight over matter and spirit," as it has been called, as a thinly veiled concern about theology. Ideals are ideas of a better state of things, which necessarily includes an improvement of general character, and to work for their realization is the kind of virtue that is its own reward. Kirsopp Lake, the "distinguished Anglo-American divine," as Dr. Inge calls him—many would say, the most distinguished divine in America—not only declared, in his Ingersoll Lecture (*Immortality and the Modern Mind*, 1913), that "most men" no longer believe in immortality, but argued that this is a social gain. It has "raised, rather than lowered, the standard of life . . . people who argued in this way [that they were immortal] contributed little to the improvement of the world . . . the hope of heaven produced a type of selfishness all the more repulsive because it was sanctified" (pp. 20-2). Divines are beginning to see that the real effect of Materialism is not only to bring the whole of life under the rule of science, but to persuade men that, if this material life is all, it were well to improve it as speedily as possible.

The pretensions of Spiritualism will be considered under that head, and enough apologetic works are quoted in the text. As in the case of belief in God, Rationalist literature is comparatively scarce, and has had little influence on the widespread decay of the belief. Useful small works are E. S. P. Haynes, *The Belief in Personal Immortality* (1913), and C. Lamont, *The Illusion of Immortality* (1936). Naomi Mitchison's *Kingdom of Heaven* (1939) is not relevant, being a Socialist plea for heaven on earth, and E. Rohde's *Psyche* (English trans., 1925) is an account of the belief and cult of the dead in ancient Greece. Especially interesting is the American series of Ingersoll Lectures. A Mrs. Ingersoll—there is no connection with the great Rationalist—left, in 1896, £1,000 for an annual lecture (with a fee of £40) on the subject of immortality. Very few of the lecturers in the long series attempt to prove personal immortality, although the controllers seem to desire this. The lectures reflect the desperate situation of the dying belief.

Impenetrability. [See Atoms.]

Impostors, The Three. The title of a Latin work which, to the great anger of the clergy, circulated in and after the pious thirteenth century. The three impostors are Moses, Jesus, and Mohammed. Robertson (*Short History of Freethought*, 1915, I, 323) has a learned note on the book and thinks that there was no such book until the seventeenth century. But in a letter of the year 1239 (preserved in Labbé's *Concilia*, tom. XIII, col. 1157) Pope Gregory IX accuses Frederic II of calling these founders of the three great religions "impostors," and of the twenty-seven authors to whom Catholics ascribed the anonymous work—the list is given by Robertson—half belong to the thirteenth or fourteenth centuries. It appears probable that some book was in circulation and was made the basis of the work that appeared later in France. The sentiment of such a work agrees so well with what we know about Frederic [see] that it seems probable that he wrote a short manuscript or letter on those lines.

Incarnation, The. The idea of a god assuming human form was familiar in

the Greek world. In the amorous adventures with mortals which were attributed to Zeus, he was said to have appeared either as a man or an animal and impregnated Leda, Alemene, Semele, etc. Demeter visited the earth in the guise of a woman. The difference between gods and men being to the Greek rather one of degree of power than of kind or nature, gods were easily conceived becoming men, and men gods. The Hindus also had their incarnations, and in Egypt it was said, when the queen conceived, that a god had visited her. The point is of interest only because it helps us to understand that the idea, which to the modern mind is so monstrous that very many theologians now reject it, was easier of acceptance in the ancient world. The pagan myths were not responsible for the Christian doctrine, which grew out of the vague position of Jesus in the Pauline scheme of redemption and as a miracle-worker, though very human, in the Gospels. The dogma was shaped in the fierce struggle with the Gnostics in the second century and imposed by the Council of Nicea against the Arians in 325. In the early Church there was so much repugnance to the idea of an incarnate God running the ordinary course of foetal and infant life that large numbers preferred to appeal to *Mark* (ch. i) and say that Jesus became God at his baptism in his thirtieth year. If one were to-day to write, as Voltaire did, a simple realistic biography of the infant-life of Jesus (on the god-man theory), the police would intervene. Theologians are now disowning the dogma. "The incarnation," says Bishop Masterman, "means Christ in every man and every man in Christ" (*The Christianity of To-morrow*, 1929, p. 76). All Modernists put some such gloss on it.

Indeterminism. The belief in Free Will [see], the opposite of Determinism [see]. The general question has been discussed in the articles to which reference is given. In recent years it has again been widely discussed because Sir A. Eddington announced (*The Nature of the Physical World*, 1927) that there was no determinism or rigid sequence of cause and effect in the

subatomic world: that certain movements of electrons were not determined by any causes. As we pointed out in the article on Free Will, the Indeterminist had hitherto not really held that a voluntary act had no cause, but no *material* cause; the soul, or spiritual will, was the cause. In the case of electrons there was no such escape, and the seriousness with which Eddington's statement was discussed was amazing. The general thoughtful public were dazed with claims that science had discovered that some of its basic principles (law of causality, etc.) were unsound and that its doctrines must henceforward be taken as provisional or as our closest approximations to the truth for the present or as "averagely" true. If the entire agitation about the "new physics" in general literature had not aimed at discrediting science in the interest of religion, the public would have been informed that Eddington [see] held the fantastic Berkleian view that what we call material realities are merely (like Hitler, Nazism, and the War) ideas in the divine mind, and the interest would have evaporated more speedily. In spite of the very unscientific and illogical character of the claim that phenomena (in a most obscure field of research) have no cause because we do not at once see the cause, Schroedinger and one or two other mathematical physicists agreed with Eddington, but the great majority, including religious physicists like Lodge, Millikan, and Planck, emphatically opposed him. The general and growing feeling of scientific men that these mathematicians were "capable of anything" found an expression in a leading article by Dr. H. Dingle in *Nature* (May 8, 1937). With most unfamiliar scorn it complained that "we now have in the scientific world itself the wholesale publication of spineless rhetoric the irrationality of which is obscured by a smoke-screen of mathematical symbols" (p. 784) and a "cosmolatry which came by metaphysics out of mathematics."

"Index," The. [See Censorship.]

Indulgences. Catholics complain that their doctrine of indulgences is misunderstood by nearly all non-Catholics. The fact is due as much to their own

peculiar proceedings and their suppression of historical facts as to the inherent difficulties. In theory the Church mitigated the harshness of the Christian doctrine of hell by discovering that God had really provided a third division of the next world, Purgatory [see], in which lighter offenders (liars, petty thieves, etc.) suffered the fires only for a time and were then admitted to heaven. The time was proportioned to the number of venial (pardonable) sins, and even if a man's graver (mortal) sins had been cleared by absolution he had to be further purified in Purgatory. In effect every Catholic except the "saint" went to Purgatory after death, and every non-Catholic to hell. The concern of relatives over this indeterminate "sojourn in Purgatory" was then relieved by the further discovery that the Church could shorten the duration of, or "remit" entirely, this punishment by an indulgence (pardon). This is naturally a modern Catholic sophistication of the theory and practice which developed in the Middle Ages. The "indulgence" was simply a new implement in the growing power and covetousness of the Church. It is of two kinds—plenary (total remission) and partial (remitting thirty days, six months, a year, etc.) of the punishment—and it may be "applied" by the receiver to the soul of a dead relative or reserved as personal fire-insurance. Theologians understand, and the priest occasionally explains, that there is no such thing as *time* for a disembodied soul, and say that the "thirty days," etc., is a figurative way of expressing a relaxation of punishment. In point of fact these expressions are a necessary part of the success of the scheme. You get the indulgence by reciting certain prayers, visiting certain shrines (which draw great wealth from the privilege), buying—directly or indirectly from the Church—pious pictures, rosary beads, etc., or kissing (with a collection-plate well in view) relics of the saints. During the Dark Age the hazardous pilgrimage to the great shrines at Rome, the road to which was beset by brigands (in some ages right up to the altars in St. Peter's), or to the Holy Land was the richest source of indulgences. In the early

Middle Ages a share in the Crusades was even more productive. But the faithful everywhere were told that their "Holy Mother the Church" could not tolerate the advantage which the rich and robust had in this respect, and therefore any person who paid to it the price, or something like the price, of such a pilgrimage or Crusade would get the same indulgences. From this and the sale of relics (for the far greater part bogus) and objects blessed by the Pope (who shakes a finger at a room-full of them), etc., vast funds were and are obtained. At the end of the fourteenth century Jubilee year [see] and other lucrative discoveries were made; and the daily "mass," for which some Catholic always pays a fee (minimum in England four shillings), is to this day a gold-mine. With the progress of frivolity and unscrupulousness in the Middle Ages the profit from indulgences rose, the Church now sending out friars with bales of bits of paper assuring any man who paid a specified sum to the friar and received the paper of an indulgence which was proportioned to the sum paid. Catholic historians like Pastor (VII, 330 and 345) no longer dispute that such friars (Tetzel, etc.) called out their wares in the cathedrals like hucksters, or that a local prince-bishop might be delegated to issue such indulgences on paying a large sum to Rome. In 1514 Albert of Brandenburg, a young noble of vicious life, got the Archbishopric of Mayence and the right to issue indulgences—and the monk Tetzel to "push the sale"—from the Pope for 24,000 ducats (in modern value about £50,000). See the article *Bulas* for a continuation of the sale in Spain until this century. The Catholic defence is that the indulgences are not and never were "sold," because the money paid is an alms to, and the indulgence a gift from, the Church! That the indulgence is not properly a licence to commit sin is clear, but it is just as clear that an insurance against the penalty of sin does not discourage it. "I have a *bula* that covers all that" (*tengo una bula para todos*) a Spaniard used to say in relation to his naughtiness. [See also *Purgatory* and *Simony*.]

Infallibility. In view of the innumera-

able blunders of Popes since the second century, some imagine that the Catholic doctrine is that the Pope began to be infallible only when the Church officially declared this at the Vatican Council of 1870. It is, on the contrary, that all Popes from the legendary days of Peter (even John XII, Boniface IX, John XXIII, and Alexander VI) have been infallible. It is, however, useless to argue with Catholics about Papal blunders and heresies. Although the most powerful of the mediæval Popes, Gregory VII and Innocent III, claimed to be infallible, the hierarchy stoutly resisted the claim century by century, and still, in 1870, there was formidable opposition among the bishops and theologians. The Pope's determination to have the measure carried was realized only by bribery and intimidation and after a long and very heated struggle. Prelates who were present told the present writer, twenty years later, that iced water was consumed in amazing quantities, and that episcopal opponents angrily asked "if the Pope pretended to have the Holy Ghost in his inkpot." The finest historical scholars of the Church, such as Hefele (who yielded and became a bishop) and Döllinger (who left the Church and never rejoined it), had long lists of errors of Popes drawn up, and the wording of the definition of the dogma was drafted by the Papal officials with these in view. The Pope was declared to be infallible only when he speaks *ex cathedra*: when he addresses a message on faith or morals in his official capacity to the universal Church. With much sophistry earlier Papal blunders are then excluded. It is more piquant that the dogma was claimed to be necessary in view of the state of the modern world, so that Catholics at least should have a safe guide; yet no Pope since 1870 has ventured to speak in his infallible character. The letters and encyclicals which the Popes of the last 100 years, who have blundered worse than ever, have issued may be disregarded and privately derided by any Catholic. It is still more amusing to hear Catholics, when they are forced to admit the crimes and vices of so many Popes, say complacently that they claim only infalli-

bility, not impeccability, for the Popes. On that theory the "Holy Ghost" is indifferent to the character of the Pope elected—a notoriously immoral cardinal, Vannutelli, tried to succeed Leo XIII in 1903 and got a number of votes—and is concerned only about pronouncements which he never makes. See Dr. G. G. Coulton's *Papal Infallibility* (1922).

Infant Damnation. The most revolting consequence of the characteristic ideas introduced by the Christian religion was that young children, even babies, were condemned to hell because they inherited Adam's sin. In America, even in modern times, preachers in the backward agricultural districts notoriously cause terrible distress to mothers by insisting on this. In the Catholic Church the original horror is softened in two ways: children are baptized and relieved of the terrible legacy a few days after birth, and the mediæval theologians discovered that there was an annexe of the nether regions (Limbo) with a more temperate climate to which the unbaptized infant would be sent. As the dogma of Original Sin [see] was not formulated in its stark barbarism until the time of Augustine—the "genius" of the Latin Church—this consequence was not at first felt; though the doctrine that any person who committed a grave sin after baptism was inexorably condemned to hell was brutal enough. Baptism was on this account at first confined to adults, but an agitation for the baptism of children began about the end of the second century, and the repulsive teaching of Augustine on their inherited guilt made it a general practice. The Pelagians, whose idea was later taken up by the Schoolmen in modified form, said that unbaptized children could not go to heaven, but were not unhappy. Augustine (Sermon 294, etc.) dourly fought them, and got infant damnation imposed upon the Church. For later developments see Dr. G. G. Coulton's *Infant Perdition in the Middle Ages* (1922).

Infanticide. The right of the father to kill deformed, weakly, or bastard infants or (for superstitious reasons) twins has been recognized among many peoples. See the details in Wester-

marck's *Origin and Development of the Moral Ideas* (1924, I, 394-413). Where, as in very many cases, pressure of population on a limited food supply causes the practice, it is natural for the female infant, the possible mother of many more, to be sacrificed, and the custom is apt to survive when the scarcity is not so acute. In China it has always been extensively practised in spite of the protests of Buddhist and Taoist priests. In earlier Roman times the law did not cross the threshold, and the father decided whether a new-born girl should be put to death or exposed. The recent emergence of the Romans from barbarism and their geographical situation on the remote fringe of the civilized world (while the early Greeks entered it) must here be taken into account. In historic times the fate of the condemned child was generally exposure [see], and against this and infanticide protests multiplied when Greek influence became effective. Seneca approved the removal of weakly or deformed infants, as many men of high principle advocate it to-day, and in extreme cases the legal prohibition of it, based upon Christianity, causes a good deal of suffering. Epictetus was opposed to it in every form, and the great Stoic jurist Julius Paulus secured that exposure and infanticide should in law be classed as murder (Dig. lib. XXV, tit. III, c. 4). Lecky (who without quoting any evidence says that infanticide was "a crying vice of the Empire") and Gibbon question if this is the correct interpretation, but later writers adopt it. [See *Exposure and Children*.] Dean Milman (*History of Latin Christianity*, 1864, II, 25) says that the older Roman practice of infanticide was over "long before Christianity entered into Roman legislation" and that "the life of the child was as sacred as that of the parent." Mommsen has the same observation, and recent authorities like Sir S. Dill and Boissier find little evidence of infanticide under the Empire. It is as unjust to accuse the imperial Romans of "crying vices" because of earlier practices as it would be to charge the English of to-day with the vices of the seventeenth or eighteenth century. Lecky does not quote a single explicit

witness that such infanticide and exposure as there were in Rome at the beginning of the fourth century decreased with the triumph of Christianity. The appalling diminution of the city-population (in Rome from about 1,000,000 to 40,000) after the year 410 and the lowering of the standard of life had much more influence in ending the practice.

Infidel Death-beds. At one time stories of sceptics dying in terror and shrieking for ministers of religion formed part of the repertory of the apologist or the preacher. Fantastic details were invented in connection with the last hours of the greater heretics like Hume, Paine, Voltaire, etc. Foote gives a collection of such stories and the refutation in *Infidel Death-Beds* (1888).

Infinity. Like the word "eternity," essentially a negative term—the denial of the limitations which are recognized in all experience—and one that it is futile to discuss in relation to nature. We cannot conceive it as either finite or infinite, and to predicate infinity of the universe is to make an assertion without any empirical basis. The astronomer puts back the limits at every improvement of the telescope and leaves the matter there. Einstein some years ago announced that on Relativist principles the universe must be finite, but he later recognized that the conclusion was not certain; and most astronomers distrust mathematical deductions which cannot be verified in experience.

Ingersoll, Robert Green (1833-99), American orator. Son of a Congregationalist minister, he was trained in law and admitted to the Bar in 1854, and he rapidly showed promise of becoming one of the most brilliant attorneys in America. His title of Colonel belongs to the Civil War, when he served in the cavalry. He began in 1860 to give Rationalist lectures, and during the next thirty years his vibrant oratory, warm sentiment, and impressive personality made him the most effective force for progress in the New World. His direct and trenchant criticisms of Christianity, enlivened by wit and satire and infused with the rich and fine emotionalism of his character, instead of alienating

believers, drew crowded audiences in nearly every town in America. The published orations, which in their turn had an incalculable influence, are more polished, and in places more rhetorical than they were as reported at length in the Press, but he was one of America's greatest orators, and second only to Voltaire in the history of Rationalism. His wife Eva (Parker), whom he married in 1862, shared his views and sustained him in his work; and his elder daughter, Eva Ingersoll-Brown—he had no son—maintained his house in Grammercy Square as a shrine of advanced life in New York and was indefatigable in humanitarian causes.

Ingersoll Lectures, etc. [*See Immortality* (last paragraph).]

Ingram, Prof. John Kells, B.A., Litt.D., LL.D. (1823–1907), Irish economist. The author of the very popular Irish poem, "Who Fears to Speak of Ninety-Eight?" (Ingram's title of it was "The Memory of the Dead"), was not only one of the most brilliant of Irish professors, but a Rationalist. He wrote his patriotic songs, it is true, in early years, and later modified his political opinions, but he maintained an outspoken Rationalism, in the milder form of Positivism, all his life. His views were so well known and his scholarship in several fields of culture made the acquisition so desirable that Trinity College dispensed him from Orders in making him a Fellow and Professor of Oratory. Later he was Regius Professor of Greek and a notable writer on economics. His *History of Slavery and Serfdom* (1895) was the first English work to correct by a statement of facts the myth that Christianity abolished slavery, and while it shows some Positivist leniency to Christianity and is to be corrected in places, it is still useful.

Innocent III (1160–1216), Pope. From the Catholic point of view Innocent, of noble family and thorough religious sincerity, was the greatest of the Popes; and his career illustrates the fact that the virtuous Popes generally did more harm than the vicious and were quite unscrupulous in the means they employed. On the lines traced by Gregory VII he carried the power of the Papacy

to its height, claiming supreme dominion in secular as well as religious matters. No one questions that he sought this power in order that the Popes could enforce virtue upon the world, but the thirteenth century—he was elected in 1198—proved to be one of the most immoral in history [*see*], and the Church secured no advance whatever in social justice. His extant letters (in Migne), which number more than 5,000, repeatedly bemoan the corruption of the age. For the failure of his moral campaign the pious unscrupulousness of many of his own major acts was largely responsible. His first act was to crush the century-old attempt of the Romans to win secular self-government. He next induced the Emperor's widow, Constance, a priest-ridden weakling, to make Sicily a fief of the Papacy and nominate him guardian of her boy, Frederic II [*see*], with a fee of £30,000 a year; and at her death he encouraged, if he did not invite (as is affirmed in the contemporary *Chronique d'Ernoul*, Ch. XXX), a French adventurer to seize Frederic's Sicilian throne and a German to seize his Empire. He made the appalling excuse that an oath of loyalty to an infant (his engagement to protect Frederic's rights) was not binding (*Epp.* X, 8). His diplomatic relations with England (see the special study of these, E. Gutschow's *Innocent III und England*, 1904) and France were not much more scrupulous, and it was he who incited and most unjustly directed the ghastly Albigensian Massacre [*see*]. We have the letter (*Ep.*, XI, 232) in which he instructs his Legate to trap Raymond of Toulouse by a lie. It was he who had the chief part in developing the sale of indulgences, and he was the virtual founder of the Inquisition. The Crusade he summoned ended in a revolting sack of Christian Constantinople, and he promised to overlook the savagery of his Crusaders if they could secure the submission of the Greek Church to Rome. In the end he could not even plead that he left the world better than he had found it. Milman's treatment of this Pope in his *History of Latin Christianity* is sound, but the chief work in English is C. H. C. Pirie-Gordon's *Innocent the Great* (1907), which should

be corrected by Prof. Luchaire's monumental *Innocent III* (6 vols., 1904-8). McCabe's *Crises in the History of the Papacy* (1916) has a long chapter on Innocent (Ch. IX) with the evidence.

Inquisition, The. In its present form it is an organization, officially styled the Congregation of the Holy Office or the Sacred Congregation of the Roman and Universal Inquisition, which was established in 1542 by Pope Paul III: a Pope who had secured promotion in the Church because his sister was the mistress of Pope Alexander VI and who was himself the acknowledged father of four children. The word means "searching out" (heretics), and the machinery for doing this was gradually developed during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, so that the establishment of the Inquisition cannot be fixed at any particular date. Contrary to the belief even of most Catholics, the "Holy Office" has not been abolished, but is to-day one of the "congregations" (of cardinals and assistants) which constitute the Roman *curia*. In Church theory it merely awaits the return of the world to piety and virtue to resume its grisly functions. More serious is the falsification of its historical work and procedure which Catholic writers are now permitted to introduce into encyclopædias and other works of reference. The last distinguished Catholic historian in England, Lord Acton [see], pronounced it "murderous" and "an abomination," and said that before he could accept this "weapon of the Papacy" a man "must have made terms with murder" (*Letters to Mary Gladstone*, 1913, p. 147): Now, while the Catholic "X" is permitted to tamper seriously with the article in the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, the *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics*, to which the inquirer would turn for a wholly impartial account, entrusts its article to Canon Vacandard, the arch-sophist in these matters of modern Catholic literature. Those who are unwilling to recognize the extent of this penetration of Catholic untruth into modern literature may ponder this summary characterization (prefixed to a long article) of the Inquisition by Vacandard in our most scholarly and most respected

Encyclopædia: "From the twelfth century onward the repression of heresy was the great business of Church and State. The distress caused, particularly in the north of Italy and the south of France, by the Cathari or Manichæans, whose doctrine wrought destruction to society as well as to faith, appalled the leaders of Christianity. On several occasions, in various places, people and rulers at first sought justice in summary conviction and execution; culprits were either outlawed or put to death. The Church for a long time opposed these rigorous measures. . . . The death-penalty was never included in any system of repression." It would be difficult to compress more historical untruth in so few lines. We have seen in the article on the Albigensians [see] how absurd it is to describe their beliefs and those of the Cathari as anti-social, and that the north of Italy and the south of France were, on the contrary, the most enlightened and incomparably the most prosperous regions of Europe. Neither there nor elsewhere did the secular authorities, though bribed with a large share of the wealth of victims of the Inquisition, proceed against heretics without pressure from the Church, which usually had to threaten them with dire penalties. That the Church ever opposed proceedings against heretics and did not urge the death-penalty, which is still emphatically claimed in its Canon Law to-day [see **Death-Penalty on Heretics**], is an amazingly bold untruth, as we shall see.

It is shown in various articles [**Christianity**; **Paganism**; **Toleration**; etc.] that the Church began within twenty years of its own liberation from persecution to press for the suppression by force of all its rivals, and long before the end of the fourth century secured the death-sentence (and other laws) against them. Pope Leo I vigorously sought out heretics and insisted on the execution of them in the fifth century. These were chiefly Manichæans, whose ascetic conduct, Jerome says, shamed Christians, and whose ideas had an extraordinary tenacity. They spread so much in the Greek world, as the corruption of Christianity deepened, that in the ninth century 100,000 of them were

executed and 200,000 deported to Europe. Their name at this time, Bogomils (the Slav for "Friends of God"), shows that they were not Satanists, but Christian puritans, and it was their ideas which spread over Europe, won large bodies of adherents in every country, and culminated in the appearance of the Albigensians and the Cathari. From the beginning of the eleventh century we read of the burning of heretics in batches—at Orleans a group included thirteen canons and priests—and the spurring of the zeal of reluctant civic rulers by Popes and Councils. We have scores of these threats to "peoples and princes" by Popes during four centuries, although in 1179 Alexander III bribed them by allotting them a large share in the property confiscated. Few civic authorities ever moved, even after this, without clerical pressure. It was exactly this clerical pressure and the "inquisition" (ordered by Lucius III in 1184) which the Church demanded that were disturbing the social order. But the heresy grew with extraordinary rapidity, peaceful "missions" totally failed, and the truculent Innocent III [see] launched decree after decree demanding search (*inquisitio*) and the death-penalty and had hundreds of thousands massacred. Innocent's words urging the death-penalty—if traitors to the State must die, how much more traitors to God—are actually quoted by Vacandard himself; and he admits that Frederic II cited them in framing his law against heretics under stern Papal pressure. It was one of the conditions of the Pope's coronation of him. Gregory IX in turn demanded an "inquisition" and executions at Rome, where heresy was rampant, as a condition of peace with the Romans, who had exiled him. In 1231 Gregory had a "tribunal of inquisition" set up in Rome, and it condemned and handed over to the secular arm (which was subject to the Popes) for execution a number of priests and citizens. Catholic writers repeatedly say that the Roman Inquisition never condemned heretics to death, yet these facts are given in the contemporary *Chronicle* of Richard of San Germano (in Muratori's *Rerum Itali-*

carum Scriptores, VII, 1026) and even in the official life of Gregory. The Catholic historian Pastor further adds that when Leo XIII professed to throw open the Secret Archives of the Vatican to scholars, and he asked for the records of the Roman Inquisition, he learned that they had been removed. It was because local prelates, as well as rulers, refused to carry out the "search" that Gregory entrusted it to the new Dominican friars, and they spread a ghastly net over Europe. One monk, elegantly called Robert le Bougre, boasted that he had 180 burned in one small French town (Prof. C. H. Haskins, *Robert le Bougre and the Beginnings of the Inquisition in France*, 1909). Thousands—long after the Albigensian Massacre—were burned in France in a few years.

The Spanish Inquisition is the only branch of the organization about which we have complete and definite statistics. Llorente [see], its General Secretary and an important ecclesiastic at the time of the French Revolution, abandoned the Church when the French came to Spain, and used the Archives of the Inquisition to write an exhaustive history of it (*Historia critica de la Inquisicion de España*, 10 vols., 1822). He gave the number of victims as 341,042, while hundreds of thousands of Jews and Moors were driven abroad or done to death. The Inquisition was one of the chief factors in the cultural and economic fall of Spain, the rapidity of which has no parallel in history apart from devastating wars; yet Catholic apologists blandly affirm that it was in the social interest that the Church persecuted heretics. While this remarkable disintegration of Spain is the chief fact of its history from 1550 to 1650, the apologists—carefully omitting to mention that he was a Canon of Toledo Cathedral and a Knight of the Caroline Order—describe Llorente as an unscrupulous and negligible sceptic whose figure they reduce by careful research to 4,000. As Vacandard admits that, "according to the most conservative estimate, Torquemada sent to the stake about 2,000 heretics in twelve years," the absurdity of this is at once apparent; yet English and American Catholic

writers continue to say that "leading authorities" like Hefele and Gams—they omit to mention that these are Catholic priests—have proved it. Equally monstrous is the Catholic claim that the Spanish Inquisition was political, and that Rome actually protested against its severity. This statement is so crude that when Bishop Hefele's *Life of Cardinal Ximenes* (1860) was translated into English, Canon Dalton refuted it in the Preface. The same Gregory IX who set up the Roman Inquisition set up the Spanish (1232), but the people and most of the rulers, even most of the bishops, resented it, and it did little until the monks persuaded the fanatical Isabella to restore it. Spain was now rich, and Rome made repeated efforts to get control of the Inquisition and its spoils, but the Spaniards, including the Spanish Church, refused. See Sabatini's *Torque-mada and the Spanish Inquisition* (1913) and, especially, Lea's monumental history.

The procedure of the Inquisition is just as falsely described by Catholic writers and is very seriously misrepresented in G. B. Shaw's *Saint Joan*. The Jesuit writer on it in the *Catholic Encyclopædia* passes the high-water mark of apologetic audacity when he says: "The Inquisition marks a substantial advance on the contemporary administration of justice and therefore in the general civilization of mankind." Canon Vacandard (*Ency. Relig. and Ethics*) quotes another Jesuit writing that the Inquisition was "a sublime spectacle of social perfection" (*Civiltà Cattolica*, 1853), and adds on his own account that it "conformed to a very high ideal of social justice"—a strange contrast to the verdict of the really learned and conscientious Catholic historian Lord Acton. But Vacandard had previously written a book (*The Inquisition*, Engl. trans., 1908) in which he admitted (p. 135) that "the criminal procedure of the Inquisition is *markedly inferior* to the criminal procedure of the Middle Ages [see *Law for the debasement of that*], just as he had said that Gregory IX "did his utmost to enforce everywhere the death-penalty for heretics" (p. 132); and he then wrote in our most respected encyclopædia that

"the death-penalty was never included in any system of repression."

The procedure is fully described by Lea, who is, on the main points, supported by Prof. Turberville. The Inquisitors arriving at a town invited denunciation of heretics, and a few weeks later sat with a jury of picked local men to try the denounced. Neither the jury nor the accused heard the names of or ever saw the accusers, and the opportunity for vengeance and spite can be imagined. Vacandard admits that if two witnesses—and, unlike civil law, the Inquisitors admitted the testimony of women, children, slaves, and convicted criminals—agreed in denouncing a man his fate was sealed. If he confessed that he was a heretic and named "accomplices" he was punished comparatively lightly. Large numbers of innocent folk thus accused themselves and others to escape torture and death; the accused could bring no witnesses and hire no lawyer. If he did not confess, he was taken to the torture-room, with its rack, strappado, scourges, thumb-screws, charcoal braziers, etc. (See Sabatini.) "On the whole the Inquisition was most humanely conducted," says the Jesuit (on whom G. B. Shaw must have relied) in the *Catholic Encyclopædia*. Vacandard admits that "the Church is responsible for having introduced torture into the proceedings of the Inquisition." Savonarola was tortured seven times, the witches of Arras forty times; thirty-six knights-Templars at Paris, and twenty-five at Sens, died under torture, and so on. Clement V benignly ruled that torture must be used only once: so the Inquisitors used to "continue" the one torture on the following and subsequent days. If a man still refused to admit the charge, he was handed over to the secular arm for execution or (if he now confessed) possibly for imprisonment for life. In either case his property was confiscated and shared between the secular authorities, the bishop, the accusers, the Inquisitors, and the Papacy. This is not the least repulsive aspect of the Inquisition. Dead and buried men, if rich, were dug up and charged. "The Inquisition was invented to rob the rich," a Catholic his-

torian says; and Vacandard quotes the Inquisitor Eymeric lamenting: "There are no more rich here, so that princes, not seeing much money in prospect, will not put themselves to any expense." England never allowed Rome to set up the Inquisition, but had its own laws against heresy and blasphemy. [See also *Witchcraft*.] Witches were heretics, and, when these are added, estimates of the number of victims in six centuries rise as high as 10,000,000. H. C. Lea's *History of the Inquisition of the Middle Ages* (3 vols., 1888) and *History of the Inquisition of Spain* (1906) are the classic authorities. Sir A. Cardew's *Short History of the Inquisition* (1933) is a superficial and indiscriminating gleaning from Lea. Prof. S. Turberville's *Mediæval Heresy and the Inquisition* (1920) is the best small work, but a solid popular work with an exposure of modern Catholic untruth is very desirable.

Inspiration. The word, which once, and for fourteen or fifteen centuries, meant that every statement in the Bible was "the word of God," has now no definite meaning. Fundamentalists cling to the old doctrine; but ever since Paine, Voltaire, and other Deists began to comment on the absurdities and contradictions in both Old and New Testaments, theologians have retreated from it. The Modernist gloss that the Bible is inspired as any work of high art or idealism is applies to very little of it, especially since it is now apparent that no book of either the Old or the New Testament rises above the contemporary moral level, while most of them are in one or other respect below that level.

Instinct. The word belongs to an antiquated comparative psychology which considered it a "faculty" of animals, while man had "intellect." Modern psychology does not admit it except as just a name for the more complex purposive acts of animals, chiefly insects, birds, and mammals. The discovery of tropisms [see] and conditioned reflexes has opened the way for a genuine explanation of these acts. It was never more than verbiage to say that "instinct" impelled a bird to build a nest, etc. Modern writers who speak of a "religious instinct" [see] are

entirely ignorant of the progress of psychology. [For literature see *Life and Tropisms*.]

Intellectualism. A word that is now generally used in error. Some writers speak of the intellectualism of Rationalists under the mistaken impression that they do not recognize the value of emotion in its legitimate sphere. Pragmatists [see] or Humanists, who advocate that not intelligence only, but our feelings, interests, and preferences, should be consulted in forming opinions, call their opponents intellectualists. No one doubts that the majority of people do in fact admit the influence of feelings or interests in forming their opinions, but it is a matter of experience that this is one of the most fertile sources of error and division of opinion, and the soundness of one's opinions is safeguarded only by basing them as strictly as possible on intellectual grounds. A still smaller number of writers (Bergson, Bullett, etc.) oppose intellectualism on the ground that the higher truths are acquired by intuition, instinct, or sympathy. Psychology has discredited all these objections to intellectualism in its proper sense (in the attainment of truth).

Intelligence. The word has not a fixed and definite meaning in modern psychology. It properly belongs to the days when the mind was understood to have separate faculties for its operations. It is now chiefly used in the phrase "Intelligence Tests," or tests of general mental ability. In the same sense Sir Charles Sherrington writes that during "vast ages," or until about 80,000 years ago, there was "nothing in the way of intelligence on the earth" (*The Brain and its Mechanism*, 1933, p. 17). Some experts take the word as denoting the apprehension of the relations or connections of things; generally it is applied to the conceptual processes as distinct from the sensory—to thought, not sensations, in popular language. Dr. Dunlap calls it "one of the most abused words in the English language."

Interest. During 1,500 years the Church condemned as usury and a grave sin the taking of interest on money lent. The Jews (*Deut.* xxiii, 19-20) had been forbidden to take

interest from fellow-Jews, but might demand it of a Gentile: one of the ethical clauses which put them below the contemporary level even after they had made full contact with Egypt and Babylon. The Gospels (*Matt.* xxv. 20) show that in the first century saner opinions had been adopted in the Judæo-Christian world, and Bishop Hippolytus of Rome tells us (*Refutation of All Heresies*, Bk. IX, Ch. VII) that in his day (the early part of the third century) the Roman Christians put out their money at interest like the Pagans. This testimony is overlooked by writers on the subject, but it is true that even before that time the leaders or Fathers of the Church elsewhere—Rome had had no pontiff of distinction up to that time—were violently opposed to interest or, as they called it, “usury.” Addis and Arnold’s *Catholic Dictionary* (1928), even in its expurgated form—Fr. Addis left the Church and his work was suspect—states, in the article “Usury,” that the Fathers were unanimous in regarding all interest on money as usury and therefore “a species of robbery.” The Catholic author quotes violent language of Chrysostom, Augustine, and other Fathers and shows that Church Councils from the fourth century onward repeatedly condemned interest. The modern plea that in this the Church was making a noble protest against Roman capitalism is insincere. It had rich members even in the first century and whenever circumstances were favourable to it, and it is a foolish anachronism to put the sentiments of a modern Socialist into any Christian leader of Roman days. The condemnation of even moderate interest on loans, which is morally, if not economically, on the same footing as rent, is not noble but stupidly fanatical—the attitude of a man who is completely indifferent to the social order. The Church, moreover, was not condemning the pagan and Jewish capitalists on whom the economic life depended. They were in any case damned. It was simply a blunder, like the attack of the Fathers (who condoned slavery) on marriage. Even when trade revived in Europe and the lending of money at interest was indispensable, and widely practised by the

Italians as well as the Jews, the blunder was sustained. The Council of Vienna (1311) declared that the civil law which permitted it was void and it was heresy to deny that taking interest was a sin. Aquinas and the leading Schoolmen, who are now pressed upon us as surprisingly modern, proved, as usual, that the Church was right. Metal, they said, does not breed or bear fruit. It was not until the sixteenth century that the Church began to distinguish between interest and usury, though the Popes and bishops had used Jewish money-lenders and financiers long before this.

Intolerance. [*See Toleration.*]

Introspection. The process of “looking inward” or reflecting on one’s mental states and operations as distinct from external sensory observation. The Behaviourist school [*see*] in modern psychology entirely rejects it, but, though psychology is now usually defined as the science of behaviour, most of the authorities claim that, while it has not the positiveness of objective measurement, it has a restricted use in the science.

Intuition. Literally “vision,” or “seeing,” but used only for a supposed power of “seeing with the mind’s eye” or direct perception by the mind without the use of the senses. Such a power was a natural corollary of Plato’s theory of the mind and reality, and the Schoolmen and most modern philosophers adhered to it. It is obviously the task of psychology to determine if we have such a “faculty,” and not one modern manual in ten even mentions the word. Not only modern views of the nature of the mind, but the general evolutionary theory of reality and knowledge exclude it. Wherever the theory of direct perception could be tested (clairvoyance, telepathy, sensing the presence of a person in complete darkness and silence, etc.), repeated experiment has refuted it. Novelists who still write about a woman’s intuition (really a flash of hasty and superficial reasoning), moralists who claim that we “intue” moral principles, and religious writers who, seeing the collapse of the old evidences, say that we know God or religious truths by intuition, have presumably never read of the large numbers

of exact experiments on which the negative position of psychologists is based. The artist's "intuition" (constructive imagination in the highest degree) has no real analogy with that claimed by the philosopher and the moralist. It does not purport to reach any truth or reality beyond the mind itself. A recent attempt to vindicate the old belief, Miss K. M. Wild's *Intuition* (1938), relies on a medley of Biblical, mystic, artistic, and ethical experiences and does not quote a single modern authority on psychology.

Ionic School, The. The first group of Greek thinkers, who, chiefly intent upon the search for a single substance (water, air, fire, or mixed chaos) at the base of nature, inaugurated the method of observation (though their ideas were overwhelmingly speculative) and stumbled upon the truths of atomism and evolution. The ideas of the various leaders of the school are necessarily crude in detail and may be read elsewhere. They were further developed by Leucippus, Democritus, and Epicurus, and finely expressed in the poem of Lucretius; and they inspired the development of Alexandrian sciences. [See notices of each.] It is more relevant here to understand the school as a whole. As is explained in the article **Greek Philosophers**, history has got beyond the stage of crediting the Greeks with a "genius for art and thinking." The first Greek peoples to reach the Mediterranean were vandals who took many centuries to learn the arts of civilization. But Greece is very largely barren and mountainous, and there had to be heavy migration. The nearer coast of Asia Minor and the islands of the Ægean Sea offered the most attractive outlet, and the Greeks swarmed over them. In the northern part of this beautiful region, which they called Æolia, their advance chiefly took the form of art and poetry. In the southern half, Ionia, they found rich and cosmopolitan trading cities (Miletus, Ephesus, etc.), intermarried with the Phœnician and other citizens, and became, by the sixth century B.C., prominent in civic and economic life. Their richer merchants, such as Thales (believed to have been half Phœnician),

being free from the priestly tyranny and legends of the homeland, then began to observe and reflect on nature and the problems of life. To what extent they borrowed their main ideas is unknown. We are poorly informed about speculative ideas in the last days of Babylon (where at least, we now know, the idea of evolution was discussed [see **Creation Stories**]) and Egypt and know nothing about such ideas among the Cretans, Lydians, and Phœnicians, who chiefly raised the cities of Ionia. While the older history laid most stress on Egypt, Babylon, and Athens, we increasingly perceive how much civilization owed to Ionia (and Phœnicia and Lydia). See *Cambridge Ancient History*, Vol. II, and Sir W. Ramsay, *Asiatic Elements in Greek Civilization* (1927). For Ionia in general see A. Gardé, *The Formation of the Greek People* (Engl. trans., 1926).

Ireland. [See **Eire**.]

Isaiah (about 760–700 B.C.). Claims of "lofty morality" in the Hebrew prophets are chiefly based upon the lengthy "Book of the Prophet Isaiah." Hebrew scholars and Biblical critics have long recognized that we have in the book the work of at least two writers who are separated from each other by about two centuries of rapid cultural development, and the finer ethical sentiments and poetic passages are found in the latter of the two. Even the first or true Isaiah must be expected to differ from the fiery and rough "bolsheviks" Amos and Hosea, who had preceded him. The critics claim that he belonged to one of the best families in Jerusalem, and by the time when he began to "prophesy" (or "speak out") the Hebrews were in full contact with Assyria, then the leading civilization. The old idea of Assyria as simply a brutal military Power (which chiefly came from the Bible) has been greatly modified by archaeological discoveries. The Assyrian kings had splendid libraries and were patrons of culture; and, as is elsewhere shown, Egypt and Babylonia had had a high culture for more than a thousand years at that time. In these circumstances an educated Jew should show a great advance on the rustic Amos and Hosea, but there is not a sentiment in the first twelve

chapters, which (though adulterated) best represent the real Isaiah, that rises above the Assyrian or Egyptian level, and there is much that falls below it. (Compare iii, 16-26.) The Lord is supposed to be not merely furiously vindictive, but as sexually crude as Hosea makes him. Because the young women of Jerusalem have taken—to put it in modern language—to lipstick and jazz, the Lord will send them venereal disease and expose it to view. A few references to the exploitation of the workers, who had been protected in Babylonian law twelve centuries earlier, hardly redeem this sort of thing; nor does the fine poetry of much of the book. Even the Second Isaiah (chiefly seen after ch. xl, but the whole book is very mixed), who probably wrote in Babylon in the sixth century, has the defects of the Jewish ethical-religious code. As to prophecy in the sense of prediction, we have merely a few guesses at the issue of the fierce Assyrio-Egyptian political quarrel of the time touched up by the later writer long after the events. [See *Prophets*.] B. D. Cohen's *The Prophets* (1939) has a picturesque and informing but uncritical chapter on Isaiah. H. Van Sella's *Isaiah* (1938) is a Catholic work of the usual type. J. W. Bohr's *Writings of Deutero-Isaiah and the Neo-Babylonian Royal Inscriptions* (1937) is a valuable short study.

Ishtar. The Babylonian and Assyrian version of the earth goddess or fertility goddess of prehistoric times, the equivalent, if not the origin, of the Syrian Astarte. Earliest references make her the goddess of water, fertility, and love, but in other connections the deity of storms and, in time, of war. It is believed that Ishtar was at first sexless, and it may have been due to this that she was later regarded as a virgin-goddess and in the East contributed to the Christian cult. She was especially venerated as the goddess of war, law, and order by the Assyrians, and in later Babylonian times she had in Babylon a pronounced ethical character and punished sexual irregularities. [See *Hymns*.] She was particularly associated with the planet Venus. The best study of the development of the cult is Prof. S. Langdon's *Tammuz and Ishtar* (1914).

Isidorean Decretals. [See *Forged Decretals*.]

Isis. In ancient Egypt an independent goddess of obscure character. That she was, as Frazer says, a corn-goddess is disputed. In the blending of deities and cults that the unification of Egypt necessitated she became the sister and, as brothers and sisters often married in Egypt, the wife of Osiris and mother of Horus. She was until Roman times rather a domestic than a temple deity, and more popular than Osiris. The Greeks identified her with Aphrodite, and at Alexandria she became the patroness of their sailors, who called her Star of the Sea (an epithet borrowed later for Mary). Her cult had great influence on the cult of Mary when, like all other pagan religions, it was suppressed in the second half of the fourth century. The most popular representation of her in Egypt, especially in the temples at mid-winter, was with the divine infant Horus [see]. In the last days of Egyptian civilization the cult was spiritualized and associated with ascetic ideas. White-robed and tonsured priests, sprinkling the people with "holy water," served her temples, in which were jewelled statues of the Divine Mother. It is a Christian libel that the cult of Isis was debased when it was transferred to Italy, where it appealed strongly to educated men and women. There were beautiful temples of Isis, and some of the best women of the fourth century were priestesses of the cult. It was one of the most important ingredients of the cult of Mary.

Islam. The religion of the Muslim or Mohammedans. The word means "submission," and ought to be used instead of Mohammedanism. For the establishment of it see *Koran* and *Mohammed*. It is not true that the Koran preaches intolerance, though the history of Islam records a good deal; and it is a flagrant historical mis-statement, if common enough, to say that the Arabs poured over the world in the seventh century in a frenzy to convert unbelievers. The *Cambridge Medieval History* is lamentably out of proportion in the space it gives to the Arabs and Persians, while it devotes stout volumes to the coarse antics of the Christian nations of Europe, but it

does make these facts clear. The Arabs were not fanatical about any religion, and after the death of Mohammed the majority disowned the Prophet and his supposed revelation. His successor, Omar, a genuine fanatic, could reunite them only by declaring war on rich Persia. It was, says Sir W. Muir, "the scent of war that turned the sullen temper of the Arabs into eager loyalty." It would be better to say the scent of incomparable loot. It was the scepticism of early Moslem rulers, in Syria and Spain, who descended from the men who had derided Mohammed's claims, that enabled the Arabs [see] to reach a high stage of civilization in two generations, while the Christian nations took a thousand years.

Israel. A name, meaning "God rules," originally applied in the Pentateuch legends to Jacob, the supposed father of the twelve tribes. Hence the later practice of calling them the Sons of Israel or the Israelites. [See *Hebrews and Jews*.]

Italy, Religion in. Articles on the Papacy and the Roman Church deal with Italy before the nineteenth century. After the fall of Napoleon the country was again divided between Austria (in the north), the Papal States (in the central parts), and the Kingdom of Naples (or Sicily). The Papal States [see] were, in the words of the British Ambassador, Lord Clarendon, "the opprobrium of Europe," while the city of Rome was, in the words of the devoted French priest, Fr. Lamennais, "the most hideous sewer that was ever opened up to the eye of man" (*Cambridge Modern History*, X, 164). The Kingdom of Naples, which was in the closest subjection to the Vatican, was, if possible, a shade worse, and waged a savage war on enlightenment for fifty years. [See *Democracy*.] Austria was much more independent of the Popes, who bitterly resented its attitude, and its Italian cities were socially well governed. These undisputed facts illumine the later religious developments in Italy.

The Papal provinces voted overwhelmingly for inclusion in the new Kingdom of Italy, and illiteracy, crime, brigandage, etc., began to diminish. Rationalism grew in the same proportion, especially in Rome. In 1894 the Minister of Public Instruction sent an official telegram of congratulation to Haeckel, in the name of the Italian Universities, on his sixtieth birthday. In 1904 the International Freethought Congress was held at Rome, and State and municipality gave the delegates remarkable privileges and courtesies. By 1908 there were at least 6,000,000 apostates, mostly of the middle class, in Italy (McCabe's *Decay of the Church of Rome*, 1909), and the *Asino* and *Papa-gallo*, two scurrilously anti-Catholic weeklies, had a million readers. Then Socialism, which was drastically condemned by the Church, spread rapidly. In 1919 it polled 1,840,593 out of a total of about 3,500,000 votes (there was no female suffrage), and in 1920 it won 2,163 towns at the municipal elections. In the weakness caused by the dissensions of Communists and Socialists, the Fascists, who also were for the far greater part apostates like their Atheist leader, Mussolini, until 1929, made headway. Mussolini won the support of the industrialists, army, and royal family by sacrificing his Atheism, but the majority of the Fascists were still anti-Papal. In 1926 the Socialists, Communists, and Liberals polled the majority of the votes (or 2,494,685), and the Fascists most of the remainder. It was clear that three-fourths of the men of Italy had seceded from the Church, though reference books continued to give the population as practically all Catholic. The Pope shudderingly consented to an alliance with the apostate murderer (or organizer of murder) Mussolini, and the unscrupulous Atheist sold the liberties which the Italian people had won from the Church at a cost of at least 200,000 lives for Papal support of his corrupt plans. [See *Fascism and the Papacy*.]

J.

Jacob, General John (1812-58), soldier. He served during the Indian Mutiny, and became a Brigadier-General in the Crimean War (1856). Besides a few military works, he wrote *Letters to a Lady on the Progress of Being in the Universe* (1855), a Deistic work in which he dismisses Christian doctrines as nursery-tales (p. 17).

Jahveh. A name of unknown origin and significance. Old-fashioned theologians, taking it to have some connection with the Hebrew verb "to be," translate it "I am who am," or "the cause of being," or in some similarly fantastic manner. Hebrew scholars cannot trace it, and some refer it to the Egyptian or the Babylonian tongue. The form Jehovah is a blunder of the Middle Ages. Written Hebrew having no vowels, and the Jews regarding the name as too sacred to pronounce, the original form was lost. Biblical scholars now generally contend that Jahveh was a god of the Kenites, who lived near Mt. Sinai, adopted by Moses. The hypothesis seems to require too much respect for the legend of Moses and the Israelites in Egypt. The bolder critics consider that Jahveh was, like Ishtar, originally a sexless principle of vegetation (or fertility, therefore a creator of crops, trees, and animals) or a goddess transformed into a god when the supposed matriarchate ended. This would help us to understand the rich phallic features of the Hebrew cult until the time of Josiah: the sacred prostitution, phallic emblems in the temple, swearing with the hand on the "loins," etc. It is enough that the origin of the God of the Hebrews and Christians is almost hopelessly obscure.

Jainism. A religion which appeared in India about the same time as Buddhism, the sixth century B.C., and sprang from the same root: the Atheistic Sankhya Philosophy [see]. There was at the time a widespread revolt against the religion of Brahma. The priests had developed their speculations into so abstract a mass of verbiage that the warriors, supported by the young nobles, the kings, and large numbers of others, broke away. The Brahmins

were very tolerant, and made no effort to crush discussion so that the first law of history in these matters—that Atheism always spreads in proportion to the growth of knowledge and freedom—came into play. It is admitted by all authorities that there was a considerable spread of Atheism, and that Buddhism [see] and Jainism embodied this negative attitude. See Prof E. W. Hopkin's *Religions of India* (1895). Neither was, or was meant to be, a religion. Buddha was content to give simple human or social rules of life (with severer rules for himself and his disciples) to the people among whom he moved, but the founder of Jainism, Nataputta—the name was changed by his followers to Mahavira ("the Great Hero")—recommended ascetic severity and aloofness from the world. Atheistic monastic communities were thus founded seven or eight centuries before Christianity inspired such, and in their longer history they never knew anything like the corruption of the monks and nuns of Europe. Jainism to-day counts 1,252,105 followers in India, though, like Buddhism, it lost its early complexion. It became a religion 2,000 years ago.

James, Prof. William, M.D., LL.D., Ph.D., Litt.D. (1842-1910), American psychologist. His great influence in shifting psychology from its philosophical and mystic to a realist and scientific stage was due to the fact that he taught anatomy and physiology before he became professor of philosophy and psychology at Harvard. Hence the pioneer work of his *Principles of Psychology* (1890) and *Textbook of Psychology* (1892). On the other hand, he had been reared as a Swedenborgian, his father being a minister of that sect, and he retained throughout life a yearning for some sort of religion (*The Will to Believe*, 1897, etc.). This explains also his adoption of Pragmatism in its first form. He is, however, generally misrepresented by religious writers. His *Varieties of Religious Experience* (1902) is based largely upon an uncritical acceptance of religious biography, but in his Hibbert Lectures (*A Pluralistic Universe*, 1907) he disdains the Christian

conception of God and the common Theistic arguments (tissues of "pedantic dictionary adjectives," he says, which "do but gather dust in our libraries"), denies the superiority of monotheism, and concludes that at the most we may admit the existence of a number of unknown spiritual beings. Spiritualists also wrongly claim him. In his Ingersoll Lecture (*Human Immortality*, 1908) he professes scepticism, and says that "my own personal feeling about immortality has never been of the keenest order" (p. 13). His brother, **Henry James**, O.M. (1843-1916), a brilliant novelist and (on account of the 1914-1918 war) a naturalized Englishman, was more religious than William, but his religion was "too large for any ecclesiastical limits" (W. D. Howells, *Literary Friends and Acquaintances*, p. 266). He believed in a future life because, he said, he "liked to believe in it" (in the symposium *After Days*, Ch. IX). Literary men love to quote a saying that Henry ought to have been the psychologist and William the novelist. It is foolish, because Henry's psychology was entirely unscientific, but his severe art was of a high order.

Jameson, the Right Honourable Sir Leander Starr, M.D., C.B., P.C. (1853-1917), physician and statesman. He practised medicine in South Africa, where he became an intimate friend of Cecil Rhodes and entered politics. He was appointed Administrator of Rhodesia and was later (1904-8) Premier of Cape Colony. The "Jameson Raid" is often used to give a wrong impression of his high character. In his biography G. Seymour Fort says: "With his natural fine character and his clear practical reasoning he early divorced himself from any theological or metaphysical leanings" (*Dr. Jameson*, 1908, p. 54).

Japan, Religion in. Statistics here are as worthless as in the case of China [see]. Practically all the better-educated Japanese are Agnostics, though they favour Buddhism or Shinto as useful for the masses. In 1871, three years after the country had been opened to the West, the Government sent a large mission to Europe to ascertain whether Christianity was of such a character that

it would be useful to press it upon the Japanese people. Lafcadio Hearn and other writers quote its verdict, that Christianity had been "less efficacious as an ethical influence in the West than Buddhism had been in the East." These men, representing the professional and higher classes, discussed religions as coldly as locomotives. To the end of the century all writers, including the Christian missionaries Griffis, Munzinger, Lamaisse, etc., admitted that the Buddhist and Shinto priests, whose creeds were taken as lightly as in China, had so good an ethical influence that the average character was far higher than in Europe. The disbanding of the Samurai (mediæval soldiery), in 1871, as part of the work of modernization, led to a change. The Samurai, who are still often represented in England as model soldiers, had brutal qualities, and they took these into the new army, journalism, etc. When a score of families grew very wealthy by the new industry and trade, they enlisted the service of these qualities, and the plan of vast conquests (really of vaster wealth) grew and spread. The Black Dragon and other (by 1934 more than 200, with millions of members) "patriotic" societies were founded, and the priests as well as the politicians were bribed and enlisted in the plot to conquer all Eastern Asia and Oceania. There were 150,000 Buddhist priests, and they sent missionaries with political aims as far as India. Great wealth was given to the Shinto and Buddhist Churches, and they made a big spurt and were organized on the model of the American Churches. This development was candidly, or cynically, described by several speakers (chiefly Prof. Pratt, the Japanese Prof. Kishimoto, and the Chinese Prof. Y. Y. Tsu) at the International Congress of Religions held at the University of Chicago in 1934. The speeches are in *Modern Trends in World-Religions* (1934) edited by A. E. Haydon. Buddhism then had, they estimated, 41,000,000 members and immense wealth, but as a religion it was "merely formal" and was wholly prostituted to the political aim. Prof. Armstrong, who taught in Japan, says that the great majority of the Buddhist priests were sceptics, and

quotes Baron Kato, President of Tokio University, describing them as "rotten." Prof. O'Conroy (*The Menace of Japan*, 1933), who had an intimate knowledge of Japan, says that the better Buddhist priests told him that 70 to 80 per cent. of their body were corrupt, and describes the exposure in 1928 of a large monastery of strict repute near Tokio which was found to be indescribably corrupt and worse than the sodomist monasteries of Germany (p. 87). America and Great Britain took no more notice of this plain warning than of a hundred others. The only European body to be impressed by it was the Vatican, which at once joined the Japanese (or Axis) conspiracy. An article (apparently by a French priest) in the Catholic *Revue des Deux Mondes*, January 15, 1935, boasted of the Pope's cleverness. The alliance began after the annexation of Manchuria, which the late Pope effectually blessed by at once appointing Catholic officials to co-operate with the Japanese. It was then arranged that Japan be diplomatically represented at the Vatican and the Pope at Tokio. Since then, says the Catholic writer, "no Japanese prince or mission ever passes through Rome without paying its homage to the Sovereign Pontiff." On October 20, 1937, an article by "Pegler" syndicated in the American Press caused a sensation, and aroused great anger and consternation among Catholics, by confirming these facts; and "Pegler," in reply, admitted that the facts were obtained by bribery from officials of the Vatican Press Bureau, which is, he said, one of the most venal in the world. When the world-influence of religion and the social need to restore it are discussed it is well to remember this prostitution of Roman Catholicism and Buddhism.

Jastrow, Prof. Joseph, M.A., Ph.D. (b. 1863), American psychologist. He was professor of psychology at, in turn, Johns Hopkins and Wisconsin Universities and President of the American Psychological Association. In his *Psychology of Conviction* (1918) he resents "the mist with which dogma has enveloped the atmosphere" (p. 42). His equally Rationalistic brother, Prof. Morris Jastrow (1861-1921), was

one of America's leading Orientalists—professor of Semitic languages at Pennsylvania University and President of the American Oriental Society. He was also one of the chief authorities on comparative religion. In his *Study of Religion* (1900) he rejects the Jewish and all other creeds (p. 127, etc.).

Jaurés, Prof. Jean Léon, D.-ès-L. (1859-1914), French philosopher. Contrary to a popular impression, the great French Socialist was a man of well-to-do middle-class family and had graduated in letters and philosophy. He was professor of philosophy at Toulouse University, for some years before he entered politics. He became Vice-President of the Chambre and was deeply respected. He was murdered by a fanatical Catholic.

Java Man. In 1893 a Dutch medical man, Dr. Dubois, discovered prehistoric remains in the island of Java which aroused a sharp discussion. Expert opinion was fairly equally divided at first as to whether they were simian, human, or an intermediate type. Fundamentalists still say that Dr. Dubois had found nothing and had duped scientific men, while Catholic writers sometimes say that they are unrecognizable fragments which can be wrapped in a handkerchief. The remains—a skull cap (very familiar from photographs and casts in all museums), a massive thigh-bone, and three teeth—are in the Teyler Museum at Haarlem. After a few years of discussion it was almost unanimously agreed by the experts that they are remains of the lowest human type known, and this was named the *Pithecanthropus Erectus* ("Erect Ape-Man"), to mark its evolutionary stage. Sir Arthur Keith considers that it throws more light on the evolution of man than any other discovery (*Antiquity of Man*, 7th ed., 2 vols., 1929), but some think Pekin Man [see] older. The cranial capacity is halfway between that of the ape and that of the lowest savage (McCurdy). The date assigned to it varies from half a million to a million years ago. A recent Dutch writer has again suggested that the remains are those of an extinct ape allied to the gibbon (*Man*, December, 1936). In 1936 there was found in

Java the skull of a child which is claimed to belong to the same race. Dubois had, in 1893, discovered and kept back certain remains of a higher type which puzzled him. These are recognized to belong to a later but very primitive type (*Homo Soloensis*) allied to the prehistoric Australians, who probably passed from that region to Australia. Java man belongs to one of the extinct early races and is not in the line of ancestry of modern man: which does not lessen its immense value as illustrating the development of an ape into a man.

Jeans, Sir James Hopwood (1877–1946), astronomer. He was professor of astronomy at the Royal Institution and one of the most distinguished mathematical astronomers in the country. He held the Gold Medal of the Royal Astronomical Society and the Royal Medal of the Royal Society, and he had been President of the British Association and the Royal Astronomical Society and received many other high (and deserved) academic honours. The brilliantly written works, however, by which he is known to the general public are distasteful to his colleagues and have almost invariably been severely criticized in *Nature*, on the ground that he does not warn the public that what he wrote was often his own opinion, not the teaching of science. It is more interesting that when he wrote these books, as well as his more academic and valuable works (*Problems of Cosmogony*, etc.), he held—he rather obscurely hinted at a recent change of view—that all material things are only ideas in the mind of God. In several of his works (*The Universe Around Us*, 1929, and *The Mysterious Universe*, 1930) he expressed admiration of Berkeley's idealism, and in an interview published in the *Observer* (January 4, 1931) he admitted that this was his view. While religious writers everywhere boasted how he had demolished Materialism, he had, in the books they recommended, admitted a theory which equally demolished the Incarnation and most Christian doctrines.

Jefferies, Richard (1848–87), naturalist. Graduating in provincial journalism, he went on to attract considerable attention by books on natural history,

and in 1883 his autobiography, *The Story of My Heart*, completed his reputation. He says in it that he has shed "the last traces and relics of superstition." He was a Pantheist. Sir W. Besant, a by no means orthodox Christian who hated Agnosticism (letters to the present writer), says in his *Eulogy of Richard Jefferies* (1888) that he was converted before he died. His friend H. S. Salt shows, in his *Faith of Richard Jefferies* (1905), that this is false.

Jefferson, Thomas (1743–1826), third President of the United States. An eminent lawyer of Virginia and the chief composer of the Declaration of Independence. He became Governor of Virginia, revised its laws, and was its greatest statesman. While representative of America at Paris, 1784–9, he contracted a close friendship with the great French Rationalists and, while sharing their Materialism, combined it strangely with Deism. His letters (*Memoir and Correspondence of Thomas Jefferson*, 1829) often express a deep contempt for Christian doctrines. In a letter to Adams, in 1820, he insists that "to talk of immaterial existences is to talk of nothings" (iv, 331), and in a letter dated December 8, 1822, a few years before his death, he protests that the Christian God is "a hocus-pocus phantasm of a God, like another Cerberus with one body and three heads." Jefferson was the ablest and most accomplished man of the American Revolution and had a character of unclouded integrity.

Jeffrey, Lord Francis (1773–1850), Scottish judge. He became Dean of the Faculty of Advocates in 1829, Lord Advocate in 1830, and Judge of the Court of Session in 1834. Jeffrey helped to found, and for years edited, *The Edinburgh Review*, and in 1820 he was Lord Rector of Glasgow University. Hugh Miller (a strict Christian) says in *The Treasury of Modern Biography* that although Jeffrey was "infected in youth and middle age by the widespread infidelity of the French Revolution," he later abandoned it. We gather from Lord Cockburn's *Life and Letters of Lord Jeffrey* (1852) that there was no change of his views on religion.

Jennings, Prof. Herbert Spencer, A.M., Ph.D., LL.D. (b. 1868), American zoologist. He was Professor of Zoology at, successively, Michigan, Pennsylvania, and Johns Hopkins Universities and visiting professor at Tokio and Oxford. One of the highest authorities on his subject, he has edited the *Journal of Experimental Zoology* and the *Biological Bulletin*, been President of the American Zoological Society and the American Society of Naturalists, and received many academic honours at home and abroad. In his Terry Lectures, delivered at Yale University (*The Universe of Life*, 1933), he notices a feeble symposium edited by E. H. Cotton with the title *Has Science Discovered God?* (1932). He replies, for the biological sciences, with an emphatic negative. His words are given in the article *Design*.

Jensen, Prof. Peter Christian Albrecht, Ph.D. (b. 1861), leading German Orientalist. He was professor of Semitic languages at Marburg University and one of the highest authorities in Germany on Babylonia and Assyria. His advanced Rationalism is found in his *Moses, Jesus, Paulus* (2 vols., 1909-10) and *Hat der Jesus der Evangelien wirklich gelebt?* (1910). In the latter he contends that the story of Jesus is a myth based upon the Epic of Gilgamesch.

Jerome, St. (about 340-420). A Dalmatian who became a monk, and one of the most learned Fathers of the Church. The interest here is that, while Jerome is quoted by religious writers as a witness to the beauty of character in the Roman Church and the beneficent influence of Christianity, he is our most reliable and emphatic witness to its corruption. As he was for several years the secretary of Pope Damasus [see], he was thoroughly acquainted with the facts, and his letters (written in much better Latin than Augustine's) are so searing in their accounts that they are not included in any translation of the Fathers. Christian writers quote from them the names of less than a dozen lady-pupils of his who led ascetic lives, but these are so exceptional that he observes to one of them that if you meet in the street a lady who seems to

be of strict life, you at once conclude that she is a Manichæan. The Christians, clergy and laity, "sacred virgins," matrons, widows, etc., he describes, in picturesque detail, as comprehensively and remarkably corrupt. See especially Letters XXII, XXIV, LII, and CXXV in the Migne collection. Jerome warns his lady-pupils that they must never remain in the same room with a priest, and he advises them, with Elizabethan coarseness, how to avoid it. The saint was often crude in speech and had a fiery temper: he quarrelled violently with Augustine, and he tells us how he and another monk spat in each other's faces during an argument on holy things. The virtuous young ladies are strictly forbidden to associate with Christian widows, whose drunkenness, etc., are frankly described, or with "sacred virgins" (a very corrupt class, he says). He says repeatedly that he does not refer to a vicious minority, but to the whole body of Roman Christians, priests and laity, and that hypocrisy, greed, and looseness are general characteristics of the priests and monks. He never discusses his friend Pope Damasus, but [see the notice of him] we know that he had a salacious reputation and was summoned to the civil court on a charge of adultery. In the same article there is evidence of another vice—murderous violence—of the Roman Christians.

Jervas, Charles (1675-1739), painter. He was so distinguished an artist that he was appointed principal painter to George I and George II, yet his opulent house in London was one of the chief Deistic centres. Horace Walpole says that Jervas "piqued himself on total infidelity" (*Letters*, XI, 335). This, since Walpole [see] was a Deist, means that Jervas was an avowed Atheist.

Jesuits, The. The correct name of the body is the Society of Jesus. When Ignatius of Loyola [see] proposed to found an organization, the Protestants of Germany and England had exposed the comprehensive corruption of the monastic orders, and those who advocated reform in Rome itself wanted the suppression of all Orders rather than the establishment of new. Ignatius had great difficulty in securing permission to found even a "Society," whose

members should take the usual vows of poverty, chastity, and obedience and live in communities without being classed as monks. Permission was granted in 1540 after years of intrigue and deceit—the followers of Ignatius in Rome were directed ostentatiously to serve the sick poor and quietly secure rich youths and the support of rich women—which left a permanent mark on the body. It was characterized also from the start by the martial spirit of the ex-soldier Ignatius and by its special consecration in the Pope's service as a regiment to fight heresy. Its activity was rightly called "Jesuitry" from the first. The vow of poverty, collective as well as individual, was prevented from interfering with the accumulation of wealth, which was a primary aim, by drawing a distinction between "colleges" and "houses of the professed" (equal to monasteries) and claiming that the former could acquire unlimited property. From the first also the characteristic Jesuit practice of spying on each other and tale-bearing was introduced and the vow of obedience was especially stressed. Nicolini mistranslates the Constitutions when he says that the Jesuit is "bound to obey an order to commit sin," but the document is written (here at least) in such crude Latin that one might so interpret it; while in practice a Jesuit superior would always claim that it was his business to judge whether the act prescribed was sinful, and the appalling casuistry of the theologians of the Society would serve his purpose. The charge that they had in addition a secret Constitution (*Monita Privata*) is disputed. The Jesuits contend that the Polish ex-Jesuit Zahorowski fabricated or falsified the document. He may have tampered with it, but so many copies of the document were found in Jesuit houses when the Society was suppressed in the eighteenth century that it is widely accepted as genuine. Modern Jesuits, on the other hand, try to convince the world of their high character by describing their "Spiritual Exercises"—an intensive periodical course of religious training such as all monks and nuns have—but these spiritual orgies leave no more permanent impression on

monks than "revival services" do on an American small town.

One must judge the Society by its actual history and by the very grave charges against it which the Pope fully endorsed in suppressing it. The Jesuits may never have laid it down in the public gaze that the end justifies the means [*see Ends and Means*], but it is a platitude of their history that they always proceeded upon that axiom. The special privileges (such as the right of their colleges to grant degrees) which they wheedled from favourable Popes—some Popes hated them as bitterly as most of the monks and clergy have always done—enabled them to capture the universities, and through these and their colleges, to which they drafted the sons of the rich and noble whom they particularly cultivated, they prepared Catholic lands for the ghastly Thirty Years War against Protestantism, in which groups of them followed the armies and hung about the camps. Their system of education, for which their writers have secured a high and spurious reputation, was the narrowest and most vicious (especially in regard to history) in Europe. Its one aim was to inspire hatred of Protestantism. In order to maintain their influence in this respect they pressed their services as confessors of princes and nobles everywhere and connived at their vices. In France, in the time of Louis XIV [*see*], the King and all the leading ladies of the Court had Jesuit confessors—Louis had three in succession during the most corrupt seventeen years of his life—and there never was a more debased court. France had at first regarded them with just suspicion, but their leader, Father Manares (whom the Jesuits themselves had later to condemn for corrupt ways), won favour by "discovering" a (fabricated) plot of the Huguenots [*see*] and prepared the way for the St. Bartholomew Massacre [*see*]. In non-Catholic lands their propensity for melodramatic secrecy and picturesque or murderous intrigue had full rein. In England, even under "Bloody Mary," they, as Burnet tells in his *History of the Reformation* (II, 526), overreached themselves by trying to secure all the confiscated monastic

property, and after Mary's death their intrigues in disguise and their inspiration of plots soured Elizabeth's policy of toleration. They boast of a hundred Jesuit martyrs in the period that followed. In point of fact only five regularly admitted Jesuits were executed (for plots), and two saved their lives by turning informers. They swelled their list of martyrs by getting priests in prison to "join the Society" before execution. In Scandinavia they strutted in court-dress as ambassadors and even, disguised, taught Lutheran theology in Protestant universities. In India some lived for years as mystics of the Hindu religion, and there (and in China) they made "converts" by permitting (for which Popes repeatedly condemned them) a mixture of Hindu (or Confucian) and Christian ideas and practices, while they worked fraudulent miracles on the ignorant natives. In South America [see *Paraguay*] they made virtual slaves of and exploited their converts and raised great wealth by trade.

Local bishops whom they defied and libelled, priests, and monks assailed Rome with complaints, and in 1656 Pascal opened the attack on them in Europe by the scalding charges, especially of lax principles and leniency to vice, of his famous *Provincial Letters*. The Popes repeatedly condemned their practices (1710, 1715, 1742, and 1744), but dreaded their power and vindictiveness. More than one Pope is said to have been poisoned by them, and we smile at the ingenuous Jesuit plea that we cannot prove it. But Europe had now begun to feel a power more subtle, yet more honest, than that of the Society—that of Voltaire—and the great statesmen who were his pupils moved against them. The Marquis de Pombal [see] got them expelled from Portugal in 1759. Choiseul exposed their trickery and their vast wealth in France and secured their expulsion (1764). Count D'Aranda [see] had them suppressed in Spain (1767), and Tannucci in the Kingdom of Naples. A tense and dramatic struggle now proceeded at Rome, the Jesuits using every device in their large repertory to avert the suppression which the Catholic monarchs demanded, but

in 1773 Pope Clement XIV, in the Bull *Dominus ac Redemptor Noster*, abolished the Society "for ever." The charges against the Jesuits were in large part brought by bishops or priests of high character, but the Jesuit writers airily dismiss them by giving the reader the impression that they were fabrications of wicked enemies of Christ. It would be fatal to admit that the Pope endorsed the indictment, so the apologists uniformly say, in one of their most brazen perversions of facts, that in the Bull "no blame is laid by the Pope on the rules of the Order, or the present condition of its members, or the orthodoxy of their teaching." That is the language of the *Catholic Encyclopedia*. The Pope is represented as being reluctantly forced by circumstances to suspend the Society for the time. The truth is that the Pope enumerates at length all the charges against the Jesuits and *fully endorses them*. He recalls that thirteen previous Popes have condemned their practices and their doctrines after full inquiry, but, he says, the remedies had "neither efficacy nor strength to put an end to the trouble." Therefore, "recognizing that the Society of Jesus can no longer produce the abundant fruits and the considerable advantages for which it was created," he "suppresses and abolishes the Society for ever." Catholic writers, in grossly misrepresenting the Pope's action, take advantage of the fact that no English translation of the Bull is available, the last published being in *The Jesuits* by R. Demaus (1873). The essential parts of it are translated from Latin by the present writer in the book listed below. The Society was restored in the sanguinary reaction that followed the fall of Napoleon, and the Jesuits returned to their pernicious intrigues. To-day they are a body of very comfortable mediocrities, confining their love of intrigue to the capture of rich Catholics for their own parishes, for which most priests cordially detest them, and angling for aristocratic or semi-aristocratic converts. They have no distinction in learning or literature in spite of their wealth and leisure, and they are superior to the other clergy only in their audacity in untruth and

their solicitous ministration to the wealthy. See McCabe's *Candid History of the Jesuits* (1913). F. A. Ridley's *The Jesuits* (1938) is a sound, shorter, but broader study. A. Close's *Jesuit Plots Against Great Britain* (1935) is generally reliable. Of the works recommended in Robertson's *Courses of Study*, all of which are outdated, Nicolini's *History of the Jesuits* (1853) is unreliable, and Crétineau-Joly's *Histoire religieuse, politique, et littéraire de la Compagnie de Jesus* (6 vols., 1845-6), which all encyclopædias recommend as the standard authority, is a monstrous piece of Jesuitry subsidized by the Jesuits themselves.

Jesus. The name is the Greek and Latin corruption of the Hebrew name Jeshua, the later or post-Exilic form of the older Joshua. As his followers call him the Messiah in the Gospels, this word, meaning "Anointed," was, in the Greek form, *Christos* [see], added to Jesus. He is also called Jesus of Nazareth from his supposed birth-place, but there is no trace of such a place in contemporaries, and the practice of modern religious writers of identifying it with the existing En-Nazira is very precarious and disputed. He is said to have been born about 4 B.C., early Christian writers having, it is contended, made a mistake in dating the commencement of the Christian era. For the overwhelming majority of people, Christians or non-Christians, his life and death are described in the four Gospels, and this account is lightly assumed in general and periodical, even in much historical, literature. Some Rationalists believe that the more critical view now pervades the Churches, but nine-tenths of the 200 works about Jesus published in the last five years (1935-1940) proceed on the traditional lines, and voluminous biographies based upon the Gospels (Hall Caine, Conrad Noel, J. Baikie, etc.) are almost as profitable as ever. On no other point in modern culture is there so flagrant a discrepancy between scholarship and general literature and belief. Even Christian scholars are well aware that [see Attis; Horus; Mithra; Osiris; etc.] the Greek-Roman world at that time saw the cult everywhere of miraculously-born, slain,

and resuscitated gods. Since the crucifixion of a Jewish rebel was common in those days [see *Crucifixion*], this does not raise any presumption against the belief that a man named Jesus was thus executed, but it shakes the basis of the Gospel story of Jesus and the theological interpretation of it; yet Christmas and Easter inspire year by year editorials which assume that only an eccentric few are sceptical. On the other hand, it has been shown, in the article on the Gospels, that on the ordinary canons of history they have no biographical value whatever, and it is further shown that not one of the moral sentiments they attribute to Jesus is novel or original. Hence Rationalist lives of Jesus (Renan, Clodd, etc.) on non-miraculous lines are now only of literary interest, and even scholars who are prominent members of the Churches admit with Dr. Inge that "no real biography of Jesus can ever be written" (*Christian Ethics and Modern Problems*, 1930, p. 43). Biblical critics are fairly agreed that the oldest part of the Gospel narrative is the account of the trial and execution of Jesus, and the few professional historians, such as Guignebert and Loisy, who have ventured to make a thorough study of the subject—as a rule the historical authorities on Rome, Greece, and the East in the first century discreetly avoid the subject—and experts on the religions of the time, like Frazer, conclude that there probably or certainly was a Jewish prophet, a rebel against the official cult, who was executed in Jerusalem, but about whom we have no further reliable knowledge. This agrees with the fundamental note of the Pauline Epistles [see], the preaching of a crucified god-man, which (or such of them as are generally accepted as genuine) precede the earliest of the Gospels. There is, however, a critical school, to which we return presently, which regards the whole of the Epistles as spurious or contends that in the genuine Epistles Paul does not refer to an historical personality.

Apart from these Gospels and Epistles we have few and slight documentary references to Jesus of a sufficiently early date to be useful. Since there was nothing unusual about the appearance

of a new religion in the Greek-Roman world, and its votaries were small and obscure groups in the great cities during the first century, the historian does not confidently expect such references. The Jewish historian Josephus ought, perhaps, to be an exception, and it is claimed that his silence provides a strong argument against the historicity of Jesus. The long passage in his *Ancient History of the Jews* (XVIII, 3, 3) is so generally admitted by scholars to be an interpolation that it is negligible. There is, however, in the case of these Christian interpolations always the suspicion that the passage was substituted for one which was not acceptable to Christians, and the assurance of Origen (*Contra Celsum*, I, 47) that Josephus did not recognize Jesus as the Messiah seems to refer to some suppressed passage in his history. The work of the rival Jewish historian Justus of Tiberias is lost, and one would hardly expect to find a reference to Jesus in the dreamy philosopher Philo Judæus, who, indeed, wrote long before Josephus and at a time when the sect was in its cradle. Of the rabbis of the first and second centuries we have only the oral traditions of the schools that were collected in the second century and are in the oldest part of the Talmud. In an examination of these, Dr. S. Kraus (*Das Leben Jesu nach Jüdischen Quellen*, 1902), R. T. Herford (*Christianity in Talmud and Midrash*, 1903), and the writer on Jesus in the *Jewish Encyclopedia*, conclude from a few anonymous and disdainful references to "a certain man," etc., that they admitted the historical character of Jesus. M. Friedländer (*Die religiösen Bewegungen innerhalb des Judentums im Zeitalter Jesu*, 1905) criticizes Herford's book at some length, but this almost entirely concerns references to Christians in the Talmud, and he admits a few references to Jesus. It has weight with many that the Jews never questioned the historicity of Jesus or connected him with any pre-Christian cult of theirs. Dr. Drews (*Witnesses to the Historicity of Jesus*, 1912, p. 17) says that the apologist Justin (*Dialogue*, VIII, 3) makes his (fictitious) Jew Trypho question if there had ever been such a person, but Drews wrongly

translates the passage, which is given correctly in Conybeare's *Historical Christ* (1914, p. 108).

When we turn to Roman literature we must remember that for more than 100 years the Christians lived a very obscure life in a squalid district (Vatican) outside the city walls, and Greek was their liturgical and common language. It is still more important to understand that we have only part of the historical literature of the time. Dr. Couchoud is the only writer of the mythical school who mentions that Tacitus names several Latin historians of the first century whose works, from which (especially the history of Nero's time by Clavius Rufus) he borrowed material, are lost, and in Prof. J. W. Duff's standard *Literary History of Rome in the Silver Age* (1927) we have the names of ten Roman writers on history, between A.D. 70 and 100, whose works have not survived. Hence, if the reference to Christ and Christians in Tacitus (*Annals*, XV, 44, written about 117) is the first in Roman literature as we have it, we must be cautious. It is too emphatically claimed sometimes that the passage is an interpolation. It is in fact generally admitted as genuine by experts on the works of Tacitus (see the latest edition, that of Halm), and not challenged by the most scholarly writer of the mythical school, Dr. Couchoud. Drews has led many astray by his statement that it is not found in manuscripts until the fifteenth century, when Poggio Bracciolini—a strange enthusiast for religion, since he was the most obscene writer of the time—he says, inserted it. Conybeare (*The Historical Christ*, p. 162) shows that the passage is in the oldest manuscript (eleventh century), which is in the Laurentian Library at Florence. Pliny the younger, who probably wrote a few years before Tacitus, reported to the Emperor Trajan, in a famous letter (No. 96), that Christians were numerous in Bithynia and sang hymns to Christ "as to a god" (i.e., in the character of a god); and a few years after Tacitus, or about 120, we have, in the *Lives of the Cæsars* (Ch. XXV) of Suetonius, an account of riots at Rome "stirred up by one Chrestos." It would be a singular coincidence if some unknown *Chrestos*

were to cause trouble among the Jews at Rome just when they were agitated about the question of *Christos*, but few of the critics notice that we have an unequivocal reference to Christians and the persecution of them by Nero in Suetonius's life of that Emperor; and with this the Letter of the Romans to the Corinthians [see], written about the year 96—Loisy and a very few others put it in the second century—is in agreement.

Since, however, the sources used by Tacitus have perished, and by the second century any Roman could learn the outline of the story of Jesus from Christians, the value of these testimonies may be variously estimated. The outstanding fact is that what nine-tenths of our literature still declares to be the most important event of all time is one of the most obscure and most feebly attested events of the first century—a century of rich literature—yet very few of the professors of ancient history, who fasten upon the most trivial obscurities, ever subject it to a serious inquiry. Their facile acceptance of the conventional belief is challenged by several modern writers, who conclude that there never was such an historical person as Jesus. The idea was put forward in 1794 by Dupuis (*Origines de tous les cultes*, 3 vols.), and half a century later Strauss's *Life of Jesus* (Engl. trans., 1844), which was discussed all over Europe, dissolved the greater part of the Gospel story into myth. J. M. Robertson took up the work in the later years of the last century and devoted nearly thirty years to it (*Christianity and Mythology*, 1900, *Pagan Christs*, 1903, *The Historical Jesus*, 1916, *The Jesus Problem*, 1917, and *Jesus and Judas*, 1927). W. B. Smith, professor of mathematics and philosophy at various American universities, began to write (in German) on the same lines in 1906, and gave his mature views in English in *Ecce Deus* (1912). Dr. Drews, teacher of philosophy in a German High School, joined the group with his *Christusmythe* (Engl. trans. *The Christ Myth*), and *Witnesses to the Historicity of Jesus* (1912), and the Orientalist Prof. Jensen, who is for some reason ignored by the others, though the most eminent

scholar of the group, contended that the Jesus myth was based upon the Epic of Gilgamesh (*Hat der Jesus der Evangelien wirklich gelebt?* 1910). In France E. Dujardin, novelist and playwright of distinction, contributed *Sources of the Christian Tradition*, 1911, *Ancient History of the God Jesus*, 1938, etc., and Dr. P. L. Couchoud, a medical man with considerable Oriental culture, gave his support (*The Enigma of Jesus*, 1924, *The Creation of Christ*, 2 vols., 1939). In England the philosophic writer T. Whittaker, and L. G. Rylands, supported Robertson in denying the historicity of Jesus, and a number of European literary men—G. Brandes, P. Alfario, A. Bayet, V. Macchioro, R. Stahl, B. Van Eysinga, etc.—lent their assistance.

On the constructive side the writers differ very materially. Robertson, Smith, and Dujardin contend that the story of Jesus is the humanization of a pre-Christian God Jesus (Jeshua or Joshua), who had been worshipped in Palestine before the arrival of the Hebrews, and whose cult lingered after the victory of Jahveh in obscure groups, mainly in Galilee, which had an annual mystery-play or pageant of his sufferings and crucifixion. Robertson's books are chiefly occupied with an attempt to trace details of the Gospel story to contemporary mythologies. Conybeare severely criticizes this attempt in his *Historical Christ* (1914), and Robertson replies in his later works. Drews believes that the Messiah-figure in *Isaiah* is the source of the myth, and puts an astral interpretation on many details. Couchoud finds the origin in Paul's alleged vision, and Rylands (*The Beginnings of Gnostic Christianity*, 1941) looks to pre-Christian Gnostic speculations. Prof. Van Manen (who regards all the the Pauline Epistles as spurious), Prof. Guignebert (*Jesus*, 1935), Prof. Loisy (*Naissance du christianisme*, 1933), Prof. Kirsopp Lake (*The Beginnings of Christianity*, 1920), and Prof. Wenley (*Modern Thought and the Crisis of Belief*, 1909), the leading academic authorities who have made a personal study of the problem, insist on the historicity of Jesus while differing considerably about the amount of bio-

graphical matter we may admit. Sir J. G. Frazer, the highest authority on the mythology of the time, wrote, in 1913 (footnote to *The Scapegoat*, vol. VI of the 1913 edition of the *Golden Bough*), that "the doubts which have been cast on the historical reality of Jesus are in my judgment unworthy of serious attention," and in the introduction to the English translation of Couchoud's work (1924) says that the theory "seems to create more difficulties than it solves" (p. xiv). See also A. D. Howell Smith's *Jesus not a Myth*, and Archibald Robertson's *Jesus: Myth or History?* (Thinkers' Library).

Many (including the present writer) are content to infer broadly, from the scanty reliable evidence and the religious developments of the first century, that probably some Jew named Jesus adopted the Persian belief [see *Avesta*] in the end of the world and, thinking that it was near, left his Essenian monastery [see *Essenes*] to warn his fellows, and was put to death. They feel that the question of historicity has little importance now that we have shown the falseness of the claim which Modernists and writers on Jesus like Bousset and Schweitzer, who surrender the divinity of Christ, put forward—that Jesus was unique in personality and far superior to every contemporary moralist. Christian scholars themselves rebuke this kind of pulpit-rhetoric masquerading as a new theology. "Let us remember," says Prof. Du Bose (*Turning Points in My Life*, 1912, p. 115), "that Our Lord taught absolutely nothing new." Prof. K. Lake and Prof. Foakes Jackson, leading scholars of the American and Anglican Church (*The Beginnings of Christianity*, 1920, I, 288), Prof. Wenley, and other Christian professors agree. For evidence on this important point see McCabe's *Sources of the Morality of the Gospels* (1914), in which (pp. 210–297) a Jewish or pagan parallel is given for every single sentiment attributed to Jesus in the Gospels, and it is shown (pp. 174–203) that even the Parables [see] are taken from Jewish sources. Modern glorifications of Jesus are based mainly upon these sentiments and parables, yet the writers betray a complete ignorance of the contemporary

religions and moralists to which they declare Jesus to be far superior. Apart from these the very scanty biographical details even as given in the Gospels [see *Mark*] do not justify the claim of a "unique personality," and they include defects (occasional bad temper, vituperation of and injustice to opponents, credulity about devils and disease, etc.) which make the Gospel Jesus actually inferior to dozens of characters in ancient literature and put him on a very common level of decent humanity. Once the romantic idea of Jesus is destroyed—too many Rationalist writers have adopted this without study—the question of his historicity has only a speculative interest. As to "Jesus in history," and the inflated claims for the influence of his teaching, see the scores of articles in this work which give a correct account of character and the social order between the establishment of Christianity in the fourth century and the general advance of scepticism in the nineteenth.

Jesus ben Pandira (or ben Panthera). A vague character, regarded by many as mythical, of Jewish literature who is said to have been stoned and hanged on a tree (not crucified) in the reign of Alexander Jannæus (106–79 B.C.). Many Jewish writers (Dr. S. Kraus in his *Leben Jesu in Jüdischen Quellen*, 1902, the *Jewish Encyclopædia*, etc.), and Dr. Lightfoot, hold that there is here a chronological error, and the character is really Jesus of Nazareth. The account in the *Sepher Toldoth Jeshua* is worthless, as we have no references to such a book until the early Middle Ages—Conybeare says the fifth, but others the ninth, century. It is believed to be a fictional Jewish attack on Jesus based upon references in the Talmud. The story itself is certainly much older than the *Toldoth*, and much of the indignation of recent Christian writers at references to it is based upon ignorance. In his work *Against Celsus* (I, 32), Origen (about 165–70) refers to a Jewish tradition that Jesus was the illegitimate son of a Roman officer named Panthera. The Benedictine editors of Origen (Migne edition), who are far more candid and learned than Catholic writers to-day, comment on

this passage that there is the same statement in the Talmud—it is true that in an anonymous reference to Jesus it is said that he was illegitimate and that the Jewish authorities had his correct genealogy—and they quote various earlier Fathers of the Church giving the name Panthera to the father of Mary or of Joseph. It is impossible to disentangle any reliable statement from the literature or to determine if there was a Jesus ben Pandira before Christ.

Jews, The. The word "Jew" is a corruption, through the French, of the Greek and Latin for Judæan or descendant of Judah. The Hebrews [see], as it is proper to call them before the Captivity, split into two kingdoms, that of Israel in the north (Samaria) and that of Judah in the south. After the Captivity (586–536) they were bitterly hostile to each other, and the cult of Jahveh was organized in the south, to which a large number of the descendants of the exiles returned from Babylonia. From that time we get an antithesis of Samaritans and Jews, or Judæans. Both remained poor and obscure, so that Herodotus never mentions them, and they did not attract the attention of Alexander. Judæa, as a province of Egypt, passed to the Ptolemies, and then to the Seleucids, until the wars of independence, in the second century B.C. The chief interest in their history after the fifth century is that the poverty and troubles of Judæa led to an increasing flow of migration to Egypt, Babylonia, and Phœnicia. When Alexandria, a short sea-voyage from Palestine, became a great city it attracted large numbers and brought them under the influence of Greek culture. Some experts attribute a special influence to a body of followers of Pythagoras in Alexandria, who are held to explain the appearance of the ascetic Therapeuts, Essenes, and Pharisees on the one hand, and the new Jewish mysticism (Odes of Solomon, Philo Judæus, etc.) on the other. See *Dispersal*, Prof. Guignebert's *Jewish World in the Time of Jesus* (1939), and Isidore Lévy, *La légende de Pythagore* (1927). In the later history of the Jews the outstanding facts are the savagery of the treatment they received in Christian countries and, in contrast

to this, their splendid contributions to civilization in co-operation with the Arabs and Persians as long as these were under liberal or sceptical Caliphs. In Spain, particularly, they were conspicuous in every field of culture as well as in industry and trade, and, since the Arabs had no incentive to travel from rich and beautiful Andalusia into the bleak Christian lands, it was Jewish merchants who stirred Europe and roused it from the Dark Age—apart from the direct contact of the South of France and Barcelona—by displaying the products and teaching the science of Moslem Spain and Sicily. See W. J. Fishel, *The Jews in the Economic and Political Life of Mediæval Islam* (1937), *The Cambridge Mediæval History* (vol. VI, p. 478), and (for a summary of their achievements) McCabe's *Splendour of Moorish Spain* (1935, Ch. XVII). For post-mediæval history see M. Raisin, *A History of the Jews in Modern Times* (vol. VI of Graetz's *Popular History of the Jews*, 1930 ed.).

Joan of Arc (1412–1431). The recent canonization of Joan has led to a general acceptance in literature of the Catholic or romantic legend of the "Maid of Orleans," confirmed by the popularity of G. B. Shaw's brilliant but in important respects gravely unhistorical play. It would not be relevant here to discuss the "miracle" of her military career, but experts point out that in all victories over the English she (or the French) had superior forces and abler commanders. The chief point of interest is the charge of witchcraft. French studies of her (Michelet, A. France, Detheil, etc.) have a patriotic bias, and A. Lang's *Maid of France* (1908) is not on the usual critical level of the author because he has the conventional and wholly wrong conception of a witch. [See *Witchcraft*.] J. M. Robertson's *Mr. Shaw and the Maid* (1925) soundly criticizes Shaw's extraordinary idea of a trial by the Inquisition, but, from the same misunderstanding of the nature of witchcraft, makes no serious inquiry into the question whether Joan was a witch. The first adequate and correct account, in English, of witchcraft is Prof. Margaret Murray's fine piece of research *The*

Witch-Cult in Central Europe (1921). Mrs. Murray approaches the question of Joan with the requisite knowledge, and concludes that "the conduct of her associates during her military career as well as the evidence at her trial bear out the fact that she belonged to the ancient religion, not to the Christian" (pp. 271-276). She returns to the subject in *The God of the Witches* (1933, pp. 174-191). Whether Joan belonged to the witch-organization—perhaps dedicated to it as a child by her mother, as was common—is certainly not a question that can now be disdainfully dismissed as it was by earlier writers. Her closest friend was Marshal Gilles de Rais, an admitted Satanist, and her answers to questions at her trial—the record was published by Quicherat in 1841—betray very curious reserves in and modifications of her profession of Christianity. It must be understood that girls of her age quite commonly were witches—one would almost say, on the records, much more commonly than old women.

Joan, Pope. In the Middle Ages, especially in the licentious period from the thirteenth to the seventeenth century, when every kind of sex-story was relished, the legend of a female Pope, who embarrassed the Papal Court by her pregnancy, was very popular. Her "pontificate" was said to be from 855 to 858, which, we have every reason to believe, was, as stated in all lists of the Popes, the period of the pontificate of Benedict III. The Papal Court was in fact gross and half-barbaric, as is described by the monk-secretary of Charlemagne, Eginhard, in his *Annals*, but it was not until centuries later that the lascivious story of Joan appeared. The real interest of it is that it was extraordinarily popular during just those centuries when the Church is supposed to have kept Europe pious, virtuous, and devoted to the Papacy; so popular that Joan was included in the series of busts of Popes in Siena Cathedral. The statement that from 858 onward the cardinals took measures to verify the sex of a candidate for the Papacy must, like the legend of Joan, be regarded as popular fiction of the erotic later Middle Ages.

Job. It illustrates the reaction of our time to find one of the latest encyclopædias, the *Americana*, describing the book *Job* as "the supreme masterpiece of ancient Hebrew literature." It is very doubtful if the writer was a Hebrew, and it is unknown when and where the book was written. The general belief is that it belongs to the fourth century B.C. and was written by a sceptic—a recent plausible theory is that he was a Babylonian—but some Jewish writer in that age of forgeries turned it into the Word of God by a few modifications and by giving it a happy ending. Prof. S. A. Cook says that there was a work about a Babylonian King who was similarly tried by afflictions and ultimately reconciled (*The Old Testament*, 1936, p. 85).

John, The Gospel of. As stated in the article *Gospels*, the book which bears the title "according to John" is generally admitted to belong to the second century and has, therefore, no biographical value. It, especially in the opening part, reflects the age when mystic or Gnostic speculation was applied to the story of Jesus. Loisy temperately assigns it to 130-135. Conybeare dismisses it as "a pious romance" in which "the Logos masquerades across the stage in a human form."

John X (ruled 914-28), Pope. One of the many scandalous Popes of the Iron Age. Bishop Liutprand, contemporary bishop of Cremona and one of the few cultivated writers of the time—note that he belonged to the Lombard part of Italy—tells us that John, while Archbishop of Ravenna, was the notorious lover of one of the chief ladies (who could not write their names) of the Roman "nobility," Theodora (*Antapodosis*, II, 48), and he was raised to the Papal throne by her and her family. Cardinal Baronius, the "father of Catholic history," admits this, and it is on account of Theodora and her two daughters that he calls this section of Papal history "the Rule of the Whores" [see]. John quarrelled with Theodora's even more brazen daughter Marozia (mother of one Pope and mistress of another), and she had him murdered. So the *Annals of Beneventum* (in the

Monumenta Germaniæ, Vol. V), written by contemporary monks, as well as Liutprand.

John XI (ruled 931–6), Pope. According to the official biographical record of the Popes, the *Liber Pontificalis* (Engl. trans. *The Book of the Popes*, 1916), itself, he was the son of Pope Sergius III, and Abbot Flodoard, one of the most conscientious writers of the time, says, in his *Annals* (year 933), that his mother was Marozia, the worst of the three “whores” (*scorta*) of Cardinal Baronius, who agrees. He was a worthless nonentity, thrust into the Papal chair by his mother.

John XII (ruled 955–64), Pope. Son of the brutal ruler of Rome, Alberic, a son of Marozia (see preceding paragraphs), who seized power from, and probably murdered, his mother and made his son Pope at the age of eighteen. John had been wildly corrupt from boyhood in his father's palace (and harem), and Bishop Liutprand (*De Rebus Gestis Othonis*) and the monk annalist Benedict of Soracte describe him as a monster of vice in the Papal chair. He was denounced to the Emperor Otto for incest, rape, and turning the Papal Palace into a “brothel.” The Roman clergy who took oath on the charges (adding chronic drunkenness, unnatural vice, etc.) said that he castrated cardinals and cut out the eyes of priests who protested. Bishop Liutprand was present at the trial. As it did not at the moment suit the Emperor's interests to condemn him, he said that John was “just a boy” and they must let him sow his wild oats. This is the period of the Ottonian Renaissance [see], which certain American historians have “discovered,” asking us to use the expression Dark Age no longer. After one of the longest reigns of the tenth century he was slain by the husband of a woman he had (apparently) raped.

John XIII (ruled 965–72), Pope. Son of a bishop and a descendant of the licentious Theodora. For his greed and nepotism he was driven from the city by the Romans, and when the Emperor restored him he wreaked his vengeance with a savagery which shocked all Italy. The body of the Prefect (Mayor), who had died meantime, was dug up and

torn to pieces. His successor was suspended by his hair for a time, then led naked on an ass through the city. Twelve Tribunes of the people were hanged and many other Romans executed or mutilated. Catholics count him one of the “good Popes” of the period, as he is not charged with rape and adultery.

John XXIII (ruled 1410–15), Pope. A brutal Neapolitan adventurer, said by some of the best contemporary writers to have been a pirate in his youth, who won his way to the cardinalate by ferocity in leading the Papal troops and raising large sums for the Popes by an infamous traffic in sacred offices. The German–Roman lawyer Dietrich von Neheim (*De Schismate*), the best-informed and most conscientious writer of the time, says that Cardinal Cossa, as he then was, corrupted 200 girls while he was Papal Legate at Bologna, and levied commissions on the gamblers and prostitutes of the city. He was elected Pope by a majority of the cardinals, but was deposed by the Council of Constance [see Hus] under pressure from the Emperor Sigismund (who certainly corrupted as many girls as the Pope). The indictment of his character which the great gathering of more than 400 cardinals and prelates drew up, while 1,000 prostitutes enlivened the city, runs to seventy-two articles, and includes every known crime and vice. Pope John was sent into a comfortable retirement, and John Hus was burned. The Dark Age had ended two centuries earlier. See E. J. Kitto, *Pope John the Twenty-Third and Master John Hus of Bohemia* (1910).

Johnson, Richard Mentor (1780–1850), Vice-President of the United States. A Kentucky lawyer who was promoted to the Vice-Presidency in 1837 and held it to 1841. Johnson wrote nothing on religion, but his Rationalism was well known by his invariable opposition to any measure which meant a new clerical encroachment on freedom, the Sunday, etc.

Johnston, Sir Harry Hamilton, K.C.B., G.C.M.G. (1858–1927), ethnologist. He was trained in both art and science (zoology and anatomy), but took up

Colonial service in Africa, rising to the positions of Consul-General for Central Africa, Consul-General for the Regency of Tunis, and Special Commissioner to Uganda. He had the Gold Medal of the Royal Geographical Society and many other academic honours, and few colonial administrators had as high a repute for conscientious service. In 1918 he gave the Conway Memorial Lecture, and he contributed to the Ethical symposium *A Generation of Religious Progress* (1916). "Let us," he wrote, "serve man before we waste our time in genuflexions and sacrifices to any power outside this planet" (p. 29). Sir Harry was a decided Agnostic (personal knowledge).

Jordan, President David Starr, M.D., Ph.D., LL.D. (1851-1931), American biologist. He was professor of biology, and later of geology, at Butler University and President of it 1885-91. As President of Leland Stanford University 1891-1913, he was one of the most influential and most respected scientific men in America, combining a high social idealism with a wide culture. He was Chief Director of the World's Peace Foundation, President of the American Association for the Advancement of Science (1908), and President of the World Peace Congress (1915). Jordan was a Theist, but quite outspoken about his rejection of Christianity. "The creeds have no permanence in the human heart," he wrote (*The Stability of Truth*, 1911, p. 44). He explains his views also in *The Religion of a Sensible American* (1909).

Joshua. The name of the last book of the Hexateuch [see], bringing the legendary history of the Hebrews as far as the conquest of Canaan. It takes its name from the alleged military leader of the Hebrews at the time, and is supposed by Fundamentalists and Catholics to have been, with the exception of the last few verses, written by him; as the Ezraist "redactors" of the book intended readers to believe. Biblical scholars regard it as part of the post-Exilic reconstruction and expansion of Hebrew literature by the priestly party in their own interest. The very name Joshua—possibly at one time Jehoshua—is obscure, and the bearer has been

represented by different writers as an historical person, a fictitious character, a solar myth, and a primitive Canaanite god. One group of the writers who deny the historicity of Jesus adopt the latter theory, and Dujardin summarizes what he regards as the evidence in his latest book, *La première génération chrétienne* (1935, p. 385). Biblical critics think the figure "purely legendary," but find some interest in the book by dissecting out fragments of an older narrative which, instead of depicting the miraculous march of the Israelites as a body, tells how the various Semitic tribes who became the Hebrews (or "people from beyond the river") slipped into the land from the desert at different dates. This agrees with the most plausible version of the early history of the Hebrews [see].

Josephus, Flavius (37-95), Jewish historian. An accomplished citizen of Jerusalem who, in concern about the tendencies of the fanatics, went to Rome in the year 64 and tried to effect a reconciliation. During his long stay in Rome he wrote the valuable and not inelegant historical works for which he is often quoted (*The Jewish War* and *The Antiquities of the Jews*). His very full and sympathetic account of the Essenes [see] leads many to infer that he had been reared in one of their monasteries or had at least belonged to the sect. The passage about Christ in the *Antiquities*, as we have the book, is generally rejected as an interpolation or as a substitution for a less complimentary reference. Origen [see Jesus] implies that he did mention Jesus.

Jowett, Prof. Benjamin, M.A., LL.D. (1817-93), Hellenist. He was Regius Professor of Greek at Oxford, Master of Balliol, and (1882-6) Vice-Chancellor of the University. Jowett never rejected his clerical Orders, but he was important as not only one of the leading scholars of his time, but a very liberalizing influence in the University and the Church. He rejected not only the Christian creed, but the idea of a personal God, and he was very sceptical about immortality. In the *Life and Letters* he says that "Voltaire has done more good than all the Fathers of the Church put together" (II, 38), and

"whether we shall recognize others in another life we cannot tell" (II, 91). In *The Letters of B. Jowett* he says to Sir R. Morier, in a letter written a year before his death: "I fear that we are both rather tending to some degree of Agnosticism" (p. 236).

Juarez, Benito Pablo (1806-72), President of the Republic of Mexico. An Indian by birth, he was educated in a seminary, but he became a Rationalist and studied for the Bar. He was appointed a Judge of the Civil Court in 1842, and five years later Governor of Oaxaca. The high character of his administration won for him the repute of being the ablest statesman in the country. He became Minister of Justice and of Ecclesiastical Affairs, in which character he severely checked the privileges of the corrupt clergy and the reactionary army. He was Chief Justice in 1857, and President from 1858 to 1862 and from 1867 to 1872. His memory is as deeply venerated in Mexico as it is execrated in the Church.

Jubilee Year. A year of special religious festivities occasionally held in Rome. The Press, which always reports it at length, does not emphasize its true aim, which is, by confining the "spiritual privileges" to the churches of Rome itself, to attract as many rich foreign Catholics as possible, and never recalls the origin and history of the institution, when it had a nakedly sordid aim. Before the year 1300 Rome had celebrated a supposed centenary year, but Pope Boniface VIII [see], afterwards indicted by the Church itself for notorious scepticism, vice, and defence of vice, then instituted the Jubilee Year. It was estimated by contemporaries that 30,000 pilgrims arrived daily, and one of them tells how "day and night two clerics stood at the altar of St. Peter with rakes and drew off the infinite sums of money." This was one of the commercial applications of the doctrine of indulgences [see]. Later Popes found that, since the span of Christ's life was thirty-three years, there was no need to wait a hundred years for a Jubilee.

Judgment, The Last. Catholics and some Protestants distinguish between a Particular Judgment (of each soul

immediately after death) and a General or Last Judgment. The idea is familiar in Paul and is found in the Gospels (*Mark* viii, 38, etc.). Lurid sketches of the "Last Day" in *Revelation* suggest that the early Christians got the idea from Jewish apocalyptic literature, but the ultimate source is clearly the Persian religion. The general Semitic attitude was one of indifference to the obscure hereafter and to stress that the gods punished misconduct in this life—a theory which led to such scepticism as we find in *Ecclesiastes* and *Job*. The Persians reacted with their vivid belief in the life after death, in which Ahura Mazda punished the wicked and rewarded the good. Going beyond the Egyptian religion, the Persian assumed a complete final triumph of justice by a destruction of the world and general roll-call and judgment of the dead. The idea is obscure in the early part of the Avesta [see], but very definite in later, though pre-Christian, Persian literature. From the third century B.C. onward this literature had considerable influence on the Jews, and the idea of a "last day" and division of "the sheep and the goats" was very familiar in the world in which Christianity developed.

Juggernaut (properly Jaggernath). A Hindu deity in connection with which English writers still retail a discredited story of people throwing themselves under "the car of Juggernaut." It is suggested that the myth arose originally from the accidental crushing of some pilgrim or pilgrims in the crowded street. Jaggernath, probably a local aspect of Vishnu or some aboriginal deity, had a large temple at Puri and a great festival at which the ugly black idol was drawn through the streets on a wheeled tower, the devotees dragging it by ropes. It naturally got along so slowly that it is difficult even to imagine a man accidentally falling under the wheels. The cult by no means favoured human sacrifice.

Julian, Flavius Claudius Julianus (331-63), Roman Emperor. He was a boy of six in the palace at Constantinople when his uncle, the Emperor Constantine, died, and Constantine's sons had, their uncles and cousins

(except Julian and his elder brother Gallus) murdered. The first Christian palace, with bishops in high honour, swam with blood. The three sons, who divided the Empire—one of them was as corrupt as Nero—resorted to civil wars until only Constantius survived as sole ruler, the Christian body at the same time seething with the sanguinary struggle of the Arians and the orthodox. Julian, meantime, brooded over the fallen glories of pagan Greece, and it is hardly surprising that at his accession to the throne he repudiated Christianity and tried to restore the old religion. He did not persecute the Church, though by this time the bishops had obtained several persecution decrees against the pagans from his cousin. He proved a good soldier and a high-minded reformer, but he was killed in battle after a reign of two years. The story that when he was wounded he cried, "Thou hast conquered, Galilæan," is one of the very numerous inventions of that golden age of forgery. See F. A. Ridley, *Julian the Apostate* (1937), or the English translation of G. Negri's brilliant *Julian the Apostate* (1905).

Julius II (ruled 1503–13), Pope. Giuliano della Rovere was one of the peasant nephews, and a Franciscan friar, whom Pope Sixtus IV (himself a high Franciscan official and one of the "good Popes") brought from their monasteries to share his new wealth in Rome. One of the nephews, Pietro Riario, killed himself in a few years by his scandalous extravagance and exotic vices. Giuliano, though at once raised to the cardinalate, preferred military service and hunting, and led the Papal armies. He was notoriously immoral, and no one questions that he had three acknowledged daughters, gambled heavily, and swore and drank like any other soldier; but Catholic historians refuse to admit the charge of one of the leading nobles of the time, that he was addicted to unnatural vice. From 1484 onward he maintained a murderous and very corrupt rivalry with Cardinal Borgia for the Papacy, which he secured in 1503 by gorgeous promises to the cardinal electors which he repudiated when he got the tiara. It was Julius who, raising funds by even worse

simony than his predecessors had practised, adorned Rome with its magnificent edifices, and this artistic splendour is now used to overshadow the very grave defects of his character as Pope. He was a thoroughly unprincipled secular monarch—"as revolting as the frank unscrupulousness of Alexander VI," the lenient Bishop Creighton says—trying to win back the Papal States, still drinking and cursing deeply, by a lifetime of fighting. His rage and intemperance were notorious to the end. We have to resent the modern practice of implying that Papal vice ended with Alexander VI. Roman corruption continued for more than a century. [See Counter-Reformation.] The best biography is still M. Brosch's *Papst Julius II* (1878), but a summary, with contemporary authorities, will be found in McCabe's *Crises in the History of the Papacy* (1916), Ch. XIII.

Jus Primae Noctis. A mediæval Latin phrase meaning "the right to the first night"; that is to say, the right of the feudal lord to have the bride of one of his serfs to sleep with him on the wedding night. The readiness of some modern historians to repeat that this is another wicked myth of the Rationalist historians of the last century is amusing. They have adopted an entirely false estimate of mediæval regard for chastity, as scores of articles in this work prove, and seem to be unaware that in some parts of the Catholic world to-day a husband considers it a praiseworthy act to lend his wife to a visiting traveller. The present writer, travelling in Mexico, proposed to visit a western district, but found that there were no hotels or inns, and any peasant who put him up would insist on this courtesy. It was common in the Middle Ages. Instead of being a Rationalist discovery, the right was learnedly discussed early in the last century by the zealous Catholic writer Louis Veuillot, who (fully admitting it) traced it, fantastically, to the pious zeal of early Church Councils in ordering married folk to abstain on the "first night" or "night of the Lord" (Sunday). In French historical literature the *Droit du seigneur* is as commonly noted as any other right, and there are plenty of

documents referring to the redemption of this and of equally indelicate rights (see, especially, Dufour's *Histoire de la prostitution*, 6 vols., 1851-61). Bede tells how English nobles in his time took the serf-women whenever they pleased, and sold them when they became pregnant. Frazer's inquiry in his *Folk-Lore in the Old Testament* (1918) shows only that it was not stipulated in Scottish law, and Schmidt's *Jus Primae Noctis* proves only that it was not universally recognized. The discussion is otiose, as during the greater part of the Feudal Age serfs were not protected by Law, and the noble or his chief officials took any woman that pleased them.

Justice, The Christian preaching of. Since, in modern times, the stress of apologetic work was shifted from doctrinal to ethical issues, a good deal has been made of the fact that the Gospels inculcate, and the Church has always preached, justice. In so far as this boast implies that the inculcation of justice began, or became more emphatic, 1,900 years ago, the historical statement is too crude for discussion. The Egyptian tomb-inscriptions, for several thousand years, insisted on justice, and see articles on **Asoka**; **Children**; **Hammurabi Code**; **Stoics**; **Woman**; **Workers**; etc. Many other articles show that, to whatever cause we assign the change, after the fourth century the great mass of the people entered upon a social order which was foully unjust as compared with the Greek-Roman [see **Christianity**; **Chivalry**; **Divorce**; **Philanthropy**; **Serfdom**; **Slavery**; etc.], and that the modern struggle for social justice grew with the spread of scepticism and had, considering the relative proportion of sceptics and Christians until less than a century ago, a remarkable number of sceptical leaders [see **Democracy**; **Social Justice**; **Woman**; etc.]. It will, before long, be recognized as a platitude of history that the period 450-1850 was one of deep injustice between the old pagan order and the new. Positivists and other non-Christians, who insist that the preaching of justice by so powerful an organization as the Church *must* have promoted it in a high degree, rarely evince a close study of the question whether in fact it

did. One needs little reflection to see where the preaching of justice fails as long as you leave it to your hearers to say what is or is not just, especially when the preacher belongs to the class which would, on a strict application of justice, have to give rather than receive. Gregory I, the greatest slave-owner in Europe, was as eloquent about justice as Luther exhorting the nobles to shoot down the rebellious peasants "like mad dogs." Leo XIII, vaguely demanding a "just wage" for the workers and refusing to define it when asked to do so, talked just as fervently about justice as did the English bishops who opposed the Reform Bill or education, or the Catholic bishops who blessed the vile persecution of democrats in Spain and Italy in the last century and unctuously blessed Fascism in our time. Our pragmatic age is more interested in facts; and they make a mockery of the preaching.

Justinian, The Emperor (483-565). The reputation of Justinian as a great and enlightened monarch, which lingers in our literature, and has recently been refreshed by Masefield's *Basilissa* (1940), is as undeserved as that of Constantine. For apologetic purposes it was necessary to have at least two "great" Christian monarchs in the five centuries which followed the establishment of the new religion. The youth of Justinian, who was, like his uncle the Emperor Justin, who promoted him, of peasant extraction, may be gathered from the fact that he married a loose actress who had the worst reputation for obscenity in Constantinople. [See **Theodora**.] Masefield's historical romance is richly informed about the vicious life of the Greeks, but quite false in its delineation of the characters of the Emperor and Empress (properly King and Queen, or Basileus and Basilissa). Bishop John of Ephesus, to whom Theodora was very generous, ingeniously, in a small extant Syriac work, calls her Theodora of the Brothel; and, though the purple persuaded her to alter many of her ways, she was ferocious in temper and quite unscrupulous. There is no evidence whatever of an improvement of the taste or character of Justinian after his accession. His Empire grew because,

in Narses and Belisarius, he had two outstanding commanders. Experts recognize no military capacity in the Emperor himself. Eulogists point to the Justinian Code, or reformed Code of Greek-Roman law, as a proof of his ability and beneficence, but it was notoriously compiled by Trebonian, his chief lawyer, who, as Dean Milman pointed out in his *History of Latin Christianity*, "has incurred the suspicion of atheism." It had, in any case, no influence on European law until the later Middle Ages, Sir Henry Maine says (*Ancient Law*, Pollock's edition, p. 305). Letoumeau points out that the really beneficent innovators in ancient law were Hadrian and Alexander Severus (or their Stoic lawyers).

Juvenal, Decimus Junius (about 55-130), Roman poet. A large part of the libel of the Romans of the first century by religious writers is derived from the satires of Juvenal. Experts, even Protestant historians like Sir Samuel Dill,

have repeatedly shown that statements in these are unreliable and often fantastic. Juvenal was by profession a rhetorician of a far from wealthy class, and had no personal knowledge of the life of the rich. In fact, his social diatribes generally refer to an earlier generation. Religious writers quote or hint at his lines on Messalina ("tired, but not yet sated with men") and her supposed frequenting of brothels, whereas she died in 48, and Juvenal did not write until 98. If a satirist of our time, not restrained by laws of libel and decency, were set to write about late Victorian times, we might have something like Juvenal. It is elementary history that in Juvenal's own time, under the Stoic (Epicurean) Emperors, Roman society was particularly sound, and in the class which the poet really knew, says Sir S. Dill, "female morality was probably as high as it ever was" (*Roman Society from Nero to Marcus Aurelius*, 1904, p. 76).

K.

Kabbala, The. [See Cabbala.]

Kames, Lord. [See Home, Henry.]

Kant, Immanuel (1724-1804), German philosopher. He was professor of logic and metaphysics at Königsberg University and the first and ablest of the long line of German philosophers between 1750 and 1850. Kant's early writings were on physics and mathematics and included a theory, based upon Descartes, of astronomical evolution (*Allgemeine Naturgeschichte des Himmels*, 1755). From science he turned to brooding over Hume's philosophy of knowledge, and in 1781 produced his famous *Critique of Pure Reason*, which he wrote in four months. The work was discussed all over Europe and, since in making intellectual knowledge subjective it destroyed the foundation of arguments for the existence of God, it greatly promoted scepticism. Alarmed at the revolutionary consequences and at the disturbed condition of the times, Kant then discovered that "practical reason" was different (*Critique of Practical Reason*, 1788). Moral intuitions, he said, were not subjective, like

intellectual, and they implied the existence of God and the immortality of the soul, since the moral imperative was "categorical" (independent of all experience or interests). The education and personality of Kant must here be taken into account. He had had a severe religious education and was a man of very isolated and rather eccentric life, and he assumed that his highly sophisticated conscience was a common human possession. His philosophy lasted little longer than that of Hegel, which displaced it. It is claimed that it had a considerable influence on law-reform.

Karlfeldt, Erik Axel (1864-1931), Swedish poet and Nobel Prize winner. Karlfeldt is the only one of the Nobel Prize Laureates who (very soundly) protested that he had no right to the prize because he was little known outside his own country, where he was greatly esteemed. Later the University of Minnesota published a translation of a selection of his poems (*Arcadia Borealis*, 1938), which show that he was an Agnostic of rather mystic tendency. In "A Vagrant" we find the couplet:

What's your religion? What is your creed?

I know only this: I know naught.

Keats, John (1795–1821), poet. At the age of fifteen he was apprenticed to a surgeon, and he became a licentiate in surgery. His poetical experiments won little recognition until *Hyperion* appeared, in 1820, and he was then already in consumption. Few seem to realize how pronounced a Rationalist the great poet was, yet some of his work is very outspoken, while the admiration of pagan days breathes through all of it. In a sonnet with the title "Written in Disgust of Popular Superstition" (1901 ed. of *Poems*, II, 174) he is very disdainful of the Christian creed, which is "dying like an outburnt lamp." W. Sharp, in his *Life of Severn* (1892), which is authoritative on the Shelley–Keats group, says that Shelley and Leigh Hunt persuaded Keats that "nothing in the world is provable," and he held that view until he died.

Keene, Charles Samuel (1823–91), artist. One of the best-known *Punch* artists of his time: also Gold Medallist of the 1890 Paris Exhibition. He was a thorough Rationalist. In his biography G. S. Layard tells us that during his last illness Holman Hunt tried to convince him of a future life. He said: "Do you really believe this? I can't think so" (*Life and Letters of C. S. Keene*, 1913, p. 423).

Keith, Sir Arthur, M.D., Sc.D., LL.D., F.R.C.S., F.R.S. (b. 1866), anatomist and anthropologist. He was secretary of the Anatomical Society of Great Britain 1899–1902, Fullerian Professor of Physiology at the Royal Institution 1917–23, President of the Royal Anthropological Institute 1912–14, and President of the British Association 1927. Equally distinguished in anatomy, physiology, and embryology, Sir Arthur is also one of the highest authorities on prehistoric man (chief work *The Antiquity of Man*, 2nd ed., 2 vols., 1925) and one of the chief defenders of Darwinism. His attitude to war as such has misled many, as he is one of the most humane and amiable of men. He is now Master of the Buckston Browne Research Farm and Curator of

Darwin House, and he is an Honorary Associate of the R.P.A.

Keith, George (1693–1778), tenth Earl Marischal. Having joined the Pretender, he was forced to fly to Spain, then to Prussia, where Frederic II appointed him Ambassador to Paris (and later Madrid). George II pardoned him, and he went to Scotland, but Frederic induced him to return to Prussia, where (Frederic said) "neither priests nor lawyers would trouble him." He was an accomplished man, a Deist and very anti-Christian. Mrs. E. E. Cathell (*The Scottish Friend of Frederic the Great*, 2 vols., 1915) says that "in almost every letter he writes there is a jibe against some sort or other of ecclesiastical lamas, as he called them." D'Alembert described him, in an oration delivered before the Berlin Academy, as "a man of pure and classic morals whom the best ages of Roman probity might have envied of our time." His brother, Marshal James Francis Edward Keith (1696–1758), was also a Deist, as appears from George's letters to Frederic. After flying from Scotland he became a General of the Russian Army and Governor of the Ukraine. Later he was a Marshal in the Prussian Army and one of Frederic's best generals.

Key, Ellen Karolina Sofia (1849–1926), Swedish writer. She was the daughter of the Countess S. Posse, but the family was impoverished and she became a teacher. Later she was known throughout Europe as one of the most advanced women writers, and had immense influence in Scandinavia. She was an Agnostic and contributed to Haeckel's *Monist*. Seven of her thirty novels are translated into English. L. Nyström, *Ellen Key* (1913).

King, The Chinese. The Chinese ancient "books" (as the word King means) are wrongly classed sometimes as "sacred" books, or the Chinese Bible. Confucius is considered to have written the first of the five classics, the Chun-ting, but all are true to the Confucian spirit and entirely secular. The one interest of the sage was to restore all that was best in Chinese tradition by getting together a collection of its finest literature (history, poetry, rites, etc.). The semi-barbarous Taoist Emperor

Shi-Wang ordered the destruction of the books in 213 B.C., but they were brought together again by the Han Emperors. The very plain and sober social ethic of the Confucian book on morals has preserved it from mystic contamination and given it an influence for 2,000 years which no Bible ever had. The unprogressiveness of China, in comparison with Europe during the last six or seven centuries, is a matter of geographical isolation. Under Confucian Emperors, especially of the Han and the Tang Dynasties, China advanced far beyond Europe morally, intellectually, and artistically. [See *Confucius*.]

King, The Right Hon. Peter, seventh Baron King (1776-1833), financier. A Whig member of the House of Lords and a high authority on finance, he was a strong supporter of Lord Holland [see]. He voted for Catholic Emancipation and opposed the suggestion of a grant to the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel. "Of late years," said the *Gentleman's Magazine* in its obituary notice (1833, II, 80), "Lord King has chiefly signalized himself as the bitter enemy of the Church, and particularly of the Episcopal Bench." He was a Deist. In a memoir prefixed to *Selections from the Speeches and Writings of Lord King* (1844), Earl Fortescue describes him as a man of great learning and impressive character.

Kingdom of Heaven, The. Theologians find a number of different meanings of this phrase as it is used in the New Testament ("Thy Kingdom come," etc.), and they stress the individualist meaning that it denotes the triumph of the kingdom of God in the good mind. They carefully avoid comparison with the language of the oldest part of the Avesta, the Gathas (in *Sacred Books of the East*, vol. 31). The devout worshipper of Ahura Mazda is absorbed in "preparation for Thy Kingdom," or, as it is more frequently said, "Thy Righteous Order." Rhapsodies on the struggle against evil end in imploring Ahura Mazda to hasten the coming of his Righteous Order or Kingdom. The phrase seems here also to have an individualist meaning, but frequently it means the end of the world and of evil, and seems to

have entered early Christian literature in this sense.

Kinglake, Alexander William, M.A. (1809-91), historian. A lawyer who made so great a reputation by his novel *Eothen* (1844) that he was commissioned to write the official history of the Crimean War (8 vols., 1863-87). His Agnosticism is freely expressed in *Eothen* and in his letters, especially one published by Grant Duff in the *Spectator*, May 10, 1919 (p. 590).

Kingsley, George Henry, M.D., F.L.S. (1827-92), traveller and writer. A brother of Canon Kingsley who gave up the creed at an early date and took a part on the anti-clerical side in the French Revolution of 1848. He studied medicine and travelled all over the world with private patients. In a memoir prefixed to his *Notes on Sport and Travel* (1900) his daughter Mary reproduces a letter of his expressing strong Rationalist sentiments and tells us that he was an Agnostic. In the book he severely criticizes the Churches, particularly resenting "the foul brutality and baseness" of the Roman Church (p. 326). **Mary Henrietta Kingsley** (1862-1900), his daughter, was still better known as a traveller and writer and not less advanced a Rationalist. On a commission from Cambridge University and the British Museum she spent two years travelling in obscure parts of Africa, but she was a woman of equal strength of intellect and tenderness and refinement. In a letter to Edward Clodd (*Memories*, p. 79) she says that she is, like him, an Agnostic. During the South African War she nursed wounded Boers, and died of enteric fever.

Kneeland, Abner (1774-1844), American writer. From Baptist preacher he became a Universalist minister and finally an Atheist lecturer and writer. He founded the *Boston Investigator*, the oldest Rationalist periodical in America, and in 1833 he was sent to prison for two months for a profession of Atheism. A carpenter in early life, he mastered Latin, Greek, and Hebrew in order to make a thorough study of the Bible. He published the New Testament in Greek and English, edited Voltaire's *Philosophical Dictionary* (2 vols., 1832),

and wrote *The Deist* (2 vols., 1822) and other works.

Knights-errant. Generally understood to be the flower of Christian chivalry in the Middle Ages, but entirely fictitious. If a single knight is described in mediæval chronicles (with which the present writer has considerable familiarity), as one who used to set out to relieve distressed maidens and smite the cruel and unjust, he seems to have escaped the notice of all our leading authorities on the period (1100-1400). The myth of the Age of Chivalry [see] was created in the seventeenth century, with the "Knight-errant" as one of its features. Prof. Luchaire, the chief authority on France at that time, quotes a ritual book of the tenth century (about two centuries before the Age of Chivalry is supposed to have begun) prescribing the form of blessing of a knight's arms and armour and giving his oath—the chief part of it is that he will protect churchmen—and adds that such sentiments would have been quite unintelligible to the knights of the Age of Chivalry, who were comprehensively corrupt, predatory, and licentious. John of Salisbury refers to a similar church ceremony (*Polycraticus*, bk. VI), but says that it was not observed and that the real conduct of the knights was revolting. We have also a work in Provençal, *El Orden de la Chevalerie*, with somewhat similar sentiments. Writers on chivalry and knights-errant—it is lamentable that even the *Cambridge History* and the *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics* entrusted the relevant articles on these to sentimentalists instead of to historians—do not even know of these documents. They, the artists who paint fanciful pictures of "The Vigil," etc., and the essayists and journalists who daily lament that chivalry is dead and the knight-errant extinct, have no ground whatever except a myth that is completely discredited in all responsible historical literature. The authorities on each country in Europe during the period in question agree with Prof. Luchaire that the virtues of justice and chastity, which are ascribed to the knight-errant, were precisely the virtues which the actual knights and nobles

of the Middle Ages most conspicuously lacked. It was, says the *Cambridge Mediæval History* (V, 593), "a world of superstitious and brutal soldiers," and "everywhere the barons perpetrated the same excesses." "These Christian knights," says the Catholic historian Lingard, "gloried in barbarities which would have disgraced their pagan forefathers." The pseudo-chivalry of Froissart, says Green (*Short History of England*, 1916 ed., p. 182), conceals "the coarsest profligacy, the narrowest caste-spirit, and a brutal indifference to human suffering." In real life, says Prof. Medley in Trail's *Social England* (I, 556), if a knight had met an unprotected maid on the road he would have raped her; and the poems and stories of the time callously, or admiringly, describe this. The heroes of romantic literature—Richard, the Black Prince, the Cid, etc.—are in history unscrupulous ruffians, and the one or two knights of really good fame, like Bayard, do not belong to the period. *Don Quixote*, in fine, is not a burlesque of reality, but of a silly romantic literature which had become very popular in Spain. For details and authorities, however, see article under the title *Chivalry, The Age of*.

Knowles, Sir James, F.R.I.B.A., K.C.V.O. (1831-1908), founder of *The Nineteenth Century*. He turned from architecture, which he practised for some years, to journalism, and succeeded Dean Alford as editor of *The Contemporary Review*. The rapid growth of Rationalism among Victorian writers and scholars called for a new monthly, independent of clerical influence, and in 1877 *The Nineteenth Century* was established. Knowles owned and edited it until his death. He also suggested the idea of the Metaphysical Society for free discussion. His letters to Huxley (*Life and Letters of T. H. Huxley*, 2 vols., 1900) show that he shared Huxley's Agnosticism.

Koheleth. [See *Ecclesiastes*.]

Kolbe, Prof. Hermann (1818-84), German chemist. For some years he was Bunsen's assistant at Marburg, then Playfair's assistant in London, but he returned to Marburg University as professor of chemistry and became one of

the leading organic chemists of Europe. Sir E. Frankland, who studied under him, says that he learned, in conversation with him on religion, that he was an Agnostic (*Sketches from the Life of E. Frankland*, p. 50).

Koran (or Quran), The. The word, which means "the reading," or "the lesson," is the title of the sacred book of the Moslem. It is about the same length as the New Testament, and is divided into 114 *surah* or chapters. The orthodox legend is that it was sent from heaven, written in gold on a rich tablet, to Mohammed. The truth is that it was jotted down, on bits of skin and palm-leaves, by Mohammed during twenty-two years (610-32) in a wild and semi-barbarous environment. He was neurasthenic, if not, as many experts believe, epileptic, and brooded over the rumours of religions (Jewish, Christian, Persian, etc.) which reached his glorified village or market-town. The fragments were collected in 633, and an authorized version put out in 650. To what extent the Prophet was a sincere visionary is a matter of conjecture. [See Mohammed.] The Koran has some admirable moral sentiments in a vast amount of tiresome verbiage, and it does not, as many think, enjoin intolerance and compulsion to join Islam [see].

Krause, Ernst Ludwig (1839-1903), German writer. Under the pen-name of "Carus Sterne" he was known all over Germany for his works on evolution (chiefly *Werden und Vergehen*, 1876), and rendered valuable service. His circulation rivalled that of Haeckel, with whom he co-operated in founding the Monist monthly *Kosmos*.

Krejei, Prof. Franz (1858-1909), Bohemian psychologist. He was professor of philosophy and psychology at the Czech University of Prague and well known throughout Europe for his academic articles. In spite of the Austrian authorities, he was an outspoken Rationalist, and did much to make Bohemia one of the most advanced countries in Europe. He presided at the 14th Annual Congress of Free-thinkers at Prague, in 1907, and said: "Reaction is the real subversive element, and it shuts down the energy of motive

forces until they accumulate and explode."

Krekel, Arnold (1815-88), American judge. A lawyer and County Attorney who served as a colonel in the Civil War and was President of the Constitutional Convention of 1865. Later he was a Federal Judge, and had a very high repute for integrity. Krekel was all his life an outspoken Agnostic (*Putnam's Four Hundred Years of Free-thought*) (p. 756).

Krishna. An incarnation of Vishnu, the most popular deity of northern India, or the form in which Vishnu is chiefly worshipped. It is thought that originally Krishna was a Hindu warrior. The later legend of Krishna has some analogy to that of Jesus at so many points that there has been a great deal of inconclusive discussion of the question which borrowed from the other or whether both borrowed from a common source. As the idea of the compilers of the Gospels having any acquaintance with the Puranas or Hindu beliefs is difficult to entertain, and alternative sources of details of the mythical story of Jesus are available, the discussion does not now attract much attention. It is well and succinctly treated by Inanendranatha Mitta in his booklet *Sri Krishna* (1900).

Kropotkin, Prince Peter Alexievich (1842-1921), geographer. As early as 1864 he was awarded the Gold Medal of the Royal Geographical Society for his explorations, and he served as attaché to the Governor of Siberia. In youth he had been one of the Emperor's pages, but in 1872 he joined the International and was confined in a fortress. He escaped and fled to Switzerland, France (where he was imprisoned), and England, returning to Russia in 1919. Kropotkin, whose social works (*Fields, Factories, and Workshops*, 1899, etc.) made him well known in England, was an Agnostic and a Tolstoian Anarchist.

Kulturkampf, The. A struggle against the Catholic Church, mainly in regard to the control of education—"cultural struggle," the word means—conducted by Germany under Bismarck 1871-86. Successive annexations of other German provinces had greatly altered the

proportion of Protestants and Catholics. In 1867 Prussia had 14,000,000 Protestants to 7,000,000 Catholics; in 1871 the Empire had, through the inclusion of Alsace-Lorraine, 25,000,000 Protestants and 15,000,000 Catholics. The Roman clergy, threatening to stir the Poles and Alsace-Lorrainers, made exorbitant demands, and the Liberals pressed for action. Bismarck suppressed the Catholic section of the Ministry of Worship, expelled the Jesuits, and passed the "May Laws" (checking education and the training of priests). The Catholics reacted by

organizing themselves politically in the Centre Party [see], and hundreds of their churches were closed and priests imprisoned. The "persecution" was mildness itself in comparison with the savage treatment by the Catholic hierarchy of Protestants, Freethinkers, and Democrats which had only just ceased in Europe, but it glows like a Neronian episode in Catholic literature. The struggle ended when the Catholics engaged to join with the Government in attacking Socialism. [See Germany, Religion-in.]

Kung-fu-tse. [See Confucius.]

L.

Labouchere, Henry du Pré (1831-1912), journalist and politician. Of French extraction, he served in the British diplomatic service for some years. He then took up journalism and, as editor of *Truth*, was one of the most familiar writers in the Press. He stoutly supported Bradlaugh, and A. L. Thorold says that he was "as completely non-religious as a man could be," and "a strict Agnostic" (*Life of H. Labouchere*, 1913, p. ix). A lamp was upset in his room when he was dying, and Labouchere, rousing himself a little, murmured: "Flames? No, not yet."

Lacépède, Count Bernard Germain Étienne de la Ville de (1756-1825), French naturalist. A noble who, after wavering for a time between music and science and writing several operas and symphonies, concentrated on science and joined the Encyclopædists. Though a member of the King's Cabinet, he accepted the Revolution, and sat in the Legislative Assembly until the outrages repelled him. Under Napoleon he was professor of natural history, President of the Senate, and Minister of State. He refused to submit at the Restoration and was deprived of his titles, but they were later restored. He remained a Deist to the end, and had a high place in the scientific literature of the time.

Lafayette, the Marquis Marie Jean Paul Roch Yves Gilbert (1757-1834), French soldier. No Frenchman is more honoured in America, since he served,

as a general, in the army of liberation. He was one of the moderate leaders of the French Revolution, and left France when it became more violent. He served again under Napoleon, and after the Restoration sat in the Extreme Left in the Chambre. He was a Deist.

Lagrange, Count Joseph Louis (1736-1813), famous French mathematician. He showed mathematical genius at an early age, and at nineteen found the solution of the most difficult problems. Next year he was appointed professor at the Turin Artillery School, and ten years later he succeeded Euler as Director of the Berlin Academy. He has a high position in the history of mathematics and astronomy. Returning to Paris, he accepted the Revolution and taught at the Polytechnic. Lagrange presided over the Commission which drafted the decimal system. Although he was an Agnostic, the restored monarchy had to respect him, as he was one of the greatest mathematicians in Europe.

Laing, Samuel (1810-97), writer. Laing was one of the business men of the Victorian Age who combined considerable prosperity in business with an active share in public education in science and religion. He was educated in law, but turned to trade and became secretary to the Railway Department of the Board of Trade, and later Chairman and Managing Director of the L. B. and S. Co. Railway. He was also Chairman of the Crystal Palace Committee and M.P. (1852-85). In his later

years he issued a series of Rationalist books (*Modern Science and Modern Thought*, etc.) which had a very wide circulation.

Lalande, Joseph Jérôme le Français de (1732–1807), astronomer. He was educated by the Jesuits, but having been sent, at the age of nineteen, on a mission by the Academy of Sciences—his genius was already recognized—he met and was converted by Voltaire. He became an Academician in 1753, professor at the Collège de France 1761, and Director of the Observatory 1765. Lalande, who ranks with Lagrange in the annals of French science, was a zealous Atheist—he inspired Maréchal's *Dictionnaire des Athées* (1800) and wrote the supplement to it—yet during the Terror he risked his own life by sheltering priests in the Observatory.

Lamarck, Jean Baptiste Pierre Antoine de Monet de (1744–1829), French pioneer of evolution. A young noble who was educated by the Jesuits and destined for the Church, but joined the army. An injury broke his career, and he took up botany and was appointed Royal Botanist, and later Professor of Invertebrate Zoology at the Natural History Museum. His *Philosophie Zoologique* (1809) offered a theory of evolution by the action of environment and the inheritance of acquired modifications and prepared the way for the discussion of Darwin. The *Catholic Encyclopedia* rather brazenly claims him as a Catholic, but he was at the most a Deist, and should probably be classified as an Agnostic. Not only does Quatrefages pronounce him, after a thorough study of his views, “essentially Deistic” (*Émules de Darwin*, 1894, I, 12), but in an important work written in his last years Lamarck emphatically states his opinions. He says that spiritual realities are unknowable, since “all knowledge that is not the genuine product of observation or of consequences deduced from observation is entirely groundless and illusory” (*Système analytique des connaissances positives de l'homme* (1830, p. 84).

Lamb, Charles (1775–1834), essayist. A clerk in East India House for thirty-three years, writing poems and essays in his leisure with little success until, in

collaboration with his sister, he wrote *Tales from Shakespeare*. With the *Essays of Elia* (1823) he became famous. In the preface to the 1829 and later editions he explains that he has quitted the Unitarian Church (II, 430), and E. V. Lucas, the chief authority on Lamb, candidly shows that by 1801 he had become a complete Agnostic (*Life of Charles Lamb*, 1905, pp. 210–11).

Lamb, William, second Viscount Melbourne (1779–1848), famous British statesman. Lord Melbourne is recognized as one of the outstanding Prime Ministers of the nineteenth century (1834–41), and he was, like Pitt and Palmerston, a thorough sceptic. Unlike some recent Prime Ministers, he never pretended to belong to a Church. Greville [see], an intimate friend of his, often discussed religion with him, and says: “He never succeeded in arriving at any fixed belief or in anchoring himself to any system of religious belief” (*Memoirs*, VI, 254). He quotes W. Allen, who also knew him, saying that Melbourne had “a perfect conviction of unbelief” (II, 331). It was not a question of mere indifference, as some say, for Melbourne was a keen student of theology all his life.

Lambeth Conference, The. In 1930 there was a Conference of 308 British and American bishops at Lambeth Palace for the purpose of defining the position of the Church in face of modern thought and discoveries. The result might be described as revolution wrapped in silk, but the Press, as usual, saw only the silk, and very few of the public realized the magnitude of the surrender. The published report (*Resolutions and Reports of the 1930 Lambeth Conference*, 1930) shows, it is true, the customary reluctance of the bishops to face facts or the customary half-knowledge of them. The bishops describe the world as “yearning” to return to the Christian faith if it is made acceptable, and they find this task easy because science has returned to a belief in spiritual realities, or at least has “created an atmosphere more favourable to faith.” It seems that to them Jeans and Eddington and the (expiring) Emergent Evolutionists [see] represent science. But on the theological side the

abandonment of Christian doctrines is notable. The language is, out of concern for the Low Churchmen and Anglicans of the more rigid type, diplomatic, but "the Biblical account of Creation" is tossed aside as "a popular interpretation of Genesis," the Devil and hell are completely ignored, and the Atonement is very clearly surrendered. There is, they say, an urgent need "for a fresh presentation of the Christian conception of God," which finely ignores the labours of all theologians from Augustine to Pusey, and the faithful must give up all ideas of him that are "inconsistent with the character of Jesus Christ." That this means the doctrines of eternal torment and expiation is clear from the assurance that "the Cross sums up the struggle of love against evil in all ages," and the Modernist ideas of the Incarnation and Trinity seem to be recommended. In the next issue of their periodical the Modernists boasted that the bishops had adopted their views. We must, however, not misconceive the range of the revolution. The overwhelming majority of the 10,000,000 Christians (in Great Britain, the Empire, and the United States) whom the bishops represented are still Fundamentalists.

Lamennais, Hugues Félicité Robert de (1782-1854), French writer. Lamennais was almost the best known and most respected priest in France from about 1814 to 1834, but his stern opposition to Church corruption, especially at Rome, and his defence of democracy brought upon him the censure of the hierarchy. His *Paroles d'un croyant* (1834) so severely criticized the clergy, and created such a sensation, that he was driven out of the Church. He remained a Theist. He is still commonly quoted in England as Père (Father) de Lamennais, but the *Catholic Encyclopædia* says that "numerous attempts were made to bring him back to religion and repentance, but in vain. He died rejecting all religious ministration." The word "repentance" is amusing. In character he rose high above all the other French clergy.

Lametrie, Julien Offray de (1708-51), French writer. He is commonly said, since he was a dogmatic Material-

ist, to have been a superficial and poorly informed thinker. In fact he was, as a youth of noble family, educated by the Jesuits, and he graduated in surgery at Leyden University. His *Histoire naturelle de l'âme* (1745), for which he was expelled from France, and *L'homme machine* (1748), for which he was expelled from Holland in turn and took refuge with Frederic the Great, were Materialist classics.

Landor, Walter Savage (1775-1864), writer. His *Imaginary Conversations* (2 vols., 1824), which he wrote in Italy, put him in the front rank of British writers. He was a Theist, but violently opposed to Christianity, and rejected the belief in a future life (letter to Mrs. Lynn Linton in *Mrs. L. Linton*, p. 123). The couplet which Holyoake repeated shortly before his death

I have warmed both hands at the
fire of life,
It sinks, and I am ready to depart,

is from Landor, who was a warm supporter of Holyoake and a great fighter for freedom. He is said to have been Dickens's model for Boythorne in *Bleak House* on account of certain eccentricities.

Lane, Sir Ralph Norman Angell. [See Angell, Sir Norman.]

Lanessan, Jean Marie Antoine de, M.D. (1843-1919), French statesman. He was a naval surgeon who entered politics and became Governor-General in Indo-China and later Minister of Marine, one of the ablest of his time. He co-operated in the secularization of France and had high international honours (the White Eagle, the Northern Star, the Rising Sun, the Double Dragon, etc.). Apart from politics, Lanessan edited the works of Buffon and wrote a number of books on science and philosophy. His Agnostic views are given in his *Morale des religions* (1905) and *Morale naturelle* (1908).

Lang, Andrew (1844-1912), Scottish poet and critic. He was for many years editor of *Longman's Magazine*, and published several volumes of verse, but his position in the front rank of British letters was chiefly won by his critical and historical works (*History of Scotland*,

1900, etc.). He declined to be labelled as regards religion, but his very obvious Rationalism pervades his *Myth, Ritual, and Religion* (1887) and *Magic and Religion* (1901).

Lang, Prof. Arnold, Ph.D. (1855–1927), Swiss zoologist. He was professor of phylogeny (evolution) at Jena, then of protist zoology and comparative anatomy at Zurich. In 1898 he was appointed Rector of Zurich University. He had considerable reputation throughout Europe, and his *Text-book of Comparative Anatomy* (Engl. trans., 1891) was for years a standard work. In the symposium *Was Wir E. Haeckel Verdanken* (1914, II, 65) he pays a glowing tribute to the master and described himself as “an Agnostic Freethinker.”

Langdale, Baron. [See Bickersteth, Henry.]

Lange, Prof. Friedrich Albert (1828–75), Swiss philosopher. He taught philosophy at Zurich and Marburg, but is known in many countries as the author of what is regarded as the classic *History of Materialism* (Engl. trans., 3 vols., 1881). The author was an Agnostic, and is not an ideal guide to Materialistic literature. L. G. Cohen prefixes a biography of him to the 1867 edition.

Lankester, Sir Edwin Ray, K.C.B., M.D., LL.D., Sc.D., F.R.S. (1847–929), zoologist. He was professor of zoology and comparative anatomy at London University College 1874–90, Linacre Professor of comparative anatomy at Oxford 1891–8, and Director of the Natural History Department of the British Museum 1898–1907. He was also Fullerian Professor at the Royal Institution and President of the British Association (1906); and he received the Copley and the Darwin-Wallace Medals, the Royal Medal of the Royal Society, and a large number of International honours which indicate his important position in science. Lankester was, however, an outspoken Agnostic and an Honorary Associate of the R.P.A.

Lao-tse (born about 600 B.C.), Chinese philosopher. The famous moralist was a contemporary of Confucius, but solitary brooding led him to express his ideas in mystic verbiage, and they were later submerged in the swamp of

superstition which is known as Taoism, or “the religion of the Way (Tao).” What precisely his ideas were, beyond an ascetic code of individual conduct, is disputed. Dr. Legge says that he believed in God as he spoke—or is so represented in the one book attributed to him, *The Book of Law and Virtue*—of Heaven (Ti). So did many Agnostic Confucians, and other authorities claim that he was an Atheist like Confucius. See W. Hayes, *The Man of Tao* (1934).

Laplace, the Marquis Pierre Simon de (1749–1827), French astronomer. On account of the commanding position in science of the famous astronomer, and since he is so frequently quoted as replying to Napoleon's query where God came in his system: “Sire, I have done without that hypothesis,” it is often asked why he is excluded from the *Biographical Dictionary of Modern Rationalists* (1920). The author does not think it correct to class as Rationalists men who, like Laplace, turned to the Church in their later years. Several distinguished French Rationalists (like Talleyrand) went through the *form* of reconciliation just before death, as in the clerical-royalist reaction after 1815 the funeral of a Freethinker was apt to be painfully desecrated. Laplace went beyond this, and for years attended church regularly. The truth is, as some French historians bitterly complain, his character was not adequate to his eminence in science. “In his political life Laplace presents a sorry picture,” one historian says. Napoleon made him a count, but he voted for the deposition of Napoleon and served the Bourbon Court with “the most extreme servility.” He was shunned and hated by his old revolutionary friends. Such a man was incapable of the bold reply to Napoleon which is ascribed to him, and the origin of the story is obscure. It is suggested that it is based upon a passage in his *Exposition du système du monde* (2 vols., 1796), in which he discards a “vain hypothesis” (meaning that of Newton).

Lareveillière-Lepaux, Louis Marie de (1753–1824), French Director. A lawyer, a follower of Rousseau, who supported the Revolution until the excesses began. He was a member of the

Directorate of five which ruled France between Robespierre and Napoleon, and he urged the establishment of Theophilanthropy, a sort of Deistic ethical Church. He was a man of inflexible principle, and refused either office or pension when Napoleon seized power.

Larkin, Prof. Edgar Lucien (1847-1921), American astronomer. Director of the New Wisconsin Observatory 1880-8, and later of the Lowe Observatory in California, and prominent member of the various American Pacific Astronomical and Astrophysical Societies. In an article in the *Truth-seeker*, which was reproduced in the *Freethinker* (October 21, 1906), he said: "Religion is totally useless in a universe based on law, and belief will be swept from the earth when men get out of infantile steps of growth."

Larra, Mariano José (1809-37), Spanish writer. A great fighter for Rationalism in a time of reaction, and a brilliant writer cut off prematurely. At the age of nineteen he founded *El Duende Satirico*, and at twenty-two *El Robre-cito Habrador*, caustic anti-clerical periodicals which helped considerably to emancipate Spain. Later he edited the more important *Revista Español* and *El Muna* and wrote plays and novels which, in spite of his early death, fill four volumes (1843). It was Larra who said: "All the truths in the world would go on a cigarette-paper."

Lassalle, Ferdinand Johann Gottlieb (1825-64), German Socialist leader. Son of a rich Jewish merchant named Lassal—he changed it to Lassalle—who, after a brilliant university career, devoted himself to philosophy and social questions. He took part in the Revolution of 1848 and later helped Marx to found Social Democracy. Contrary to a common impression, he was a very cultured man—he wrote a two-volume work on the philosophy of Heracleitos and other books—but from mid-life onward he gave up everything else for social work. He was, like Marx, an Atheist (*Reden und Schriften*, ed. by E. Bernstein, 4 vols., 1891-4).

Lastarria, Prof. José Victorino (1812-79), Chilean jurist. He was professor of public law at the Santiago National

Institute and one of the leading orators and reformers of his country. Later he became Dean of the Faculty of Law and Politics in the University of Chile and published standard works on law. Lastarria was a Positivist in the South-American sense (a Rationalist) and often contributed to *El Progreso*, the anti-clerical periodical.

Latham, Robert Gordon, M.D., B.A., L.R.C.P. (1812-88), ethnologist. A professor of the English language and literature at London University College who turned to medicine and lectured on forensic medicine at the Middlesex Hospital. In 1849 he abandoned medicine for philology and ethnology. Huxley says that "the existence of the Established Church was to his mind one of the best evidences of the recency of the evolution of the human type from the simian" (*Life and Letters of T. H. Huxley*, II, 383). The article on Latham in the *D.N.B.* describes him as "on who for brilliance of intellect and range of knowledge had scarcely an equal among his contemporaries."

Laveran, Prof. Charles Louis Alphonse (1845-1922). French physiologist and Nobel Prize winner. He was a professor at the Pasteur Institute and one of the leading international authorities on tropical diseases. Laveran did the chief work in tracing the propagation of fever to mosquitoes. He was an Atheist. When he was told that Edison was interested in Spiritualism, he said that he "did not believe a word of the report" and that he himself "did not believe in spirits" (*Le Gaulois*, October 5, 1920).

Lavissee, Prof. Ernest (1842-1922), French historian. Professor of modern history at the University of Paris, Director of the École Normale, and Grand Officer of the Legion of Honour. In collaboration with Rambaud he wrote the standard *Histoire générale du IV siècle à nos jours* (12 vols., 1893-1901) and the *Histoire de France contemporaine* (10 vols., 1920-2), chief French historical works of the time. Lavissee had begun his career secretary to the Rationalist historian Duruy, and shows his agreement with him in his biographical sketch *Ministre, V. Duruy*. His historical

works are all on Rationalist and unpromising lines.

Law, Christianity and. Probably the most important of the many positive tests of the claim that the Christian religion inspired a higher order of society in Europe [see articles **Children; Crime; Dark Age; Divorce; Education; Justice; Marriage; Middle Ages; Serfdom; Slavery; Torture; etc.**] is law. Modern historians have shown that in the earlier civilizations—Egypt, Babylon, Persia, Greece, and Rome—law and the administration of justice were on the high level which we should expect from the general character of their culture. The Roman Stoic lawyers in particular greatly improved the humanity and justice of the older laws, and passed on to the Christian Emperors an enlightened code that protected slaves and women, and Rome extended the benefits of the code to the greater part of the known race. The last act of a Pagan Emperor, Licinius, was, in agreement with Constantine, to remove the last disability and sanction complete religious liberty. And the first unequivocally Christian Emperor and his successors restored intolerance in a harsher form than ever, while the articles in this Encyclopædia on **Serfdom, Slavery, and Women** show how the other humanitarian gains were totally abandoned. The Justinian Code [see], compiled under the direction of a jurist who is generally held to have been a Pagan, though reactionary where it had to yield to Christian influence, was the last word of the old civilization. What did in fact happen, from the religious-sociological point of view, after the fall of Rome is left in a significant obscurity by expert writers on law. The article in the *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics*, which ought to be our best guide, is written by a Catholic priest, with the usual consequences. The *Cambridge Mediæval History* is little more satisfactory, several of the eight volumes which cover the thousand years hardly mentioning law. The best chapter on mediæval law, that of Prof. Hazeltine, excuses itself on the ground that in that vast field we see law “shifting like the fragments of coloured glass in the kaleidoscope.” Recent writers (Jenks’s

Law and Politics in the Middle Ages, 1919, etc.) generally confine themselves to technical and theoretical developments of no social interest. Prof. Munroe Smith’s *Development of English Law* (1928) is by a Catholic apologist, and the history of the Church and the social order which it embodies is legendary. Dr. Zane’s *Story of Law* (1928) is by an Episcopalian, but candidly envisages the broad situation. The author observes that if a Roman had revisited the earth about A.D. 1000 he would have found a field of ruins, but “especially would he have been astonished at the eclipse of all forms of respectable legal administration” (p. 200); that “a black night of lawlessness and disorder seemed to have settled down in every one of these once prosperous lands” (p. 201); that law was “an institution of the past” (p. 204), replaced by greed, cruelty, and intolerance, and that the chief vices continued throughout the Middle Ages. The distinguished American jurist is hardly less severe than the French Rationalists (Michelet, Letourneau, etc.) of the last century, and from these works we, neglecting the technical discussions of most writers on the subject, may distil a few general observations that are relevant to the question whether or no Christianity had a beneficent influence on law.

When we recall the vast work of legal, juridical, and prison reform that had to be effected between 1750 and 1850—by the Encyclopædists and Beccaria in France and Italy; by Bentham, Romilly, Mackintosh, etc., in England—the appalling conduct of the royalist-clerical authorities in most countries after Waterloo, and the decades of conflict that had still to be waged to secure justice for the workers, for women, for children, for religious minorities and Rationalists, etc., it seems idle to discuss whether a higher type of law and justice had been introduced into Europe fourteen centuries earlier. We conclude rather that, since law had been advancing during at least six or seven of those centuries (from the date of the Capitularies of Charlemagne), it must have sunk to a barbaric level during the four or five centuries

that had followed the establishment of Christianity. No legal writer except a Catholic would question this, but most of these writers too easily accept the Catholic myth that the Teutonic invasions suffice to explain both the collapse of Roman law and the protracted barbarism. As is shown in other articles, almost the worst barbarism during the Dark Age was in Rome, while the Ostrogoths first, and the Lombards after them, restored respect for law, and their work was ruined by the Popes. When the study of law did seriously begin in Christendom it was in the old Lombard cities of North Italy; and the jurists had now the example of a fine and very orderly civilization in Arab Spain and Sicily to stimulate them. They were, in any case, for the most part concerned with the codification of Church law, largely on a base of ecclesiastical forgeries, and civil law was, as Maitland says, corruptly influenced by it in several respects. To this time, the end of the Dark Age, nine-tenths of the population had had practically no protection of law. The Teutonic conquerors, naturally, had had no written codes, and they introduced and maintained for centuries the crude and cruel device of the ordeal [see] instead of the court. We are asked to admire the Bishops' Courts, but against the theory of these we must set the fact that the bishops and abbots were quite generally neither religious nor virtuous and in not one case in a thousand in sympathy with the people. Sir James Fitzjames Stephen, who carefully studied their procedure, found it as crude as that of the later Inquisition. As wealth at last grew in Europe, the practice of putting nobles in the abbeys and bishoprics also grew, and, except in the rare case of a really religious prelate, they despised the people. Michelet quotes from a French chronicle the saying of a lord who used a serf cruelly: "He's mine—I can boil him or roast him if I want." Repeatedly we find, in the chronicles, that they did roast or boil them in diabolical ways. That there were in all ages a minority of good men hardly needs saying. The social student is concerned with the general body.

But the close of the Dark Age, when

serfdom began to disappear, the fine to replace the duel, and codes and courts and lay lawyers to multiply, brought also new evils. The Age of Chivalry (1100–1400) opened, and it is a commonplace of all authorities that the knights and nobles had a profound contempt for burghers as well as for the workers and peasants (four-fifths of the population), and treated them with a gross injustice against which they had no legal redress. The law itself was not a stereotyped code, as we know it. What some jurists call "customary law" was followed in most courts, and it had the most amazing variations even in a single kingdom like France. It had (see Letourneau) the common feature of a certain brutality. History, based upon contemporary chronicles, provides a picture quite different from that suggested by legal writers on mediæval law. For instance, Abelard tells us in his first letter to Heloise that when her uncle sent men to castrate him, he demanded as a legal right that the uncle, a canon of Paris Cathedral, should be similarly mutilated. Froissart tells us, in his *Chronicles*, how Edward II's favourite noble was publicly castrated after trial; and the Venetian ambassador tells us of courts in Rome, about the year 1500, passing the same sentence (with almost incredible details) on Jews. Mutilation and torture [see] remained in the law of every country. In the days of Louis XIV (or about 1680) French law recognized two barbaric forms of torture—the Spanish boots and pouring a vast quantity of water into the accused—and the *Archives de la Bastille* (see, especially, vols. V to VII) show the application of it a hundred times in a year. In Austria, Italy, Spain, and Portugal torture (often of the genitals) was used frequently in the clerical-royalist struggles of the nineteenth century, and in Spain, Portugal, Italy, and South America it is used today. Further details about this foul disfigurement of Christian civilization—there had been little torture in the ancient Roman—will be given under *Torture*, but it was not the only feature of law or of legal administration that for at least fourteen centuries kept Christian Europe far below the level to

which law had been raised by—to quote the words of a clerical historian, Dean Milman—“the inflexible rectitude of the Roman mind so sagaciously applied by the wisdom of her great lawyers” (*History of Latin Christianity*, II, 11). The work of Prof. C. Letourneau (a sociologist), which is recommended above (*L'évolution juridique*, 1891), has not been translated, and the section on mediæval law is short. Letourneau draws upon richer material in the historian Michelet's *Origines du droit français* (1837), which needs to be checked by later works.

Lawrence, David Herbert (1885–1930), writer. Son of a Nottingham coal-miner, who, in 1911, startled critics by the power and originality of his *White Peacock*. He was prosecuted for *The Rainbow* (1915) and discussed all over Britain and America. Even some critics who complained that he was obsessed with sex admitted that he was the most gifted of modern writers, if not a genius. In view of his febrile mind and temperamental character, we should not expect a well-defined attitude to religion, though the whole spirit of his work is anti-Christian; but his biographer, H. Kingsmill (*D. H. Lawrence*, 1938), explains that he had a “home-made” religion which might be described as hovering between Agnosticism and Pantheism. “There is no God, but everything is Godly,” he said.

Lawrence, Thomas Edward (1888–1935), “Lawrence of Arabia.” After a distinguished course in modern history he went to Syria to study the architecture of Crusading times. The thorough knowledge of Arabic and the Arabs which he acquired enabled him to render the famous service during the War which he describes with literary distinction in his *Seven Pillars of Wisdom* (limited edition, 1926). Disgusted with his failure to secure justice for the Arabs, he changed his name by deed-poll to Shaw, in 1927, and became a mechanic in the Air Force. V. Richards, in his *Portrait of T. E. Lawrence* (1936), tells us that he was at an early date “shaken free of the half-dead sentiments of formal religion” (p. 10) and never returned even to a belief in God.

Lawrence, Sir William, F.R.S. (1783–1867), surgeon. He was professor of anatomy at the Royal College of Surgeons, surgeon to the Queen, President of the Medical and Chirurgical Society, and President of the Royal College of Surgeons; and he was regarded as the most distinguished surgeon of his time. The lectures he delivered at the Royal College of Surgeons, 1817–18 (*Lectures on Comparative Anatomy, Physiology, Zoology, and the Nature of Man*), caused a sensation and were violently assailed by the clergy. He denied the inspiration of the Bible, praised Voltaire, and made an open profession of Deism. His work had a very large circulation (9th ed., 1848), and he courageously kept the offending passages in all editions.

Layard, the Right Hon. Sir Austin Henry, G.C.B., D.C.L., P.C. (1817–94), statesman and Assyriologist. He abandoned a training in law for the diplomatic service in the Near East, where he was one of the first to explore the ruins of Nineveh. Entering Parliament, he became Under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs (1861–6), Chief Commissioner of Works (1868), Privy Councillor, and Ambassador to Madrid and Constantinople: and he was recognized to be the leading Assyriologist at that time. In his *Autobiography* (1903) he says that the discourses of W. J. Fox [see] at South Place Chapel “rapidly undermined the religious opinions in which I had been brought up” (I, 56), and he thinks that “the best thing the Turks could do would be to turn all the Christians out of Jerusalem” (II, 200). He scorns the identification of “the Holy Places.”

Lecky, the Right Hon. William Edward Hartpole, O.M., M.A., LL.D., D.C.L., Litt.D. (1838–1903), historian. He was so religious in youth that he meditated entering the ministry, but his *Declining Sense of the Miraculous* (1863) shows that he abandoned the creed before the age of thirty. He devoted himself to writing history, and became one of the most distinguished British historians of the second half of the century, declining an invitation to the Regius professorship at Oxford. His chief work was a *History of England in the*

Eighteenth Century (8 vols., 1878-90). Of more value to Rationalists is his masterly *History of European Morals* (2 vols., 1869, cheap R.P.A. ed., 1911); but Lecky's eagerness to pay compliments to Christianity, which are discredited by the facts he gives, has also made it of much service to apologists. Several of his Rationalist contemporaries resented his attitude, George Eliot sarcastically representing him as saying that while it is true that two and two make four, one must not press the matter too far. Lecky was an Agnostic with an ethical regard for Christianity, but many of his tributes to it, and harsh censures of the Romans, which apologists quote, are refuted by other general statements and the facts in his own book. A critical edition would be useful.

Leconte, Prof. Joseph, M.D. (1823-1901), American geologist. He left medical practice to take up chemistry and geology and became one of the highest American authorities on the latter (*Elements of Geology*, 1878, etc.). He was professor at South Carolina College; then at California University. The frequent appeals to him in older apologetic literature are very misleading, for he was an advanced Rationalist. In his *Evolution in its Relation to Religious Thought* (1888) he describes himself as a Pantheist (p. 284), rejects Christianity, and recognizes "no test of truth but reason" (310).

Leconte de Lisle, Charles Marie René (1818-94), French poet. He took part in the Revolution of 1848, and later, by his *Poèmes antiques* (1852) and *Poèmes nouvelles* (1854) and his masterly translations of Theocritus, Anacreon, Hesiod, Homer, and Æschylus, won admission to the Academy and a place among the chief French writers. J. M. Robertson says, in his *Short History of Freethought*, that he was "one of the most convinced and aggressive Free-thinkers of the century," but he was not an Atheist. References to God in his poems are Pantheistic. He disbelieved in immortality.

Le Dantec, Prof. Felix Alexandre (1869-1917), French biologist. He was professor of biology at the Sorbonne and a brilliant writer on science whose

early death was deeply deplored. He worked himself to death in hospital service during the war. In an obituary notice which recognized his high position in science *Nature* (August 16, 1917) said that he had "a passion for veracity" and "a hatred of superstitious sentimentalism, metaphysical verbiage, and intellectual hypocrisy." He was, in fact, an outspoken Atheist and Materialist. All that he believed in was "the mysterious and universal agent which we call energy" (*Athéisme*, 1906).

Lee, General Charles (1731-82), American soldier. Second in command to Washington, and a historic figure in the War of Independence. He was, like Washington, a Deist (*Memoir of Charles Lee*, appended to *The Correspondence of Sir T. Hammer*, 1838, pp. 475-8).

Le Gallienne, Richard (b. 1866), poet. From the office of a chartered accountant he passed to the literary world, and had in his time a very high reputation. In his *Religion of a Literary Man* (1893) he rejects the belief in a future life (p. 54) and says that "organized Christianity has probably done more to retard the ideals that were its founder's than any other agency in the world" (p. 61). In *If I were God* (1897) he professes a vague and very unorthodox Theism.

Leidy, Prof. Joseph, M.D., LL.D. (1823-91), American geologist and biologist. He had a long series of academic appointments, ending as Director of the Department of Biology at Pennsylvania University. His 800 learned papers on biology and palæontology brought him many international honours, including the Lyell Medal of the Geological Society. Sir W. Osler [see] thought him "one of the greatest naturalists of America" and assures us that he was an Agnostic. "I have," he says, "often heard him say that the question of a future state had long ceased to interest him" (*Science and Immortality*, 1904, p. 41).

Leighton, Frederic, Baron Leighton of Stretton, R.A., D.C.L., LL.D., Litt.D. (1830-96), painter. Lord Leighton, a leader of the Pre-Raphaelite School and President of the Royal Academy (1878), was raised to the peerage for his dis-

tion in art, and had a large number of other national and international honours. In his *Addresses Delivered to the Students of the Royal Academy* (1896) he often goes out of his way to refute the conventional belief that Christianity inspired the art of the Middle Ages (especially in the second and fifth Addresses). He shows that the more serious Christianity of the early Middle Ages acted as a blight on art, that it flowered only in the sceptical and licentious atmosphere of the Renaissance. His biographer, Mrs. Russell Barrington (*Life, Letters, and Work of F. Leighton*, 2 vols., 1906), says nothing about his attitude to religion, yet he is openly Agnostic in his Addresses. He occasionally uses the word "God", but explains that he means only "the might and majesty of the mysterious and eternal Fountain of all good things" (p. 159).

Lenin, Vladimir Ilyich Ulyanov (1870–1924), founder of the U.S.S.R. Of a good middle-class family—his father was a schoolmaster and his mother the daughter of a doctor—he was educated, in law, at Kazan University, passed his examination at St. Petersburg University, and practised for a time in the provinces. But he had joined the insurrectionary movement at Kazan, and he soon devoted his life to it. He was exiled in 1897, and his writings on Marxism made him the acknowledged leader of the Bolshevik Party. He returned to Russia in 1917, and was elected President of the Council of People's Commissars. He was, of course, an Atheist and Materialist.

Leo X (ruled 1513–21), Pope. Although he is not usually counted one of the "few bad Popes," Leo was a thoroughly vicious and unscrupulous man, and, in view of the position of the Church on the eve of the Reformation, one of the most scandalous Popes of the series. Son of Lorenzo de Medici, and profanely destined by that prince for a clerical career (whatever his character might prove to be), he became a cleric at the age of seven and a cardinal at the age of fourteen. Abnormally fat and unhealthy, and gravely ill with fistula, in the election-chamber he bribed his way to the Papal chair

through friends, and settled down to a life of vulgar display and sensuous enjoyment. His health compelled him to be temperate at table, but he had about him a crowd of unscrupulous adventurers and professional buffoons. He loved to sit at indecent comedies in the Vatican, some of which were composed by his favourite, Cardinal Bibiena, the most immoral man of the Papal Court. Catholics boast that he was at least chaste, unlike his predecessors and successors, but they are untruthful about the evidence. Guiccardini, the greatest historian of the Middle Ages and a Catholic, says that Leo was not accused of vice before his election, but "he was afterwards found to be excessively devoted to pleasures which cannot be called decent" (*Storia d'Italia*, lib. XVI, C. V, p. 254, in the 1832 edition), and the Pope's friend and biographer, Bishop Giovio, discusses at length (*Vita Leonis X*, lib. IV, pp. 96–9, in the 1551 edition) the charge that he was addicted to sodomy, and lamely concludes—he obviously believes it—that it is difficult to be sure on such secret matters, and that in any case the Pope was no worse than other Italian princes. In diplomacy he was admittedly the most dishonest prince in Europe, and he used the most corrupt means of raising money [see *Indulgences*] at the very time when Luther's revolt began. He did nothing for literature and little for art, as Pastor admits, yet he spent (largely on jewels, banquets, and favourites) at least 5,000,000 ducats (equal to £10,000,000 in modern money) in eight years, and left behind debts of nearly £1,000,000. The statement that he said, "We owe all this to the fable of Jesus Christ," appears in the work of an ex-priest long after his death, and we cannot check it. Encyclopædia articles on Leo are based upon Roscoe's *Life and Pontificate of Leo X* (4 vols., 1805), which is very unreliable. Dr. Pastor, the chief modern Catholic historian, admits all the above facts, except the charge of sodomy, in his *History of the Popes* (vol. VIII). See also H. M. Vaughan, *The Medici Popes* (1908), and for a summary sketch McCabe's *Crises* (1916), which gives the complete literature.

Leo XIII (ruled 1878–1903), Pope. Though there was still much corruption in the Papal Court in the nineteenth century—Cardinal Vannutelli, father of three children, tried to succeed Leo—there is no charge against the character of Leo XIII, but the sagacity and diplomatic distinction attributed to him in most literature are Catholic myths. His official biographer, Mgr. T'Serclaes (2 vols., 1894), shows that he was a complete failure in diplomatic missions when he was a cardinal, and Pope Pius IX set him aside. He was elected Pope largely because he was not expected to live long. His refusal to recognize the French Republic until it was too late, or to be reconciled to the Italian Government, led to the loss of tens of millions of Catholics; his intrigues with England against the Irish, and with Germany against the Poles, failed, and his pedantic rebuke of the American bishops [see *Americanism*] had to be effectually disowned. In Europe and America the Church lost, largely owing to his blunders, more subjects than it had lost at the Reformation.

Leon, Sir Herbert Samuel, first Baronet (1850–1926), third Chairman of the R.P.A. He was a financier who warmly supported progressive causes. He sat on the Buckingham County Council and in Parliament (1891–5) as a Liberal, and was created baronet in 1911. He was Chairman of the R.P.A. 1913–22.

Leonardo da Vinci (1452–1519). As there was much scepticism during the Italian Renaissance, and Leonardo was an intellectual as well as an artistic genius, his attitude to religion invites inquiry. Unfortunately few public men dared speak out in the days when "the Hounds of the Lord" (Dominican Inquisitors), were active. The best study of his opinions is in Robertson's *Short History of Freethought* (1915, I, 370–1), but the author can conclude only that so critical a thinker was most probably a secret Rationalist.

Leopardi, Count Giacomo (1798–1837), eminent Italian poet. A youth of noble family, and so brilliant in intellect that he had read nearly the whole of the Greek and Latin classics by the age of seventeen. The classical

literature, in contrast to the smug religion of his father, made him so bitter over the debased condition of Catholic Italy that he became melancholy as well as a Rationalist. He refused an invitation to join the staff of Berlin University, and in solitude wrote the forty poems which gave him a unique place in modern Italian literature. In his last illness he said that he would look for no consolation "in private hopes of a pretended future felicity" (quoted by Sainte-Beuve in his *Portraits Intimes*, V. III).

Lerdo de Tejada, Sebastian (1825–89), President of the Republic of Mexico. He was educated for the priesthood, but took up law and joined the anti-clerical Liberals. In succession he was Minister of Foreign Affairs, President of Congress, President of the Supreme Court of Mexico, and, to the great anger of the clergy, President of Mexico (1872–6). Like his friend Juarez [see], whom he succeeded, he was a drastic Rationalist.

Lessing, Gotthold Ephraim (1729–81), German dramatist and critic. He abandoned training for the ministry to take up medicine, and, though he returned to theology for a time under pressure from his father, he soon found himself a complete sceptic, and devoted himself to literature. He became the greatest dramatist (before Goethe) of modern Germany and the highest authority on æsthetics. He also edited the *Wolfenbüttel Fragments*, which opened the story of Biblical Criticism, and discreetly expressed his Rationalism in *Nathan the Wise* (1779). Lessing was so reserved in his references to religion that he is often quoted as a Christian, but Robertson (*Short History of Freethought*, II, 323–6) shows that "from first to last he was a freethinker in the sense that he never admitted any principle of authority." Robertson overlooks his early abandonment of the Church in spite of great pressure; and it should be added that the works mentioned above show that he admitted no supernatural element in Christianity and was virtually a Deist.

Letourneau, Prof. Charles Jean Marie (1831–1902), French anthropologist. He was professor of the history of civilization at the Paris School of Anthropology

and President of the Anthropological Society. In a series of learned and valuable books (*L'évolution de la morale*, etc.) Letourneau applied the principle of evolution to all ideas and institutions. He was an Atheist and Materialist. "There is nothing in the whole universe but active matter," he said.

Leuba, Prof. James Henry, Ph.D. (1868-1947), American psychologist. Of Swiss extraction and educated in German universities, he settled in America and became professor of psychology at Bryn Mawr College. He was an authority on the psychology of religion (*The Psychological Origin and the Nature of Religion*, etc.), but his most valuable service was a confidential inquiry into the beliefs of the leading American scientists, psychologists, and historians and the publication of the results in *The Belief in God and Immortality* (1916). For these and the outcome of a fresh inquiry twenty years later, see article under **Culture and Religion**. Clerical critics, who were dismayed at the proof that about four-fifths of the greater men rejected the belief, and that there were more Atheists than "reverent Agnostics," tried to assail the inquiry, but the only weakness of it is that Leuba included professors in sectarian (except Catholic) institutions, without whom the total would probably have been nine-tenths Atheists or Agnostics. In his *Psychological Study of Religion* Leuba defines himself as an "empirical idealist" (or Agnostic with Positivist tendencies). He holds that "belief in a personal God seems no longer possible" (p. 125) and that "it is no longer the consciousness of God but the consciousness of man that is the power making for righteousness."

Lewes, George Henry (1817-78), philosophical writer. A London clerk who turned to journalism and literature, with special attention to philosophy. His *Biographical History of Philosophy* (2 vols., 1845-6) was much esteemed at the time. The state of the law not permitting relief from an impossible marriage, in 1854 he went to live with George Eliot in Germany, continuing to support his wife and children. As the distinguished Victorian Rationalists did not resent his domestic arrange-

ments, he returned to England, and was very prominent in their circle. He was the first editor of *The Fortnightly Review*, and wrote *Problems of Life and Mind* (4 vols., 1873-9), and other works.

Lewis, Sinclair, Litt.D. (b. 1885), American novelist and Nobel Prize winner. Son of a medical man, educated at Yale, after a few years in journalism he opened his brilliant series of social novels in 1914. *Main Street* (1920) and *Babbitt* (1922) made him the most-discussed author in America, the titles passing into proverbs or symbols. His Rationalism is seen in all his books, but especially in *Elmer Gantry* (1927), a scathing exposure of the American clergy. He was awarded the Nobel Prize in 1930.

Liber Gomorrhæus, The. A work on the morals of the clergy and monks written in the eleventh century by the monk-cardinal Peter Damiani, the chief lieutenant of Hildebrand. Damiani was of peasant extraction and, as his extant sermons on the married priests show, a revoltingly coarse and violent Puritan. It would not be permitted to-day to publish a translation of some of his descriptions of the vices and perversities of bishops, priests, and monks, which he represents as appallingly prevalent. As one historian says: "Nothing in Aristophanes, Athenæus, or Petronius gives a picture of more bestial depravity than the one drawn by a Prince of the Church of the manners of his clerical contemporaries." The book was presented to Pope Leo IX (1049-54) as part of the campaign for clerical celibacy, and was suppressed in disgust by a later Pope, but the manuscript survived, and is published in the Migne collection of the Fathers (Vol. 145). This condition of the Church, confirmed by all contemporary clerical evidence, was at the close of the Dark Age, many years after the much-lauded Cistercian reform of the monasteries and a century after what accommodating American historians call "the Ottonian Renaissance." Italy was still the most corrupt part of Europe, though Goths, Lombards, and Moslems had in turn tried to restore civilization in it.

Libraries. The way in which many apologists continue to speak about the monastic libraries of the Middle Ages

and the preservation of literature is a painful exhibition of the cultural (or moral) quality of their work. Even articles in encyclopædias (*Ency. Brit.*, *Ency. of Rel. and Ethics*, etc.) on the subject show that the solidly Christian period (500–1300) was in this important respect an appalling intellectual desolation lying between the ancient and the modern periods. Archæologists have discovered the ruins of large libraries in Assyria, and finds in Egypt confirm the statement of Diodorus Siculus that there were large libraries in that country at least by 1300 B.C. The library at Alexandria in Greek–Roman times had 500,000 (some say 700,000) works, and even a small city like Pergamos had a library of 200,000. The holocaust of books, from Rome to Asia Minor, when the Christian bishops and monks triumphed was terrible, and Gregory I is said to have completed the vandalism. From that date (about A.D. 600) we do not find a library of more than 2,000 volumes anywhere in Christian Europe until the Renaissance. During the Dark Age a collection of a few hundred was a great library, whereas in the Arab–Persian world at that time books, beautifully written and bound, were produced by the million, and large cities lived by the manufacture of paper. The Caliph's library at Cordova, in the tenth century, contained 400,000 (some say 600,000) books. Four centuries later, after all the wonders of the thirteenth century, Canterbury headed the list of Christian libraries with 1,800 volumes, or 300 separate titles (*Catholic Encyclopædia*). On this point we have another example of the Catholic revision of the *Encyclopædia Britannica* which purported only to have corrected a few dates. In earlier editions there is a fine article on Libraries by Tedder, one of the highest authorities. It says that the Canterbury Library contained 698 works or (as there were several copies of some works) 3,000 volumes. In the current edition "X" alters 3,000 to 5,000, and says works instead of volumes. The entire article is sadly mutilated. Peterborough had 1,700, and other abbey or cathedral towns less. These facts are so elementary that almost any encyclopædia may be consulted.

Lick, James (1796–1876), American philanthropist, donor of the Lick Telescope. Of poor extraction, he made a large fortune by manufacture and prudent investment and was remarkable among the Californian millionaires of those days for his generosity. He gave liberally to charities during his life, and at his death left \$3,000,000 to educational and charitable institutions. He was an Atheist and Materialist and one of the chief donors to the fund for building the Paine Memorial Hall (Putnam's *Four Hundred Years of Freethought*, pp. 762–4).

Life, The Nature of. Until about a century ago the great majority of scientific men agreed that there were in the living organism "forces" at work which could not be material. Ever since the days of Aristotle the spiritual world had been protected against science by an outer fortified line, the belief in the immaterial nature of the Vital Principle (or Force), and it was said that life *must* have been created because the immaterial could not be evolved from matter. There were always two fatal weaknesses in this position. One is the assumption that the Materialist has to explain every vital process in physical and chemical terms, whereas, since he merely denies that there is evidence of immaterial realities, it is the task of his opponent to furnish proof that there is. The second is that the Vitalist theory about the nature of life was never more than a play on words and could not sustain serious analysis. The late Sir A. Thompson, for instance—a scientific man whose religion influenced his science—used to say that even muscular action could not be explained on material principles. It is in point of fact now explained, but could one work out satisfactorily the idea of the molecules in the tissues moving under the impulse of an immaterial principle? Embryonic development is still very obscure, but would it help to explain obscure chemical processes to say that an immaterial something took the leading part in them? The Vital Principle was fabricated just as "Aquosity" was imagined to be the principle of water before chemists analysed it and its properties. The change began in

science when chemists like Wöhler and Liebig created in the laboratory what were called "organic substances"—substances which (like urea, sugar, etc.) were produced up to that time in the organism alone. Organic chemistry now produces vast numbers of them. Vitalists said, down to twenty years ago, that such substances as sugar would never be made synthetically. Sugar is now made in the laboratory. The "wonderful instincts" of animals are very largely resolved into physical and chemical processes [see *Instinct and Tropisms*]. Biochemistry [see] made rapid progress. Experimental physiology and embryology attained remarkable results by treating the organism or embryo as a chemical machine: keeping dissected hearts alive and making tissues grow in chemicals, causing ova to develop (even into adult frogs) without fertilization, etc. By 1912 Vitalism was in so parlous a condition that the President of the British Association, Sir E. A. Schäfer [see], gave a materialistic address on the subject (*Life: its Nature, Origin, and Maintenance*, 1912), and the President in 1923, Sir C. Sherrington [see], discoursed on *Some Aspects of Animal Mechanism*. In the same year appeared Prof. Philipps's *Fundamentals of Organic and Biological Chemistry* and Prof. E. B. Wilson's *The Physical Basis of Life*. Prof. Wilson, one of the highest American authorities, said that the residual difficulties have "not in the least shaken our faith in mechanistic methods and conceptions," and he met the question whether in regard to these we should invoke a Vital Principle with the words, "No: a thousand times No." Prof. Hogben was still more scornful of Vitalism in his *Nature of Living Matter* (1930). In 1933 Prof. Beutner (*The Physical Chemistry of Living Tissues and Life-Processes*) concluded that life is only "one of the innumerable properties of carbon-compounds," and again the President of the British Association returned to the subject and, though very cautious, warned the few remaining reactionaries that they were forbidden by "the law of parsimony" (things must not be multiplied without necessity) to bring in "super-chemical entities."

Other points, and the virtual disappearance from science of Vitalism, will be treated under that title. The literature (besides the above) is now enormous. A good summary is given in T. H. Savory's *Mechanistic Biology and Animal Behaviour* (1936). For theories on the origin of Life see *Abiogenesis*, and for a general treatment, *Mechanism*.

Lincoln, Abraham (1809-65), sixteenth President of the United States. While still a manual worker, with poor schooling, Lincoln read Volney's *Ruins* and Paine's *Age of Reason* and abandoned Christianity for Deism. Desperate efforts are made by American apologists to prove that this idol of their people returned to the faith, but the evidence they adduce proves at the most that his difficult political position compelled him to make a few concessions, and this evidence is outweighed by the assurances of Lincoln's personal friends. The chief witness on the religious side is General Collis, who claims, in his *Religion of Abraham Lincoln* (1900), that he used Theistic language (which is admitted) and attended the Presbyterian Church in Washington. Even Agnostic officials have been known to attend church; and Collis did not attempt to meet Ingersoll's challenge to prove that Lincoln admitted the divinity of Christ. No one claims to show that he was a member of any Church. The second chief witness on the Christian side, H. G. Rankin (*Personal Recollections of Abraham Lincoln*), relies on statements of the President's mother. These, if a pious old lady's recollection is trusted, show only that he expressed to her a high appreciation of Christianity—which again is inconclusive. A more reliable witness is Lincoln's law-partner in pre-political days, and intimate friend, W. H. Herndon, who was emphatic—and he quotes Mrs. Lincoln and others in support—that he was a non-Christian Theist (*Abraham Lincoln*, 1892 ed., II, 145-56). Col. Ward Hill Lamon, another intimate friend, said the same and, when his statement was challenged, explicitly said in the next edition of his book: "He was not a Christian" (*Recollections of Abraham Lincoln*, appendix to 1911

ed., p. 385). J. E. Remsburg examines all the evidence in *Abraham Lincoln: Was he a Christian?* (1893), and rightly concludes that he remained a disciple of Paine. C. J. Leland (*Abraham Lincoln*, 1879) gives virtually the same verdict when he claims that "as he grew older his intensely melancholic and emotional temperament inclined him toward reliance on an unseen Power and a belief in a future state" (p. 56). There is no evidence that he believed in a future state.

Linton, Eliza Lynn (1822-98), novelist. Mrs. Lynn Linton was a well-known figure, a distinguished novelist and feminist, in the last quarter of the century. She was an Agnostic (G. S. Layard, *Mrs. Lynn Linton: her Life, Letters, and Opinions*, 1901, pp. 66, 155, and 202). A year before she died she wrote a letter, professing Agnosticism, to a clergyman, and saying: "I think the Christian religion has brought far more misery, crime, and suffering, far more tyranny and evil, than any other" (p. 367). Her husband, **William James Linton** (1812-97), one of the best engravers in London, was active in reform movements, but his religious creed was "a large loose jumble of Christianity and Pantheism."

Littre, Maximilien Paul Émile (1801-81), French philologist. One of the most distinguished philologists of France, and author of the monumental *Dictionnaire de la langue française* (5 vols., 1866-77). His opinions were so well known that when the Academy decided to open its august doors to him, the Catholic leader, Bishop Dupanloup, resigned. Now the *Catholic Encyclopedia* claims him on the ground that, it alleges, after many conversations with a Jesuit late in life he "finally asked to be baptised and died in the Catholic Church." His biographer, J. d'Arsac (*Émile Littré*, 1893), explains that he was dying and unable to speak when he was baptized, but a friend of Loisy at Paris, a French ex-priest, told the present writer that it was an open secret among the French clergy that it was Littré's Catholic wife who baptized him while he was unconscious! He was a Positivist, but much more positive (less mystic) than Comte.

Llorente, Juan Antonio (1756-1823), Spanish historian. Catholic writers give the impression that the author of the *Historia crítica de la Inquisición en España* (10 vols., 1822) was a frivolous sceptic who fabricated the figure of 341,042 victims of the Spanish Inquisition. He was, on the contrary, a priest of great distinction and learning in the Spanish Church; General Secretary of the Inquisition, Canon of Toledo Cathedral, and Knight of the Caroline Order. He was converted to Deism and, when the French were driven out of the Peninsula, he went with them, taking the official records of the Inquisition and compiling his work from them. After the fall of Napoleon the French ecclesiastical authorities fell upon him. He wrote a scathing history of the Popes (*Portraits politiques des Papes*, 1823), and was expelled. The efforts of Hefele, Gams, and other Catholic writers, to disprove his figures are futile. He was a conscientious scholar, and had the official documents before him.

Locke, John (1632-1704), philosopher. He was in earlier years physician to Lord Shaftesbury [see] and his family, and through Shaftesbury's influence he got Government appointments which enabled him to live at Montpelier, where he wrote most of his famous *Essay Concerning the Human Understanding* (1690)—a work on which he had expended seventeen years and which had a momentous influence on the development of thought. It opened the rebellion against intuitions and innate ideas. As Locke held a public office, he was cautious about religion, but his philosophy implies that he rejected the belief in an immortal soul. He was a Theist, but his work *The Reasonableness of Christianity* refers to its ethic, and does not accept its doctrines.

Loeb, Prof. Jacques (1859-1924), American physiologist. A German by birth, educated at Berlin, Munich, and Strassburg Universities, who settled in America and was professor of physiology at Chicago and California Universities. In 1910 he was appointed head of the Department of Experimental Biology of the Rockefeller Institute for

Medical Research at New York, and his splendid pioneer work put him at the head of his science. The *Dictionary of American Biography* says that his discoveries "constitute an epoch in the progress of biology." Loeb was at the same time an Atheist and dogmatic Materialist. All his works are Materialistic (*The Comparative Physiology of the Brain*, 1902, *The Mechanistic Conception of Life*, 1912, etc.), and he dedicated his *Organism as a Whole* (1916) to "the group of Freethinkers, including D'Alembert, Diderot, Holbach, and Voltaire, who first dared to follow the consequences of a mechanistic science to the rules of human conduct." He was an Hon. Associate of the R.P.A., and he often scolded the present writer (in personal correspondence) for not declaring more emphatically in public lectures that science has now proved the truth of Materialism. The Churches regarded him as a deadly enemy, but his position in world-science was unassailable. See W. J. V. Osterhout, *Biographical Memoir of J. Loeb* (1930).

Logia, The. In 1897 and 1903 archæologists found at Oxyrhynchus, in Egypt, where there had been an early Christian settlement, fragments of papyri containing a dozen "Sayings" (*Logia*) of Jesus. One papyrus is claimed to go back to the middle of the second century, and the others to about 200. The words are often similar to sayings in the Gospels, and an immense amount of futile discussion followed the discovery. No one doubts that words attributed to Jesus circulated widely in the Church by the year 150, and some experts claim that even that date is too early for the *Logia*. The Sayings are given in the eleventh edition of the *Encyclopædia Britannica* and are cut out of the latest edition.

Logos, The. As applied to Jesus in the first line of the Fourth Gospel (in English "Word") it is borrowed from the pre-Christian Greek-Jewish mysticism which culminated in Gnosticism [see]. Egyptian mythology had used "Word"—though the English (or Latin) is a misleading translation—in an analogous sense, but the mystic meaning was developed in Greek philosophy. Heracleitos (a Materialist) had spoken

of it as the principle of order in Nature. Anaxagoras [see] had turned this into a mystic element by calling it *Nous* (Mind), and Socrates had further converted it into Spirit. The Stoics of the religious wing had made a central feature of the *Logos* (Reason) as the basis of the Law of Nature, and Philo, the Alexandrian Jew, had returned to the Platonist conception or blended the two. From this Alexandrian school of mystic Judaism was derived the use of the word in the Fourth Gospel.

Loisy, Prof. Alfred (1857–1940), French historian. From 1881 to 1893 he was a priest, and professor of Oriental languages and Biblical exegesis in the Catholic Institute at Paris, and the outstanding scholar of the Church. His successive books on the Gospels were censured by the authorities—he used to bow meekly and write another—and in 1908 he was excommunicated, and he became professor of the history of religions (1909–32) at the (secular) Paris University and rector of the *École des Hautes Études*. He was one of the most learned authorities in Europe on early Christianity. His Rationalist views are best seen in *La morale humaine* (1923), *Religion et humanité* (1925), and his very valuable work *Les mystères païens et le mystère chrétien* (2 ed., 1930).

Lollards, The. The name, which is of unknown origin and meaning, was first used in the Netherlands, and was applied in England to Evangelical sectaries before the time of Wycliffe [see]. As his followers had the same creed, to return to the simplicity or virtue of the early Christians, it was given to them. The significance of Lollardism in the evolution of European thought is shabbily treated in historical literature because it discredits the myth of the general docility of the people to the Church of the Middle Ages. As soon as any part of Europe was intellectually awakened, at the end of the Dark Age, revolt began: the rationalistic revolt in the schools [see *Abélard*; *Arnold*; etc.], the spread of democratic ideas [see *Democracy*] in Italy, and the moral (or immoral) revolt of the troubadour literature and chivalry. The Church crushed the first and second, but the deeper corruption into which it

itself sank when its power was secured, and the invention of new doctrines, powers, and rites, led to fresh extensive revolts. That of the Albigensians, Waldensians, etc. [see], was bloodily suppressed, as the Crusades had now put armies of looters at the disposal of the Papacy, but the stark contrast between the Gospels and the actual features of the Church continued to provoke rebellion in spite of the Inquisition. This had never been admitted into England, and when Wycliffe (1324-84) organized a band of stern puritan preachers there was an amazing response. Although the population of England was then less than 4,000,000, authorities estimate that Wycliffe had about 500,000 followers, or nearly half the adult males of all classes. In view of the loose morals of the time, we may regard a very large proportion of these as just men who resented the greed and hypocrisy of the clergy and monks. In spite of royal and clerical pressure and many martyrs—the death-sentence for heresy in the statute *De haeretico comburendis* was passed in 1401—the Archbishop of Canterbury complained that they were as numerous as ever in 1428, and the movement persisted until it was absorbed in the Reformation. See G. M. Trevelyan, *England in the Age of Wycliffe* (3 ed., 1904), and E. Powell and G. M. Trevelyan *The Peasant-Rising and the Lollards* (1899, with valuable documents).

Lombards, The. A Teutonic people from North Germany who entered and conquered North Italy in the sixth century. The popular theory that the name means Long Beards (Longobardi) is disputed, but they were at first as barbaric as any of the Germanic invaders of the South. Their history, like that of the Ostrogoths, in whose former territory they settled, decisively refutes the attempt of apologists to lay the blame for the Dark Age upon "the barbarians." Within a century, stimulated by the Ostrogothic monuments, they formed the most advanced and most (or only) enlightened civilization in Europe. Under their king Liutprand (712-44), a model ruler, they created the cities of north-central Italy which took the lead in the later revival of Europe,

had admirable laws, and cultivated a zeal for art and education which was the sole inspiration of the moderate and almost sterile idealism of Charlemagne. "If," says Dean Milman, "the Papacy had entered into a confederacy of interests with the Lombard Kings and contented itself with the spiritual supremacy . . . Italy might again perhaps have been consolidated into a great Kingdom" (*History of Latin Christianity*, II, 417). But, though the Lombards had accepted the Roman faith, and Liutprand, Hodgkin says, "carried compliance with the Papal admonitions to the very verge of weakness and disloyalty to his people" (*Italy and her Invaders*, VI, 499), the Popes, from sheer greed of wealth and power, summoned the Franks to wreck the Lombard civilization and hand over its ruins to form their Temporal Power [see]. By their policy the second serious and most promising attempt to restore civilization in Europe was frustrated, and Rome itself soon sank into the barbarism of the ninth and tenth centuries. Vols. V and VI of Hodgkin's great work (1916) are the standard authority.

Lombroso, Prof. Cesare, M.D. (1836-1909), Jewish-Italian criminologist. He knew Chinese, Chaldaic, and Hebrew before he was twenty years old, and was the most famous criminologist in Europe before he was forty. His *L'Uomo Delinquente* (1875) was translated into all the chief languages. Lombroso was an Atheist and an Honorary Associate of the R.P.A., but Spiritualists claim that he joined them. His daughter and biographer (*Cesare Lombroso*, 1915) explains that during his last two or three years, when he was duped by a medium, he was a physical wreck, unable to eat or sleep. He in any case remained an Atheist to the end.

Long, Charles (1800-79), classical writer. After a few years as professor at the University of Virginia, to which Jefferson had invited him, he returned to occupy the chair of Greek at University College, London. His translations of Latin and Greek works ("Long's Classics") were famous at the time, and almost equally well known was his *Decline of the Roman Empire* (5 vols.,

1864-74). In this work and *An Old Man's Thoughts about Many Things* (1862, pp. 24, 46, 213, etc.) he expresses a drastic Rationalism.

Longfellow, Henry Wadsworth (1807-82), American poet. He was professor of modern languages at Harvard, 1836-54, and esteemed to be America's greatest poet. Religious writers commonly describe him as a Christian, but his intimate friend, a fellow-poet, W. D. Howells, says: "I think that as he grew older his hold upon anything like a creed weakened, though he remained of the Unitarian philosophy concerning Christ" (*Literary Friends and Acquaintances*, 1901, p. 202). As the "Unitarian philosophy" denied the divinity of Christ, and Howells adds that the poet "did not latterly go to church," he was clearly an advanced Rationalist.

Lotze, Prof. Rudolph Hermann (1817-81), German philosopher. He is counted the last of the dynasty of great German thinkers who succeeded Kant. Lotze was an eclectic, and did not found a system. While he professed to reconcile science, philosophy, and religion (*Mikro-kosmos*, 3 vols., 1856-64), his "God" was Hegel's Absolute, and very far from the Christian conception.

Loubet, Émile (1838-1929), seventh President of the French Republic. A lawyer who after the Revolution of 1870 entered politics on the anticlerical side, under the aggressive Rationalist Gambetta [see]. As Premier, President of the Senate, and ultimately President of the Republic, he played a great part in the secularization of France.

Louis XIV (1638-1715). In spite of the fact that modern historians do not recognize a single element of greatness in Louis, either in war or statesmanship or personal character, conventional literature continues to speak of him as "the Great Monarch," and fulsome biographies are still published. His only virtue was that he paid close attention to his royal duties, but it was two great Ministers, Colbert and Louvois, who made France the richest country with the finest army in Europe. He did much for the adornment of Paris, but he hated the city, and very

rarely entered it, and the single reason for this embellishment of it was that it was *his* capital. He spent vast sums on palaces (Versailles, etc.), while whole provinces of France literally starved, and the taxation was appalling. He compelled the nobility to live in or near his Court; and for gambling, looseness, and murderous intrigue, few Courts ever surpassed it. All classes were, with few exceptions, corrupt, poisoning was epidemic, and devil-worship [see] had an extraordinary vogue. Louis's personal character was the joke of Europe. From the age of sixteen to forty-five he never attempted to curb his passions, and it is an audacious untruth of the subsidized historian of the Jesuits, Crétineau-Joly, that they "made war on the King's heart." Three Jesuit confessors in succession guided his "conscience" during the most flagrant period of his irregularities, when his mistresses ruled the Court and had better suites in it than the Queen. At the time of his last affair Paris was fouled by scandals which astonished Europe. As, in addition, his health was now poor—he was a glutton at table—the clergy weaned him from his adulteries and got him to atone by the persecution and suppression of the Huguenots [see], which did irreparable injury to France. Belloc's *Monarchy* (1938) shows that Catholics can no longer suppress as much as they used to do, but there is more truth (partly obscured by the criminal splendour of his Court) in H. N. Williams' *Mme. de Maintenon and Louis XIV* (1910).

Lourdes. A town on the foothills of the Pyrenees which has become extremely rich as a special shrine of the Virgin. The legend is that the Virgin appeared in 1858 to a peasant girl of neurasthenic type and questionable character. The clergy and civic officials built upon this, and the attempt, which failed in a score of places before and since, in France, Belgium, Ireland, Canada, etc., was skilfully carried to success at Lourdes. The widow of one of the officials, Baron Massy, handed a correct manuscript account of what really happened to the Jesuits, and they suppressed it. An orthodox and sincere priest, Fr. Domenech, then told the

facts, and his book (*Lourdes*, 1894) was suppressed. Another Catholic, J. B. Estrade, published the facts (*Les apparitions de Lourdes*, 1899), and the clergy falsely represent him as an apostate. The shrine is a gold-mine to the Church, even English Catholics sending profitable pilgrimages annually, though not even a serious recovery of a neurotic character occurs. In 1924 Fr. Woodlock ventured to submit a "miraculous cure" to a group of London medical men, and they rejected it. In *The Lourdes Miracles* (1925) the present writer examines every major miracle claimed to that date and exposes the trickery in many cases and the effect of nervous excitement in others. Three points should be noted: (1) no cure of a serious disease or injury is ever claimed to have been instantaneous (which ought to be as easy for the Virgin as a gradual cure); (2) the great majority of the patients cured are girls or young women; (3) the accounts of cures claimed by the medical men (a paid Catholic staff) at Lourdes are generally falsified in Catholic literature.

Lowell, James Russell (1819-91), American poet. He passed from law to letters, and in 1846 made a high reputation by *The Bigelow Papers*. In 1854 he succeeded Longfellow as professor at Harvard, edited the *Atlantic Monthly*, and entered the front rank of American writers with his essays and poetry (much of which is used as Ethical hymns). For some years he was ambassador at Madrid, and later at London. The word "God" occurs sometimes in his poems, but W. D. Howells, who knew him well, assures us that he was an Agnostic and sceptical about a future life (*Literary Friends and Acquaintances*, 1901, p. 288).

Lowell, Percival (1855-1916), American astronomer. He was head of the Lowell Observatory (Arizona) and professor of astronomy at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. His valuable work on Mars made him a world-figure in his science and brought high honours. In his *Soul of the Far East* (1886) he professes Agnosticism, saying that religions are "self-constructed idols" (p. 162). He had spent years in Japan.

Luchaire, Prof. Achille (1846-1908), French historian. He was professor of mediæval history at Paris University, and his works on France in the Middle Ages (chiefly *Innocent III*, 6 vols., 1904-8, *France at the Time of Philippe Augustus*, Engl. trans., 1912) have the highest authority. The latter work is in effect a comprehensive refutation of the myth of mediæval virtue, piety, and chivalry.

Lucifer. Properly the planet Venus, or the morning star, "the bringer (or herald) of the light." Isaiah applies it to the fallen King of Babylon, and the Fathers, believing that Jesus (*Luke* x, 18) referred to this when he spoke of Satan falling from heaven, began to call the principal devil Lucifer.

Lucretius, Titus Lucretius Carus (about 98-55 B.C.). Although he was "one of the greatest of Roman poets" (*Ency. Brit.*), he is one of the most obscure, only the approximate date of the writing of his famous poem *De Rerum Natura* being ascertainable. By a remarkable piece of good fortune the manuscript of this defiantly Materialist poem was preserved through the Middle Ages—must we attribute this to the good monks?—and it gives us the best account of the Ionic-Epicurean science and philosophy in its full application to nature and man. Religious writers who insist on judging the science of 2,000 years ago by the science of to-day should be invited to consider the much feebler scientific ideas of Aquinas, though the Arabs had meantime carried science a long step farther. There are admirable English translations of the poem by Cyril Bailey (1910), R. C. Trevelyan (1937), and others.

Luke, The Gospel of. On the poorest grounds the majority of Biblical writers claim that this was written by a Greek physician named Luke, who accompanied Paul on his journeys and wrote also the "we" section of *Acts* [see]. The Rev. Professor Kirsopp Lake disdainfully exposes the weakness of the argument (*Introduction to the New Testament*, 1937) and shows that the text nowhere suggests a medical author. On equally poor grounds the book is said to have been written about the year 80. Conybeare says between 80 and

95, but Loisy and others put it in the second century. On ordinary historical principles it affords no clue whatever to the date beyond saying (I, 1) that a good many lives of Jesus have preceded it. There is no evidence of its existence and circulation in the Church before 140, and the long speeches and casual remarks attributed to Jesus, as if a hearer had written them down, are obvious fiction even if we date it about 80. It has no biographical value.

Luther, Martin, D.D. (1483-1546). His father was of the peasant class, but he had improved his position, and he gave Martin a good education at the local Latin School and Erfurt University. There is no charge against his character either at school or in the Augustinian monastery which he entered. Whether he was neuropathic—some say epileptic—and terrified into a deeper piety by a thunderstorm is one of the idle disputes which distract attention from his real historical significance. This is, as regards the first part of his life, that the coarseness of his language reflects the normal coarseness of the monastic as well as the lay world of the time. We gather from him that life in this abbey was not irregular—no one suggests that *all* monasteries were—but the conversation appears to have been what modern taste calls filthy (not sexually). The grosser words of Luther are, of course, erased from English translations, but the Jesuit Father Grisar makes a malodorous bouquet of them (from Luther's *Table Talk*, etc.) in his German biography (*Luther*, 1911, Engl. trans., 1913), and the American Mgr. P. O'Hara (*The Facts about Luther*) finds in them "a Satanic desire to deity indecency." Luther obviously used this language, like Rabelais, to provoke laughter. This reflects on the character of his earlier monastic environment as much as on his later environment. In point of fact, his chief opponent, the celebrated friar-preacher Thomas Murner, often used the same coarse language in sermons delivered to crowds of burghers in the cathedrals and large churches. See his *Narrenbeschwerung* (in vile mediæval German), of which Spanier published a modern edition (1894). As Gustav Jung shows,

in his *Geschlechtsmoral des deutschen Weibes im Mittelalter* (1922), and, as is explained in many articles of this work, women as well as men of all conditions had then a sexual looseness and coarseness to which it is hardly possible to find a parallel in normal periods of history. A booklet privately printed in America, and attributed to Mark Twain, fairly represents conversation at the Court of Elizabeth.

The second chief point in the modern Catholic attempt to weaken Luther's indictment of the Church is less crude, but equally unsound. It is to exaggerate "the social and political causes of the Reformation," with a suggestion that the corruption of the Church had much less to do with it, and was far less in volume, than the historians of the last century represented. A few recent historical writers have adopted this apologetic novelty. Even in a neutral work like Roy Pascal's *Social Basis of the Reformation* (1933) we find the social causation greatly exaggerated and the corruption of the Papacy, the priests, and the monks, so understated as to give an entirely false impression. How the political conditions ensured the success of the rebellion against Rome in the sixteenth century, though such revolt had repeatedly failed in earlier centuries, will be considered under the title **Reformation**, but they certainly did not *cause* the revolt. Of the social conditions, neither Luther nor any other Reformer took much notice. When the mass of the people, the peasants, taking their stand on the preaching of justice in the Gospels, rebelled against the foul and cruel conditions in which they lived, and appealed to Luther, he addressed a pamphlet (*Against the Murderous Peasants*) to the nobles urging them to "cut them (the peasants) down, slaughter and stab them." He said that their demand for the abolition of serfdom was "against the Gospels, and robbery." Melancthon also appealed to the nobles to crush the peasants, and in one summer 150,000 of them were killed, the leaders having the flesh torn from them with red-hot pincers. It is, to say the least, extremely misleading to quote social conditions as a cause of the Reformation. It was, in

fact, not so much the moral corruption as the adulteration of doctrine that moved Luther at first. He visited Rome in 1510, when the Papal Court was still brazenly corrupt, but he took no step until 1517, when Tetzel began to sell indulgences in his district. In later years he wavered between the two horns of the Christian dilemma: Paul, the founder of the religion, and Augustine, the founder of its theology, had been fanatically anti-sex; yet God was the author of nature. Luther robustly concluded that God meant men to enjoy sensual pleasure. Catholic writers on him go so far as to suggest that he contracted syphilis from one of the ex-nuns or other women who surrounded him in later years. See, especially, the vicious *Luther* of Father Grisar, and the works of Father Denifle and Mgr. O'Hara. He remains, in spite of the floods of ink that have been poured out about him, an enigmatic personality: certainly sincere and religious, but very far from "spiritual," as the word is now used, in his mature years. He did not inspire the revolt against Rome, if he "hatched the egg which Erasmus had laid." The revolt had, as we show in many articles, simmered and repeatedly overflowed from the eleventh century onward, and it was the corruption of the Papacy, the clergy, the monks, and the nuns, that counted most in its inspiration—not so much the vice itself, which shocked only a minority in so loose-living an age, as the hypocrisy of it in the clergy and their greed and parasitism. Books on Luther are either white (Protestant) or black (Catholic), and a portrait in half-tones is very desirable. Probably Prof. Mackinnon's *Luther and the Reformation* (4 vols., 1925–30) is the best now available, though it lacks candour and is overloaded with Protestant theology.

Lyall, the Right Honourable Sir Alfred Comyn, K.C.B., G.C.I.E., D.C.L., LL.D., P.C. (1835–1911), statesman. He advanced in the Indian Civil Service to the positions of Home Secretary to the Government of India and later Governor of the North-Western Provinces. Among his works *Asiatic Studies* (1882) is of considerable value, and he does not conceal his Rationalism in his

Verses Written in India (1889). See especially the poem "Theology in Extremis." Clodd says, in his *Memories* (pp. 101–4), that when religion was discussed Lyall used to say: "I don't know—but then who does?" It was Lyall who persuaded Sir L. Stephen's daughters (who told the present writer) against their wish to give Stephen a Christian burial service.

Lydians, The. An Aryan people who passed from the Balkans, probably sailing over the Black Sea, to Asia Minor about 1000 B.C. and settled inland from the Ionian coast. They are interesting for two reasons. They created a very prosperous and attractive civilization—their King Croesus is still a symbol of wealth—by the seventh century B.C.—another instance of the educability of the Aryan "barbarians." The more interesting point is that, borrowing and humanizing the Hittite cult of Ma (the Earth Mother), they developed the corollary of the brotherhood of man [see] more than any other ancient nation. Their life was one of gaiety and pleasure, and "Friend of All" was the most coveted epitaph for a man's tombstone. Through the Ionic cities, and then the Stoics and Epicureans, they had a most important influence on the evolving ethic of the race. With them began the "colleges" or trade unions of workers. The best work on this greatly underrated civilization is Radek's *La Lydie et le monde grec* (1892), but there is much appreciation in Sir W. Ramsay's *Asiatic Elements in Greek Civilization* (1927).

Lyell, Sir Charles, M.A., F.R.S., LL.D. (1797–1875), famous geologist. His great work *The Principles of Geology* (3 vols., 1830–3) swept the old Catastrophic Theory [see] out of science and prepared the way for Darwin. He gave his invaluable support to the *Origin* and prepared the way for an application of evolution to man by his *Antiquity of Man* (1863). By 1873 Lyell had abandoned not only the Christian creed, but the ideas of a personal God and immortality (*Life, Letters, and Journals of Sir Charles Lyell*, 1881, II, 82, 442, 452, etc.). Lyell was the greatest geologist in Europe in his mature years.

M.

Macartney, Prof. James, M.D., F.R.S., F.R.C.S. (1770-1843), Irish anatomist. He practised as a surgeon in London for some years, and was professor of comparative anatomy and physiology at St. Bartholomew's Hospital. From 1813 to 1837 he was professor of anatomy and surgery at Dublin University and one of the most distinguished surgeons of his time. Although the priests bitterly attacked him for his avowed Rationalism, he held too strong a position to be displaced. Prof. Macalister mildly says (*James Macartney*, 1900) that he "did not formally commit himself to any creed" (p. 279) and that he held that "every revelation, no matter whether it be real or supposed, must produce hatred and persecution among mankind" (p. 281). Macartney was a Deist.

McCabe, Joseph Martin (b. 1867), writer. He became a monk of the Franciscan Order and, as "Father Antony," was professor of philosophy and ecclesiastical history for five years. He studied philosophy and Semitic languages at Louvain University, but the rules of his Order forbade him to take a degree. He left the Church in 1896 and wrote two books for the Rationalist Press in that year; and he was one of the original Directors of the R.P.A. (1899). He has written about 200 books and thirty translations, delivered about 2,000 lectures (including seven lecture tours in Australasia, the United States, and Canada), and held a score of public debates. He is an Atheist and Materialist. For books see *Who's Who*?

Macdonald, Eugene Montague (1855-1909), American editor. A printer who in 1883 bought (with others) the New York *Truthseeker* and edited it until 1907. His brother, George Everett Macdonald (1857-1943), worked with him on a farm as boy, took up printing, and founded and edited the San Francisco *Freethought* (1877-81). After twelve years in provincial journalism he succeeded his brother as editor of the *Truthseeker*.

Machado, Bernardino (1851-1922), third President of the Republic of

Portugal. He was a professor at the Coimbra University and, being an avowed Agnostic and Republican, took part openly in International Congresses of Freethinkers and the Revolution of 1910. He was appointed Foreign Minister, and was in 1916 elected President by 134 votes to 45. Under his guidance the old power of the Roman Church was broken and so remained until a few years after his death.

Mackenzie, Prof. John Stuart, M.A., LL.D., Litt.D. (1860-1937), philosopher. Professor of logic and philosophy at the University College of South Wales, 1895-1915, and actively associated with the Ethical Movement and the Moral Education League. Mackenzie was an intuitionist in ethics, but entirely outside Christianity. In his *Manual of Ethics* (1893) he says that we must reject Christian doctrines, and "what remains essential to religion is the reality of the moral life" (p. 450). In the Ethical symposium *A Generation of Religious Progress* (1916) he observes that religious creeds "have the disadvantage of having to be accepted without definite proof." He published an autobiography in 1936.

Mackintosh, Sir James (1765-1832), Scottish philosopher. He settled in London, and gave warm support to the progressives, writing in defence of the French Revolution against Burke. Though he became less radical in politics, he continued to support liberal movements and was one of the brilliant group who met at Lord Holland's house. For a time he was professor of law at Haileybury College and he held several political offices. Greville (*Memoirs*, III, 331) quotes Allen saying that Mackintosh had "never believed at all during life," but professed religion before he died. On the contrary, he was always a Deist. His pious son failed to induce him to embrace Christianity before his death (*Memoir of the Life of Sir J. Mackintosh*, 1836, IV, 485-90). Lord Coleridge classes him as an unbeliever with the Mills, Tyndall, and Huxley (*Memoir of Baron Bramwell*, letter of October 18, 1877).

Macrobius, Ambrosius Theodosius (wrote about 400-423). A Roman

pagan official, believed to have been Proconsul in Africa, who, like most of his class, resisted Christianity to the end. His *Saturnalia*, mainly consisting of imaginary conversations among the patricians he knew, is a valuable witness to the high character of the last generation of Roman gentlemen. He makes one of the earliest attempts to resolve religion into solar myths.

M'Taggart, Prof. John M'Taggart Ellis, LL.D., Litt.D. (1866-1925), philosopher. One of the chief British followers of Hegel and lecturer on philosophy at Cambridge. On account of his opposition to Materialism he is often quoted as orthodox; yet he was an Atheist. In *Some Dogmas of Religion* (1906) he rejects the idea of immortality and says that we have "no reason to suppose that God exists" (p. 291). In *Studies in Hegelian Cosmology* (1901) he says that the Absolute "is not God, and in consequence there is no God" (p. 94).

Madison, James (1751-1836), fourth President of the United States. After graduating at Princeton he devoted himself to a thorough study of religion as well as law and history, and he was one of the most cultured of the revolutionaries. His protests kept religious phrases out of the Constitution of the State of Virginia, and in the Virginian Legislature he strongly protested against the idea of compulsory contributions to the Churches, and had much to do with the separation of Church and State. He was Secretary of State to his fellow-Rationalist Jefferson, and was elected President in 1809. His letters (*The Writings of James Madison*, 9 vols., 1910) confirm that he was a Deist of an Agnostic tinge. He would not have the American universities turned into "an arena for Theological Gladiators" (IX, 126), and in a letter to a clergyman, in 1832, he said: "There appears to be in the nature of a man what ensures his belief in an invisible cause of his present existence and an anticipation of his future existence" (IX, 485). Like Washington and Lincoln he never speaks about God in his letters.

Maeterlinck, Count Maurice (b. 1862), Belgian writer and Nobel Prize winner. He practised law in Belgium till 1896,

then settled in Paris, and made a world-reputation by his exquisitely written moral essays. He is Intuitionist in ethics, but he rejected Catholicism and apparently (from his writings) Theism also, in his youth and never returned to them. He has a mystic vein, but in *La mort* (1913) he is not convinced of a future life.

Mahavira (about 560-483 B.C.), founder of Jainism. A Hindu descriptive name meaning "The Great Hero," for Nataputta, a contemporary of Buddha, who is believed to have founded the Jain sect. Like Buddha [see], he was an Atheist. See Jainism.

Maitland, Prof. Frederick William, M.A., LL.D., D.C.L. (1850-1906), jurist. Downing Professor of English Law, Ford Lecturer at Oxford, Rede Lecturer at Cambridge, Fellow of the British Academy, and author of very weighty works on law (*English Law Before the Time of Edward I*, 2 vols., 1895, etc.) as well as a sympathetic life of L. Stephen (*Life and Letters of Leslie Stephen*, 1906). His biographer, the Hon. H. A. L. Fisher, says that he was "always a dissenter from all the Churches" (F. W. Maitland, 1910, p. 100). He was, like his intimate friend Stephen and most of the "Sunday Tramps," an Agnostic (personal knowledge).

Malherbe, François de (1555-1628), French poet. He was educated for the law, but his fine poetry induced Henri IV to summon him to his Court, where he was openly "a scoffer" and "the literary dictator of the first quarter of the century" (Perrens, *Les libertins en France au XVII siècle*, 1896, p. 84). The best edition of his poetry is in 5 vols., 1862-9.

Mallet, David, M.A. (1705-65), Scottish poet. He settled in Cambridge, and his poetry was so highly esteemed that in 1742 he was appointed under-Secretary to the Prince of Wales. He edited Bolingbroke's works, and was a close friend of Hume and Gibbon and "a great declaimer in all the London coffee-houses against Christianity" (*Dict. Nat. Biog.*).

Malta, The Papacy and. In 1928 there was a struggle which Catholics got suppressed or misrepresented in the

British Press. Mussolini had openly said, from his first accession to power, that he would seize Malta, and after his reconciliation with the Papacy the Maltese clergy worked for him. A Franciscan monk was ordered by his superiors to go to Italy, and he, justly fearing arbitrary action, appealed to the British authorities. The Premier, Lord Strickland, a Catholic, protected the friar by refusing him a passport, and the bishops and clergy conducted a fierce campaign against him at the next election. Maltese Catholics were compelled to disclose in the confessional how they voted. Strickland was outraged and fought them, but, as usual, the British Government eventually appeased Italy and the Vatican by sacrificing him.

Mammary Glands, The. One of the most obvious, yet most decisive, proofs of the evolution of man is that all males of the higher classes of mammals have vestigial breasts; not merely the external parts, but atrophied milk-glands. In many cases of men the glands have been fully developed and yielded milk, and in still more cases there are (as in the lower mammals) several pairs of breasts arranged on the usual lines. See *Haeckel's Evolution of Man*, cheap ed., 1912, pp. 113-15, for photographs. The cause is still obscure in science. Haeckel suggested a confusion of sexes in embryonic development, and experts on modern genetics give point to his necessarily vague suggestion by explaining that, as all sex characters are potential in both female and male, though some remain latent in each, some freak of chromosome development may be the cause. Others suggest that, in very early mammal evolution, both sexes may have suckled the young. Whatever obscurity remains in science, the theory that God created the male mammal with these features is ludicrous.

Man, The Evolution of. There is no point on which the conflict of science with religion persists to-day in broader range, and is more deadly, than in regard to the evolution of man, and all claims that the conflict is over, or relates only to an interpretation of the teaching of science, not the teaching itself, are based upon ignorance of either

the scientific or the religious position. Science—in comparative anatomy and physiology, anthropology, and psychology—has been agreed upon the evolution of man almost from the beginning of the present century. Virchow [see] opposed the teaching of evolution for conservative and social reasons. Wallace made a reserve as regards the mind, on Spiritualist grounds. Otherwise the historic struggle was over forty years ago. There remained a small group of scientific men (Lloyd Morgan, Osborn, Thomson, MacBride, etc.) who, like Wallace, contended that the mind was not evolved from matter, but most of them are now dead, and their **Emergent Evolution** [see] theory is quite discredited. The authorities on the relevant branches of science allow no distinction of body and mind, and no one who knows the present state of psychology in regard to mind could venture to make that distinction. Yet, even the better-educated members, leaders, and writers of the Churches *never* admit the evolution of what they continue to call the mind of man. When the Anglo-American bishops, at the Lambeth Conference [see], recommended the faithful to accept evolution even in anthropology, they, led by Bishop Barnes, clearly relied on the theory of Emergent Evolution, which they called the teaching of science. Dr. Inge treats the theory with disdain, but, as a Neo-Platonist philosopher, he holds that all evolution is mental evolution. It is, therefore, a serious mistake to imagine that only a minority of Christians who are known as Fundamentalists [see]—they are in fact the overwhelming majority of Christians—still foolishly reject the established truths of science. The educated minority are equally in opposition to science on one of the most important and best-substantiated of its teachings. The reason is obvious. All doctrinal Christianity is stultified if what is called the mind or soul is only a higher development of the behaviour of an ape or the culmination of a thousand million years of animal development.

The article **Evolution** examines a number of converging lines of evidence which put that truth beyond question, and the attempt to isolate man was

doomed from the start by comparative anatomy, embryology, and psychology, and was menaced by the advancing science of anthropology. To Huxley's argument that man was identical with the ape in bone, muscle, and nerve, Haeckel added proof of identity in embryonic development and vestigial organs [see]. Although the ductless glands were then unknown, and physiologists were consequently often led astray, only two organs (the thymus and the thyroid), cited by Haeckel in his long list of vestigial organs, have to be struck out, and we do not know in what degree earlier structures or parts of structures became vestigial and later entered into new structures. Much ridicule also was poured upon Haeckel's striking exposition by photographs and drawings of the evolution of the face, but it is fully supported by Prof. W. K. Gregory in his book *Our Face: From Fish to Man* (1929). The discovery of blood-tests [see] confirmed the relationship. The study of animal diseases, susceptibility to drugs, etc., added further proof; and the progress of child-psychology continued the embryological evidence. It was found that a newborn human baby has remarkably strong finger and arm muscles and can suspend itself clinging to a stick, and up to the age of eighteen months large numbers of children run on all fours like young apes (Prof. Hrdlicka, *Children who Run on All Fours*, 1931). Prof. Haldane has an excellent summary of these advances in his *Causes of Evolution*, 1932.

But the most decisive evidence, and that of which the opponents of evolution show the most deplorable ignorance, is that of anthropology. The chief ground of opposition in the last century was the "gulf" between man and the ape. The argument was always loose and superficial. Literary men and theologians used to contrast Shakespeare and the gorilla, and all opponents took man (generally themselves) as we know him in civilized society. Since no one disputed that civilized man has risen from a stage of savagery, one ought at least to take the lowest "savages" (the Negritoes [see]), in which case the "gulf" shrinks very materially. The

progress of prehistoric anthropology (or archæology) has now made an end of it. Palæontologists discovered that in the Miocene there were larger-brained apes [see] than those of to-day, which are a few survivors of a formerly very large family, and types even nearer to the human type have been found in Africa [see *Australopithecus*]. It will be shown in the article *Prehistoric Man* that the interval between these highest known apes and the lowest living men has been satisfactorily filled with fossil forms. Java man and Pekin man [see] stand midway between the two, and we have a human type gradually and very slowly advancing from that level in the Pilt-down, Heidelberg, and other remains. The question whether any of these are in the line of ancestry of modern man is immaterial to the present issue. They prove an evolution from a simian to the human level, which had been declared impossible. And this is even more decisively proved, especially as regards intelligence, by the millions of prehistoric stone implements. They begin with artefacts (rostracarinales and eoliths) which point to a lower grade of intelligence than that of the Negrito and show a portentously slow and gradual rise to the level of the Eskimo (Mousterian and Magdalenian man). These flint implements, which are abundant at the lowest levels, and innumerable (because imperishable) at the higher levels, would compel us to accept the evolution of man even if not a bone of our forerunners remained.

Where and how man was first evolved is still a subject of speculation. Both Asia (usually Central Asia) and Africa have their claims as the cradle of the race, while a few are disposed to believe that there was more than one centre. The question is not relevant here. The causes of the advance of our ape-like ancestor are more important and less controverted. The theory that man's ancestor was a ground-ape has found very little support, and it is generally agreed that a change from the comparative safety of arboreal life to life on the ground that swarmed with rivals for food and enemies could give the starting advantages. We know that forests of enormous extent disappeared north of

the Himalayas as the mountains rose, and that apes and other animals had lived there in tropical abundance. Sir G. Elliot Smith finely works out, in his *Evolution of Man*, how the new co-operation of hand (especially thumb) and eye would lead to improvements of both as well as of the cerebrum. See also Prof. Peake, *Early Steps in Human Progress* (1933), and Prof. Broom's *Coming of Man* (1933). The advance was so slow and gradual that no point could be indicated at which the ape became human. The evidence points broadly to the early Pliocene, or at least 20,000,000 years ago. While the in-expert critic demands some spectacular cause of advance beyond the apes, it is the infinitesimal slowness of the advance that puzzles the expert. From the Asiatic centre, if we accept this, the first migratory wave of men of short stature and dusky skin would spread to China, Southern Asia (then connected with Java and Australia), Africa, and South Europe, reaching even England (then part of Europe and having a very genial climate) before the Ice Age. Probably they lived, like the lowest Negritoes, in very small social groups. In the central region there later developed the taller race, which, according to the environment into which it drifted, acquired the features of the negro, the mongoloid, or the Caucasian. On the future evolution of man it is idle to speculate. Pictures of a hairless, toothless, flabby-muscled, large-brained type need not haunt us. Even with our present knowledge of glands, genes, and psychology, we could in the course of a century create a race with the Praxiteles type of physique and a much higher intelligence. Besides works mentioned above see Prof. A. F. Shull's *Evolution* (1936), Prof. A. M. Hocart's *Progress of Man* (1933), Prof. G. G. McCurdy's *Coming of Man* (2 ed., 1935, illustrated), and works indicated under **Prehistoric Man**.

Mana. A word used in the Pacific Islands for a vague diffused magical power or quality which the natives imagine in objects (weapons, etc.) or persons. It is supposed to have belonged originally to men or spirits and been communicated to objects. In the

generally accepted theory of the origin of religion this *Mana* is much discussed as something like the vague feeling of early man which preceded belief in spirits. There is the serious objection that the lowest peoples, in whom the belief in spirits begins, have no idea of *Mana*. [See **Religion, The Origin of.**]

Mandæans, The. A Mesopotamian sect who call themselves "The true Believers," and are also known as Nasoræans or St. John's Christians. They now number about 2,000, but were much more numerous in the Middle Ages, and are said by some experts to have originated in pre-Christian times and been related to the Gnostics. The interest is that they seem to be a surviving remnant of the jumble of Persian and late Jewish ideas which deeply influenced the rise of Christianity. They have the Persian ideas of an antithesis of light (which God created) and darkness, of swarms of demons, and of hatred of the flesh. They approach the Gnostics in preaching salvation by knowledge. Possibly they, the Jewish mystics, the early Christians, the Gnostics, and the Manichæans were separate streams from the same muddy lake of thought.

Manen, Prof. Willem Christian van (1842-1905), Dutch writer. He was for twenty years a pastor of the Reformed Church, and in 1884 was appointed professor of theology at Groningen University, and in 1885 professor of ancient Christian literature and New Testament exegesis at Leyden. His chief work, *Paulus* (3 vols., 1890-6), made a sensation by rejecting all the Pauline Epistles as spurious—a view which was little adopted. In 1904 he became an Honorary Associate of the R.P.A.

Manfred (1232-66), King of Sicily. Another pathetic example of the gifted and estimable rulers of the Middle Ages whose promise for the restoration of civilization was ruined by the Church. He was a natural son of Frederic II, and a prince of high and magnanimous character who represented his half-brother, the Emperor, in Sicily. When Conrad died he refused to surrender the Kingdom to the Popes and incurred their bitter hostility and libels. Hearing that the

infant Conradin, for whom he had made himself Regent, was dead, he took over the royal power, and was slain defending it against the French whom the Popes summoned. He was a notorious sceptic, says Vilani (*Istorie Fiorentine*, VI, 46), but a ruler of lofty ideals. The French, on the contrary, behaved with such brutality that they provoked the appalling massacre known as the Sicilian Vespers.

Mangasarian, Mangasar Magurditch (1859–1944), American lecturer. An Armenian who was educated in America and became a Congregationalist Minister. He passed to Agnosticism, and founded the Chicago Society of Ethical Culture, later the (Rationalist) Independent Religion Society.

Manichæans, The. The followers of Mani or Manes, a Persian of the third century (about 215–76) who composed a new religion from Persian and Babylonian elements and was put to death by the priests and secular authorities. The religion had an extraordinary diffusion westward, and in Italy became the chief rival of Christianity. To the usual drastic dualism (light and darkness) it added that Adam and Eve and the Old Testament were of the Devil, but Jesus a prophet sent by God. Mani was the Paraclete promised by Jesus. It was a formal Church, with bishops and sacraments. The candid Jerome says (*Ep.* 22) that the morals of the Manichæans were far superior to those of Christians, while Augustine, in his degenerate years, retailed the most stupid Christian libels of them (in his *Morals of the Manichæans*, etc.). He not only had Manichæan nuns examined by midwives, but publicly interrogated a girl of twelve on the story that the Manichæan sacrament was made by the priests misbehaving with such children at their altars. As the Manichæans remained loyal and numerous, while the Pagans passed lightly from temple to Church, Pope Leo I, renewing the painful tactics of Augustine, got the Emperor (a vile type of raper and adulterer) to sanction the death-sentence against them, and the practice of murder for opinions began. The Manichæan ideas, however, had a remarkable tenacity, and continued to inspire heretics, including

the strict inner sect of the Albigensians, until the thirteenth century.

Mann, Horace (1796–1859), the creator of the American school system. Of poor parents, and in view of the terribly backward condition of education in America—the early work of the Puritans is greatly exaggerated—Mann had a long and painful struggle to get education. When at length he had made a comfortable position as a lawyer, he abandoned it for the reform of education. As President of the Senate, in Massachusetts, he found his opportunity, and created the first Board of Education. Americans grant him in this respect a position that no single reformer has in England, but they do not emphasize that he was an advanced Rationalist and that the clergy bitterly opposed him. *The Dictionary of American Biography* describes him as “a Puritan without a theology.” He believed only in an impersonal God, and rejected immortality. Just before his death he said to a body of students: “Be ashamed to die until you have won some victory for humanity.”

Marcus Aurelius Antoninus (121–180), Roman Emperor. He is the only one in the series of so-called Stoic Emperors who definitely was a Stoic. Hasty readers of his famous *Meditations*, however, get a wrong impression. He never discusses God, and he did not believe in immortality. He was a vigorous and practical ruler, and did not recommend isolation in virtue. Yet the element of mysticism weakened his counsels, and his son, to whom he left the Empire, with the most disastrous consequences, was utterly corrupt. His persecution of Christians within very narrow limits was part of his policy to strengthen the Empire by enforcing the laws. It was to him that the apologists Justin and Athenagoras offered their defences of the new religion.

Maréchal, Pierre Sylvain (1750–1803), French writer. A lawyer, librarian at the Collège Mazarin, who lost his position and was later imprisoned for writing Rationalist books. He was the first to compile a biographical dictionary of sceptics (*Dictionnaire des Athées*, 1798), but the idea that it was a super-

ficial piece of work is wrong. He was a man of great learning, and was persuaded to write the book by the famous mathematician Lalande [see].

Marett, Robert Randolph, M.A., D.Sc. (b. 1866), anthropologist. A Jersey lawyer who became lecturer in philosophy at Exeter College (Oxford) and later University Reader in Social Anthropology and Dean of Exeter College. Marett is one of the chief authors of the Pre-animistic theory of the origin of religion (*Personal Idealism*, 1902; *The Threshold of Religion*, 1909, etc.). He believes in an impersonal God and rejects Christian doctrines.

Mariette, François Auguste Ferdinand (1821–81) famous French Egyptologist. He was sent on a Government mission to Egypt, and remained there most of his life as Conservator of the Egyptian Monuments. His great work brought him decorations and other honours from a score of countries, and his name is one of the most outstanding in the annals of Egyptology. Mariette was an Atheist. He never entered a church, says his brother and biographer, E. Mariette, and he "found no charm in the pastorals and fictions of which we have a prodigious amount in Christianity" (*Mariette Pacha*, 1904, p. 226).

Mark, The Gospel of. It is admitted by virtually all authorities, Christian or Rationalist, that this is the earliest of the Gospels, but that it was written by "Mark," and before the year 70, is a feeble claim which has been examined and rejected in the article *Gospels*. The theory that the actual Gospel is an expansion of an earlier (or Ur-Mark) is rejected not only by Conybeare, but by Dr. A. Cadoux, who describes it as "generally abandoned" (*The Sources of the Second Gospel*, 1935). Cadoux interestingly traces three written documents which were used by the writer of *Mark*, and Conybeare shows, in a useful analysis (*Myth, Magic, and Morals*, 1909, pp. 28–59), that the duplications and contradictions—Cadoux calls them "inconsequences, discrepancies, and harsh collocations"—in the text clearly prove that he used various documents. As we have none of these and cannot know what they contained, or what "Mark" added, or of what

date they were, the analysis adds nothing to the credibility of the narrative. By a different analysis, which any person may verify, the present writer finds that, of 668 verses, nearly 200 describe miracles or miraculous episodes which only Fundamentalists admit, and 234 give speeches, often of considerable length, of Jesus which it is equally impossible to admit. Paul cannot have known them, and the Letter of the Romans to the Corinthians [see], in 96, shows that they were not known at Rome at the end of the century. The date remains obscure, though later than the year 70, but the Gospel as we have it—earlier documents of unknown content do not interest us—has no biographical value.

Marlowe, Christopher, M.A. (1563 or 4–1593) "father of English tragedy." It was a question in Elizabethan days whether he or Shakespeare was the greater poet, and but for his tragic, premature end he might at least rank next to Shakespeare in English literature. His chief interest for Rationalists is that his story confirms the historic law that scepticism always grows in proportion to the growth of enlightenment and freedom of discussion. Although the latter condition was very imperfectly realized at the time—his friend Francis Kett was burned for heresy and he himself later marked for prosecution—there was so much Rationalism in educated circles that a clerical writer spoke of "Raleigh's School of Atheism." Certainly Raleigh, Marlowe, Herrick and others were notorious sceptics. The word "Atheist" was then used loosely, but several contemporaries who would use the word in its proper meaning (Kyd, Baines, etc.) say that Marlowe was an Atheist. There seems to be no good reason to doubt it; but see J. M. Robertson's *Marlowe* (1931). In 1593 the Privy Council ordered his arrest, but he was killed in a tavern.

Marmontel, Jean François (1723–99), Encyclopædist. A priest and professor in a Toulouse seminary who adopted Deism and settled as a writer in Paris. He was admitted to the Academy and appointed Historiographer of France. His novel *Bélisaire* was condemned for heresy, and he wrote many articles for

Diderot's Encyclopædia. He was a very learned man of high character, and his *Contes Moraux* (2 vols., 1761) is a French classic. His complete works fill 19 vols. (1818-19).

Marriage, The Church and. Few claims of the modern apologist have been so freely adopted in our journalism and general literature, even endorsed at times by non-Christian moralists and scientists, as the claim that Christianity rendered a high social service by elevating marriage; yet this claim is as completely false to the historical facts as the statement that the early Church broke the fetters of the slave, gave the world schools and hospitals, and taught it charity, mercy, and justice. There is here no question of different estimates of the facts or of a selection of some out of a number of conflicting facts. The entire history of marriage since Roman days makes a mockery of the claim. Many articles of this work which describe the actual state of morals during the Dark Age and the Middle Age may seem sufficient to rebuke the statement, but it is often based upon so gross a misrepresentation of historical facts that it is expedient to state these. With the earlier evolution of marriage—for which see Prof. Westermarck's *History of Human Marriage* (1891)—we are not here concerned, since it is the Roman social order that is supposed to have been transformed. It is usual to say that under the early Republic the Romans had an admirable ideal of marriage and the family, but this was corrupted in the later Republic, and the corruption continued under the Empire until the new religion saved society by making marriage a sacred thing. As the complete collapse of the Roman social order, which had been sound until the latter part of the fourth century, after the establishment of Christianity and the fall of Rome is a notorious fact, this is audacious; and even a theologian will smile, covertly, at the statement that the Church (apart from the opinions of individual Fathers) made marriage a Sacrament, which was not done until more than 1,000 years later. But the account of the development in ancient Rome is itself grotesquely false to modern historical scholarship. In

early Rome, the man, married or unmarried, had no obligation whatever of chastity, and the forms of marriage (*confarreatio*, etc.) put a wife on a level with the slaves or children. She could acquire no property, and the husband could put her to death for offences. As soon as the Romans were fully civilized by Greek influence this had to cease and less rigid forms of marriage be permitted. The change led for a time to just such freedom as we find in all ages of rapid prosperity and discredited traditions, but apologists, who usually know no more about history than science, give ridiculous accounts of this. They blush over the morals of the age of Augustus; yet even Lecky, who so frequently obliges them, says "there is probably no period in which examples of conjugal heroism and fidelity appear more frequently than in this very age" (*History of European Morals*, II, 303). The Empress, Livia, was as puritanical as Queen Victoria, and the Emperor sent into a stern exile for life his beloved daughter Julia for loose conduct. The apologists next deplore the age of Trajan and Hadrian, which is admittedly the finest period of ancient civilization, on the strength of the discredited statements of Juvenal (about an earlier age) and Martial (whom, clearly, none of them ever read). However, the authoritative studies of this and the last pagan period by the Protestant historian Sir S. Dill, *Roman Society from Nero to Marcus Aurelius* (1904) and *Roman Society in the Last Centuries of the Western Empire* (1899), have disposed of all this shallow and ignorant rhetoric.

It is more important to understand what the Church really did, and about this in turn there is no dispute in social history. Since all earnest Christian leaders, from Paul to Augustine, regarded sexual intercourse in itself as repulsive, they lashed adultery. But it is chiefly among the Christians that they find and denounce it. Chrysostom in one sermon—significantly, it is on chastity—says that there are 100,000 Christians at Antioch (out of 500,000 people), but he doubts if 100 of them will escape hell, and, Jerome, Cyprian, Augustine, etc., concur. Moreover,

their horror of the flesh gave them an attitude to marriage which sterilized their work. Married folk were weaklings who had to be indulged in this "decorous sort of adultery," as Athenagoras calls it in his Apology (c. 33), Lecky quotes from the Fathers, from the second to the fifth century, a list of such sentiments. Augustine would not refuse a Christian a concubine if his wife were childless (*De 'Bono Conjugali,'* c. 15), and the first Synod of Toledo (eighteen prelates) permits a man (canon 17) to have a concubine instead of a wife (in Mansi's collection of Councils, III, 1001). This unnatural asceticism of the really religious leaders of the Church broke down. Divorce [see] continued to be allowed on from four to six grounds, and the Church failed to get any control of marriage. The few points on which the bishops induced the Emperors to interfere legislatively form, says Muirhead, "a miserable chapter in the history of law" (*Historical Introduction to the Private Law of Rome*, 1899, p. 356). The Dark Age, in which "conjugal morals returned to brutality" (Legouv  ), followed, and in the eleventh century the reformed Papacy began its great struggle to suppress divorce, enforce sacerdotal celibacy, and bring the marriages of the laity under control [see **Celibacy; Divorce; Gregory VII; etc.**], relying very largely on forgeries [**Forged Decretals**]. S. B. Kitchin's *History of Divorce* (1912) and Howard's *History of Matrimonial Institutions* (2 vols., 1904) give a fair idea of this; but for a thorough study one must consult Prof. E. Fahrner's *Geschichte des Unaufl  sigkeits Przips* (1903), or J. Freisen's *Geschichte des Canonischen Eherechts* (1888). There is, however, little reason to go into detail. Marriage was never more flagrantly flouted than in the Age of Chivalry [see], which opened after the death of Hildebrand, and the Renaissance [see], which followed that. It is shown in many articles [**Baths; Celibacy; Divorce; Middle Ages; Prostitution; Thirteenth Century; etc.**] that the five centuries which followed the formulation of the Canon Law and the Church's control of marriage are one of the most licentious periods if

not *the* most licentious period, in history.

The later development in Catholic countries need not be pursued. Catholics had themselves to invent the myth of "the hot blood of the Latins" to explain the state of conjugal morals in Italy, Spain, Portugal, France, and South America, while the boast of Irish chastity has been heavily discredited [see **Eire**]. But it is necessary to emphasize that Protestantism entirely failed to correct what Doctor Howard calls the shameful abuses which disgrace the record of ecclesiastical judicature previous to the Council of Trent (I, 324). Child-Marriages [see] continued. The Anglo-Catholic Party fanatically blocked the way to a reform of divorce, though the state of law caused general irregularity. Howard quotes a statute of Henry VIII lamenting "the terrible confusion of marriages in England" and the finding of a Royal Commission in the eighteenth century that at least a third of the marriages in the country were irregular. For a situation had developed in England in the seventeenth century which makes the idea of the Church of England as the stern guardian of marriage as amusing as the loose morals of Catholic countries make the claim of *their* Church. "Free parsons" (technically not under the bishop, many of them being in jail) could and did marry anybody who applied, without any conditions beyond the fee. The "free" incumbent of St. James's in the West End performed 40,000 marriages in twenty-seven years. A parson in the Fleet Prison for debt performed 36,000 in thirty-one years. Adventurers brought young eloping heiresses, whores dragged drunken sailors who had just been paid off, and so on. The parsons had touts out in Fleet Street. See the extraordinary story in Burn's *Fleet Registers* (1833), or J. C. Jeafferson's *Brides and Bridals* (1872). It was reserved for the sceptical or humanitarian England of the nineteenth century to reform marriage and divorce (as in other Protestant countries) and reduce the sufferings of women and children. The Church of Rome still affronts our modern ideals with its law of indissoluble marriage; and still dissolves it

for the rich. In 1924 Countess Marconi (*née* O'Brien) had her marriage declared null from the first—which meant nineteen years earlier—because of lack of *real* consent. A Vanderbilt lady married to the Duke of Marlborough got a similar cynical decree. G. Seldes, *The Catholic Crisis*, has a full account of these cases. A rich and pious American film-actress was permitted to marry a married man, whose union was conveniently annulled. [See *Pauline Privilege*.] The Church can flout the civil law and the social interest by declaring a secret Catholic marriage valid, or a marriage with a non-Catholic without a priest's permission invalid. [see *Canon Law*.] In addition to the works recommended above see, for a general survey, McCabe's *Influence of the Church on Marriage and Divorce* (1916).

Marten, Henry (1602–80), Puritan leader. He was one of the most prominent men of the popular party, and fought in the Civil War. He opposed Cromwell's seizure of power, but was elected to the Council of State, and was at the Restoration imprisoned for life as a regicide. Wood (*Athen. Oxon.*, III, 124) says that Marten "never entered upon religion, but with design to laugh at it and morality"; but he clears him of Royalist calumnies, praises his championship of toleration, and says that he saved the lives of many Royalists in the Civil War.

Martineau, Harriet (1802–76), writer. She and her famous brother, Dr. J. Martineau, came of Huguenot refugees who embraced Unitarianism. In 1830 she won a prize offered by the Unitarian body for three propagandist essays, but the discourses of W. J. Fox converted her. She won a high reputation by a work on political economy, and ten years later she further startled the public by a profession of Atheism (*Letters on the Laws of Man's Social Nature and Development*, in collaboration with H. G. Atkinson, 1851). For a time she favoured Comtism, but in her *Autobiography* (published posthumously 1877) she described herself as "an Atheist in the vulgar sense—that of rejecting the popular theology—but not in the philosophical sense of denying

a First Cause" (II, 351). One of the most prominent women writers of her time, she was a commanding figure in the fight for the reform of education, and she combined notable intellectual strength with great delicacy of character.

Martyrs, The Christian. The common use, as a proverb, of a phrase from a piece of early Christian fiction, "The blood of martyrs is the seed of the Church," illustrates the thorough permeation of our general literature and the mind of the public with apologetic untruth. The scandal is in this case all the more flagrant from the fact that it is almost entirely Christian scholars, and mainly Catholic scholars, who have exposed the fiction. They have shown that not one martyr story in a hundred survives critical examination, and in particular that at each of the two general persecutions not one Christian in many thousands was loyal to his faith, and that, instead of the blood of the very few martyrs being the seed of the Church, the close of each persecution saw the Church everywhere appallingly shrunken and in a state of complete demoralization. Stories of pagans rushing to join the faithful at sight of the fortitude of the martyrs are taken entirely from fictitious lives or forged Acta (records of trials) of the martyrs. The contemporary bishops (Cyprian, Eusebius, etc.) speak of a few heroes and heroines and a vast apostasy. Read Eusebius's *Ecclesiastical History* (VIII, 1). But the work of fiction, which in the end produced a literature without parallel in the story of any other religion, began as soon as the axe of the persecutor was laid aside. It was started by Lactantius, an employee of the imperial household, who was in an exceptional position to know the truth, but wrote a recklessly false work *On the Deaths of the Persecutors*. The unscrupulous Pope (St.) Damasus [see] gave a powerful impetus to the work at Rome and, as the provincial churches now vied with each other to purchase "relics" of the glorious dead—even St. Ambrose stooped to cater dishonestly to this—the trade assumed heroic proportions during several centuries. It may seem strange that Catholic priests figure so largely in the modern exposure of the

fiction, but the far greater part of it contains such grotesque anachronisms, yet continued to be respected in the Church during the centuries of "great Catholic scholarship" (twelfth to seventeenth centuries), that it had to be disowned, though the ignorant majority of Catholics are still encouraged to believe the most blatant stories, and even the *Catholic Encyclopædia* is far from complete candour. We should note, moreover, that the work of exposure began among the French clergy (particularly by Tillemont) at the time when they held a very critical, largely cynical, attitude towards Rome. Tillemont's *Memoirs* (1698) slew tens of thousands of martyrs with great cheerfulness, but Rome, except for a short and futile attempt at reform by Benedict XIV, remained obstinate until, in the nineteenth century, Protestant critics took up the subject. We have now a large Catholic literature analysing the stories. The most important are the works of the Jesuit Fr. Delehaye, who is a Bollandist (or expert on saints and martyrs), but the English and American authorities seem to have found the translation of one of his books (*The Legends of the Saints*, 1922) so disturbing to the faithful that the more important, including one in which he shows that no Christian was put to death in the Coliseum [see], remain in French. The Catholic Prof. A. Ehrhard has a useful summary of the entire literature (*Die altchristliche Literatur*, 1900) which also is untranslated, and the liberal Mgr. Duchesne and other Continental priests (not the British and American priests who are so eager to tell the exact truth) co-operate. Protestant writers like Graf, Görres, Führer, Usener, etc., keep pace with them, but Prof. Biddle is insufficiently critical in *The Martyrs* (1931), and this must be said also of Prof. Gwatkin's article in the *Ency. of Religion and Ethics*.

How many martyrs survive this critical slaughter it is impossible to say in a word. None of the writers attempts this, and the literature is too diffuse, too anxious to save what it can of the Church's credit, to sum the results in a general statement. A few points are clear. One is that even Rationalist

estimates of the number of martyrs have been far too generous. J. M. Robertson, who does not take into account recent literature, suggests a maximum of 2,000 for the last or Diocletian persecution (*A Short History of Christianity*, 1902, p. 138), and that is probably about ten times the number of proved martyrs in two and a half centuries. The legendary literature claims about 40,000 martyrs in that persecution, but Mgr. Duchesne (*History of the Christian Church*, 3 vols., 1904-29) recognizes only a score, including three at Rome, and Delehaye and Ehrhard reject some of these. [See **Diocletian Persecution**.] Another vast crowd are claimed for the Decian (the only other general) Persecution [see]; yet the Catholic writer Gregg finds, after heavy research, only five (out of tens of thousands of Christians) at Rome and possibly thirty or forty (out of at least a million Christians) elsewhere. A fair summary of the critical work is that it claims definite reliability for accounts of a few score martyrdoms (in 250 years) and a fair historical probability for a few hundreds mentioned in contemporary letters or local traditions. All the stories of mass martyrdoms (the 11,000 Virgins of Cologne, St. Pappus and his 24,000 companions, the Thundering Legion, etc.) are disdainfully put aside, and the overwhelming majority of the Acta (the supposed verbatim reports of trials) are found to be spurious. Moreover, the martyrs in whose cases the Acta are considered genuine are such as Fructuosus, Augurius, Carpus, Papyrus, etc., in whom even the Catholic is not interested, while the men and women who are popular—St. George, Catherine, Agnes, Laurence, Sebastain, Cecilia, Denis, etc.—the saints who are pressed upon children in all Roman and Anglican schools and even mentioned reverently in the Press, are fictitious. In a few cases the consolation is offered that a grave or a church testifies that a person of that name did exist, but the use to-day of detailed and often ludicrously false stories based upon these is dishonest; especially when the apologist builds upon them an argument that its richness in martyrs proves the supernatural

character of the Church. Beyond these few dozen Acta which are, often on slender grounds, declared to be genuine, we have only letters of one church to another when persecution ceases. In some cases the martyr-makers used pagan deities (see Rendel Harris's *Cult of the Heavenly Twins*, and especially Ehrhard), and the same story was used repeatedly. Only a few hundred real martyrs in 250 years can be reasonably claimed; while the Catholics killed many times that number of Arians in half a century, and between 1200 and 1700 they slew millions (Albigensians, Waldensians, Lollards, Hussites, Witches, Huguenots, Jews, Moors, etc.).

Marx, Karl (1818-83), founder of modern Socialism. Marx, a German-Jew, was thoroughly trained in philosophy at Berlin University, but he was fired by the insurrectionary spirit, kindled by the brutality of the reaction after Waterloo, which culminated in the Revolution of 1848. At its failure he fled to Paris, then London, where he wrote his famous work and organized Social Democracy. The writings of Feuerbach had early made him an Atheist, and he adopted Materialism and had a disdain of metaphysics. What is called the philosophy of Marxism, a blend of Socialism and Materialism with the use of Hegelian phrases was not his work. [See *Dialectical Materialism*.]

Mary, the Mother of Jesus in the Gospel story. It throws light on Christian borrowings that there was no cult of Mary until paganism was suppressed. The story that she was in some vague way the mother of Christ and a virgin was accepted as just a detail of his biography. As the imperial decrees against the old religions were first effective in the East, the cult began there. Epiphanius (*Haereses*, LXXIX) says that it began in Arabia and Thrace, and the details he gives show that it replaced the popular cult of Ceres and Cybele. In Armenia the cult replaced that of Anahite [see]. The Christians of the cities, especially Rome, being confronted on every side with cults of divine mothers, were the last to admit it, and Augustine never admitted it. Sermons of his quoted in Catholic official (the Breviary) and unofficial

(*The Glories of Mary*, etc.) works are admitted to be spurious. But when paganism was suppressed the pagans were conciliated by decking Mary in the glories of Cybele, Ceres, Isis, Ishtar, Maia, Flora, etc.

Maryland, Toleration in. It is one of the freaks of American Catholic literature that the Church is claimed to have been the pioneer of modern toleration, instituting it in Maryland in the seventeenth century. The claim is strongly asserted by the Calvert Associates, a propagandist body (under the patronage of Dr. N. Murray Butler and other non-Catholic professors) which boldly takes its name from the English founder of Maryland. It is amusing when we remember that the Catholic Church had, to its great anger, only just been compelled to abandon the Thirty Years War (1618-48)—Lord Baltimore's Charter of religious liberty was dated 1649—and that the savage machinery of the Inquisition was still in operation all over the Catholic world (even just across the American frontier in Mexico). We might recall, too, the toleration of Brahmanists, Buddhists, Confucians, most of the Arab and Persian rulers, etc. But the claim is seen to be even more audacious when we examine the facts as given by Bancroft (*History of the United States*, I, 166, etc.) and all American historians. Instead of Maryland being a "solidly Catholic colony," as the Calvert Associates claim, it never even had a Catholic majority. The *Catholic Encyclopædia* admits that the great majority of the first arrivals were not Catholics—the truth is that the persecuted Catholics in England almost entirely ignored Baltimore's invitation—but says that in 1645 three-fourths of the population were Catholics. No authority whatever is given for this, while Bancroft quotes a contemporary testifying that in 1654 there were "very few Catholics." The few Catholic gentry who went out from England (about twenty in number) were naturally entrusted by Baltimore (a Catholic) with the administration, and when they saw no prospect of ever having a "solidly Catholic colony" they enacted religious liberty to protect their own against the Protestant majority! Eng-

lish Catholics often imagine that the colony was named in honour of the Virgin Mary, whereas it took its name from Queen Henrietta Maria.

Masaryk, Prof. Tomas Garrigue (1850-1937), first President of Czechoslovakia. The son of a coachman who became a teacher, and was professor of philosophy at Vienna University and later at the Czech University, Prague, and leader of the Czech Peoples' Party. He had the chief part in securing the establishment of the Republic, and proved himself one of the most enlightened statesmen in Europe. He "ranked equally high as a philosopher and a statesman," says the *Annual Register*. The Press, which never mentions him without deep respect, omits to state that he was an Agnostic (*Die Ideale der Humanität*, 1902) and that under his lead the Czechs created the finest Rationalist organization in Europe.

Mascagni, Pietro (b. 1863), Italian composer of *Cavalleria Rusticana*. He was appointed Director of the Rossini Conservatory at Pesaro when his famous opera took Italy by storm, and later was head of the Scuola Musicale Nazionale at Rome. Although he wrote Church music, he had no religious belief, his biographer, G. Bastianelli, says (*Pietro Mascagni*, 1910).

Mason, Sir Josiah (1795-1881), philanthropist. A Birmingham man who, although he began to earn his living at the age of eight, made a fortune by inventions and manufacture. He left £250,000 for an orphanage, and £180,000 for a College of Science which is now part of Birmingham University. He forbade religious teaching in his institutions because "the dogmatic and ecclesiastical aspects of religion were repugnant to him" (J. T. Bunce, *Josiah Mason*, 1882, p. 163). Mason College was merged in the University of Birmingham under the Act of 1900, which superseded Mason's conditions; but professorial candidates' "opinions" must not weigh with electors—i.e., a professor of theology need not have religious views. A Mason Lectureship to "illustrate the scientific method of approach to problems of civilized society" has recently been established at Birmingham University.

Mass, The. The morning ceremony in Catholic churches which, on Sundays, must be attended by all under pain of hell. The central part of it is that the priest converts a wafer of bread and a little wine and water into the body of Christ: not symbolically, for the substance of the bread and wine is supposed to be annihilated, and the living body of Christ, "whole and entire" in every crumb and drop, takes its place. [See *Eucharist*.] The Mithraic ceremony, from which the Mass was developed in the second and third centuries, seems to have been less wildly unreasonable; yet it is a grave obligation of conscience for every Catholic to believe this doctrine. Every priest "says" a Mass every morning, and, as some Catholic always pays to have it said to his "intention"—the minimum fee fixed by the Church is four shillings in England—the belief is very profitable. It is disputed if it takes its name from the priest's final words to the people *Ite, missa est* ("Go, it is all over"). The chief ceremony in the cult of Isis had a similar ending.

Massacres, Christian. As is stated in the article *Martyrs*, the stories of massacres of large bodies of Christians in the early Church are all fictitious, and so recognized by Catholic authorities. There is better evidence of massacres of bodies of Arians by Catholics in the fourth century and of very large bodies of heretics later in the Greek Church. For massacres by Catholics in Europe see *Albigensians*; *Bartholomew*; *Cathari*; *Hus*; *Inquisition*; *Jews*; *Lollards*; etc.

Massenet, Jules Emile Frederic (1842-1912), French composer. He won the Prix de Rome in 1862, and was later professor of advanced composition at the Paris Conservatoire. Massenet, whose operas and oratorios were of a high order, was an advanced Rationalist. His views on religion are found in the last chapter of his reminiscences (*Mes Souvenirs*, 1912).

Materialism. The theory that all realities known to man are material. On the analogy of the word "Atheism" [see] the Materialist ought to be defined as the man who either denies or disbelieves (lacks belief in) the existence of

spirits; but while the leading dictionaries correctly define Atheism, they usually define Materialism in such terms that we should have to conclude that there never were any Materialists. They represent it as the dogmatic statement that "all things are explainable by matter and force." The *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics*, which ought to be the standard authority, has a quite foolish article. It says that Materialism has "always been strong in England, but now, under the influence of Bergson, Alexander, and Lloyd Morgan," is on the wane. The author has in mind the familiar reference to "the Materialists of the last century," but his suggestion that science has been affected by the eccentric opinions of a few metaphysicians is absurd. In point of fact most of the so-called Materialists of the last century (Büchner, Haeckel, Huxley, Tyndall, etc.) expressly denied that they were Materialists, and no man of science, then or now, claims that we can actually explain everything in the universe by material (or any other) agencies. Haeckel, the arch-Materialist of the apologist, in his preface to the *Riddle*, calls that accomplished an "immeasurably distant goal." The Oxford Dictionary is nearest to the truth—as to what all responsible writers who have called themselves Materialists really meant—when it defines Materialism as "the opinion that nothing exists except matter and its movements." This is correct in so far as the Materialist, (1) seeing that all arguments for the existence of spirit since the days of Plato are discredited [see *Immortality and Spirit*], is convinced that there are no such realities, but does not find it necessary to make a dogmatic denial; (2) seeing the rapid and comprehensive advance in the material interpretation of phenomena since the technique of science was improved, believes that the remaining obscurities (cerebral and embryonic processes, subatomic phenomena, etc.) will in time be brought under the same interpretation. Most scientific men, holding positions in public institutions, are hardly likely, and could not be expected, to challenge the Churches by expressing opinions on the first point. On the second point

scientific men [see *Brain and Mind; Life; Mechanism; etc.*] now frequently assert their confidence, so that there is, in fact, immeasurably more Materialism in science than there was in the last century. The contrary statement is a parrot-cry repeated from the works of Sir O. Lodge, in whose case the belief in spirits was mainly based upon the work of fraudulent mediums.

F. A. Lange's *History of Materialism* (Engl. trans., 3 vols., 1877-8), which is always recommended as the standard work, is unsatisfactory. It fails to make clear that, as Gomperz, one of the highest authorities, says, nine-tenths of the Greek philosophers [see] were Materialists—a fact which one might expect to restrain modern philosophers in their proneness to dismiss Materialism as "superficial"—and it is confused, from lack of a consistent definition, in dealing with modern times. It names Spencer, Bain, Huxley, Haeckel, Büchner, and others, who rejected the description, often very warmly. Ueberweg (*History of Philosophy*) and Eisler add Vogt, Moleschott, Czolbe, Strauss (who knew nothing about science), and Hartmann (a philosopher), nearly all of whom refused the label. None of these writers mentions such express and distinguished Materialists as Pavlov, Loeb, Maudsley, Bastian, Delage, Watson, J. B. S. Haldane, Chalmers Mitchell, etc. To give names is, however, misleading, on account of the confusion in defining the term, and because, while most biologists, physiologists, and even psychologists, are to-day Materialists in the real sense (disbelief in spirit), they are puzzled by developments in the science of physics, and hesitate to speak of matter. That these are irrelevant to Materialism is shown under *Atoms, Energy and Matter*. Another cause of confusion is that, since Materialism is in philosophy the exact opposite of Idealism (that mind or spirit alone exists), the word has in general literature come to have the meaning of a lack of ideals in the cultural and ethical sense. All the writers who were or are in effect leading Materialists (as rejecting the idea of spirit), such as Vogt, Feuerbach, Moleschott, Büchner, Bastian, Loeb, Maudsley, Haeckel, Mitchell, Pavlov,

J. B. S. Haldane, etc., were or are men of exceptional humanitarian idealism. Nor does this apply only to writers. The learned Anglo-American divine, Prof. Kirsopp Lake, candidly says in his Ingersoll Lecture, *Immortality and the Modern Mind* (1913, p. 24), that "most of the best men of to-day are materialists. . . . Nevertheless there is no type of man now living who so completely sacrifices himself for the good of others." If we keep clearly in mind that the essence of Materialism is not whether this or that phenomenon in nature can to-day be fully explained by science, but is the rejection of the supposed evidence for the existence of spirits, we see the range of this truth. Such men have been in the van of every reform movement, as they (Stoics, Epicureans, etc.) were in the ancient world.

Matter. It is shown in various articles [**Atoms; Conservation of Matter and Energy; Energy**] that recent advances in physics do not affect the definition of matter as it has always been and is used in the Materialist controversy. Whether it is identical with energy (in the new meaning of that word), whether we must cease to define it as having mass and inertia, and so on, are purely scientific questions. In religious controversy matter has always been—and still is—conceived as anything quantitative or dimensional or having relations in space and time. It is defined by its opposite, spirit [see], which exact religious thinkers have always defined as something non-measurable or without dimensions or time and space-relations. It is the loose thinking and lack of a clear definition of spirit on the part of modern apologists which cause the whole confusion. Bishop Barnes is almost alone in showing a clear grasp of the situation. In face of Eddington's assurance to the public that matter is "no more substantial than moonshine"—did Eddington challenge the teaching of his own science that moonshine, being reflected sunlight, is not only measurable but has weight?—Barnes says: "The truth is that energy and, as a particular sample, sunlight belong completely to the material world and exactly resemble matter in being distinct from that which is spiritual"

(*Scientific Theory and Religion*, 1933, p. 310). The popular definition of matter as "that which occupies space" was clumsy even before the Relativist idea of space was accepted. It suggests space [see] as a reality into which matter fits. Space and time are measurements of matter, which is whatever is measurable (or quantitative). That the Rationalist writers of the last century did not hold that matter was composed of "hard indissoluble atoms," but assumed that atoms were composed of smaller particles, is shown elsewhere. [**Atoms; Energy.**]

Maudsley, Prof. Henry, M.D., LL.D., F.R.C.P. (1835–1918), alienist. Professor of medical jurisprudence at London University College, editor of the *Journal of Medical Science*, and Galstonian Lecturer (1870). Maudsley was, like Loeb, an outspoken Materialist. His views were strongly expressed in lectures for the London Sunday Lecture Society, but are found in all his works on mind (*The Physiology of Mind*, 1867, etc.) which had considerable influence, and especially in his *Natural Causes and Supernatural Seemings* (1886: The Thinker's Library, 1940). A high-minded idealist as well as a man of great distinction in his science, in 1908 he gave £30,000 to the L.C.C. Asylum's Committee to get better treatment for the insane.

Maugham, William Somerset (b. 1874), novelist and playwright. He was in the secret service during the war of 1914–18, and his intimate knowledge of the East appears in many of the brilliant novels which have given him a leading position in British letters. During the war he produced a play in which one Rationalist passage "took a Christian's breath away," Bishop Gore said (in the writer's presence). In *The Summing Up* (1937) he says: "I remain an Agnostic." He is an Hon. Associate of the R.P.A.

Maupassant, Henri René Albert Guy de (1850–93), French novelist. An employee of the Civil Service who became a friend of Flaubert and Zola and almost entered the front rank of French writers in a brilliant age with his first story (*Boule de suif*, 1880). He was a master of the short story, but wrote

also novels (*Mlle. de Maupin*, etc.) and verse. All his works (29 vols., 1908-10) show his contempt of religion.

Maupertuis, Pierre Louis Moreau de, F.R.S. (1698-1759), French mathematician. He was, as geometrician to the Paris Academy of Sciences, one of the chief experts engaged to measure a degree of the meridian. He was a member of the Academy, a Fellow of the British Royal Society, and at one time (being a friend of Frederic the Great and Voltaire) President of the Berlin Academy. Besides his many important works on mathematics and astronomy, he published a Rationalist work on religion (in Latin, 1751).

Maxim, Sir Hiram Stevens (1840-1916), inventor. An American engineer who was naturalized in England and was famous for his inventions (the Maxim gun, etc.). He was a member of the firm of Vickers' Sons and Maxim. Maxim was an aggressive Atheist (personal knowledge) and the compiler (with the present writer) of the collection of strong criticisms of religion which he called *Li Hung Chang's Scrap-book* (1912). He explained that the Chinese statesman, whom he knew well, shared his sentiments.

Max Müller, Prof. Friedrich, Ph.D., M.A. (1823-1900), philologist. After a brilliant university career he took up Sanscrit, and was engaged by Burnouf to prepare a new edition of the Rigveda. Settling in England in 1846, he became Deputy Taylorian Professor, later professor of modern European languages at Oxford and Curator of the Bodleian. In 1860 he was selected for the chair of Sanscrit at Oxford; but, although he was the highest authority in Europe, the clergy kept him out because of his advanced Rationalism. He was appointed professor of comparative philology and editor of "The Sacred Books of the East." He was loaded with international honours. His Pantheistic views are seen in his *Origin and Growth of Religion* (1878).

Maxse, Frederick Augustus (1833-1900), admiral. His distinguished career in the navy won him the appointment of Rear-Admiral. After his retirement he worked cordially for progressive movements, especially Rationalism. Howard

Evans (*Radical Fights of Forty Years*, 1913) tells us that "a calendar of Positivist saints occupied a prominent place in his study" (p. 33), but his correspondence with George Meredith (*Letters*, p. 169) shows that he was, if possible, an even more aggressive Rationalist than the eminent novelist, who was an Atheist.

Mazdaism. The orthodox Persian or Zoroastrian religion. [See *Persia* or *Zarathustra*.]

Mazzini, Giuseppe, LL.D. (1805-72), Italian patriot. The famous orator and agitator is often described as a Christian, but, though he was a Theist and had an ethical admiration of Jesus, he rejected Christian doctrines. The plainest statement of his rather dreamy opinions is in a letter to Holyoake (*Life and Letters of G. J. Holyoake*, I, 240-3). He detested Atheism, and was embarrassed in England to find that most of the help he got came from advanced sceptics. Garibaldi in turn scoffed at Mazzini's religiosity and never co-operated warmly with him. See Bolton King's *Mazzini* (1903).

Mechanism. The theory that the world of life contains only the same elements as the physical world, or the rejection of the idea of a vital force or a soul. It is in effect the same thing as Materialism, but most scientists prefer it because it restricts the issue to the nature of life. It is not a happy expression, because to the inexpert it suggests a metallic machine with rigid parts. Biologists explain that the organism is a "chemical machine," which is unintelligible to the inexpert.

Medicine in the Middle Ages. That ancient medical science, as perfected by Galen, and the Roman provision for the sick [see *Æsculapius* and *Hospitals*], should have perished with the collapse of the Empire was an inevitable occurrence, and all histories of medicine and surgery describe their appalling condition in Europe from that date until modern times. But Catholic apologists try even here to distort the facts in the interest of the Church. Their one medical authority, the American Prof. J. L. Walsh, replies, in *The Popes and Science* (1912), to A. D. White's severe indictment of the Church in his *Warfare*

of *Science with Theology*. The point Walsh makes about the Bull of Benedict VIII, virtually forbidding, or interpreted to forbid, dissection is examined under **Anatomy and Dissection**. In refutation of White's further statement that medicine and surgery remained in a degraded condition until the fifteenth century, Walsh quotes two German works (which are probably unavailable outside Germany), and Sir C. Allbutt, the distinguished British physician, and certainly one of the highest authorities on such a question, but he says exactly the same as White and the opposite of Walsh. On surgery he is particularly vehement (*Historical Relations of Medicine and Surgery*, 1905). During the Middle Ages it was "hated and avoided by medical practitioners, scorned in clerical and feudal circles," and the opposition to it "culminated in the reactionary ferocity of the Church" (p. 51), while progress in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries was due to "the ascendancy of secular elements." For the ghastly consequences in that age of violence and war one should see Dr. H. Peters's *Der Arzt und die Heilkunst in der deutschen Vergangenheit* (1900), a work illustrated with mediæval wood-cuts and telling the horrors of medicine as well as surgery. The Arabs and Persians had lifted medicine and surgery above the level at which the Greeks had left them, and we can hardly call it patronage of science when Popes or prelates engaged Jews trained in the Arab schools to relieve their sufferings. But progress was painfully slow and the sufferings of the mass of the people terrible (as indicated in the ghastly death-rate) until the nineteenth century. See Sarton's learned *Introduction to the History of Science* (1927). As late as the reign of Louis XIV sanitation (which had been admirable in Spanish cities seven centuries earlier) hardly existed, and the popular pharmacopœia continued to store the vilest ingredients of mediæval ignorance.

Melanesians, The. It is important, in considering the evolution of religious or ethical ideas in the light of what are called "savage customs," that the position of each people should be clearly understood. Too often, even

in scientific works like those of Westermarck and Frazer, peoples at very different grades of culture or stages of development are lumped together. The most primitive level among living races is that of the Negritoes [see], the next that of the Australian Aborigines. The Melanesians (of Fiji, New Guinea, the Solomon Islands, etc.) come next in the rising scale, and are far below the Polynesians, Africans, etc. It is chiefly upon them that the *mana* theory of the origin of religion is based, but they do not represent a primitive level. They have a very definite belief in spirits, human and non-human, incipient or rudimentary gods, shrines, and sacrifices to dead chiefs. See Dr. R. H. Codrington's *Melanesians* (1891) and Dr. G. Brown's *Melanesians and Polynesians* (1910).

Mencius. [See Meng-tse.]

Mencken, Henry Louis (b. 1880), American critic, "the American G. B. Shaw." After a long experience of journalism he became contributing editor of the *Nation* and the best-known literary critic in America. He edited the *American Mercury*, which he had helped to found. A vein of caustic Rationalism runs through all his writings.

Mendel, Gregor Johann (1822-84), monk botanist. Of peasant extraction, but developing in his youth a passion for knowledge, he found that, owing to the poverty of his family, he could get education and leisure only by entering a monastery. In time he became Abbot of Brünn, in Moravia, and in the monastic garden he made the first experiments in crossing plants which, if the paper in which he described them had not passed into oblivion, would have formed the starting-point of the science of genetics. His discoveries were not unearthed until De Vries and others had, in complete ignorance of them, come to the same conclusions, and it is only by courtesy that his name is given to Mendelism [see *Genetics*]. A more serious point is that the repeated references of scientific writers to "the devout abbot" betray a poor acquaintance with his history, and Catholic writers are encouraged to boast of their "great Catholic scientist." The only authoritative biography is by G. H.

Iltis, a relative (*Gregor Johann Mendel*, 1924, Engl. trans., *Life of Mendel*, 1932), and in the German original the author gives abundant evidence that Mendel was acridly anti-Christian in his youth and remained a sceptic all his life. Iltis gives an aggressive Rationalist poem, speaking of "the gloomy powers of superstition which now oppress the world," which Mendel wrote two years before entering the monastery, and shows that he became a monk only to get leisure to study, and always remained a sceptic (a Deist). Before he became abbot he shirked priestly functions whenever it was possible. He never read Catholic papers, but after he became abbot he bought Darwin's works and accepted evolution.

Mendelssohn, Moses (1729–1786), German-Jewish philosopher. Of poor family and little education, he, with great labour, mastered philosophy and the works of the English Deists and abandoned his creed. Of his many important works, one (*Abhandlungen*, 1763) was crowned by the Berlin Academy. In later years he believed in a personal God and immortality, but lived entirely in the sphere of Deism and natural religion. (Baur, quoted in Robertson's *History of Freethought*, II, 323.)

Mendes, Catulle (1841–1909), French-Jewish novelist. At the age of nineteen he founded the *Revue fantaisiste* at Paris and was prosecuted for articles he wrote for it. A long series of poems, novels, and dramas put him in the front rank of the brilliant writers, almost exclusively Rationalist, of the last third of the century in France. In his volume of verse, *Pour dire devant le monde* (1891), he gives free expression to his caustic Atheism.

Meng-tse (or Mencius, 372 (?)–289 B.C.). Chinese philosopher. Educated by Confucian teachers, and always full of deep respect for the Master, he followed his example and wandered over China seeking rulers who would listen to their principles. At the time there was a great ferment of thought in China, as in the West, and every theory of life, from hedonism to universal love as a panacea for all ills, had a large party and a leader. Mencius was a practical idealist of great intellectual

power. He broadened and modernized the teaching of Kung, stressing the law of reciprocity (the Golden Rule), denouncing war and social injustice, and paying close attention to economic conditions. He was the first Chinese democrat, and the young Chinese of to-day find him easier to follow than Kung. He occasionally speaks of Heaven in the Confucian way, but did not mean a God. He was an Atheist. Yuan Cho-Ying shows, in *La philosophie morale et politique de Mencius* (1927), that by Heaven he meant "the collective will of the people" (he said: "Heaven sees, but only through the eyes of the people"), and was remarkably modern in his sentiments. The works which bear his name (*Life and Works of Mencius*, 1875, by Dr. J. Legge—a missionary and occasionally inadequate) may be, in part at least, by his pupils.

Mental Reservation. The Roman Catholic moral theory that it is sometimes legitimate to make a statement which misleads (deceives) the hearer provided you justify it in your own mind. In the *Catholic Encyclopædia* and the *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics* it is represented by Jesuits as a quite blameless, indeed beneficent, invention of the casuists. It may in certain circumstances do harm to supply information, they say, and in the Catholic doctrine about lying, which alone is correct, the essence of the sin is not in the intention to deceive, but in your consciousness of saying something false (which you avoid by telling the truth in your own mind). A "pure mental reservation," when the hearer is completely deceived and does not even suspect that there may be a "reserve," was, these Jesuits say, condemned by the Church or by Pope Innocent XI in 1679. They do not add that Innocent detested and condemned Jesuits and their casuistry. Addis and Arnold's *Catholic Dictionary* more candidly says: "Almost all theologians hold that it is sometimes lawful to use a mental reservation which may be, though very likely it will not be, understood from the circumstances." In point of fact, the doctrine is still taught in Catholic seminaries from Jesuit manuals—the present writer was taught

it from Fr. Lehmkuhl's *Theologia Moralis* (2 vols., 1888)—and freely practised by priests, even (in the writer's presence) in courts of law and under oath. For instance, an important London priest disappeared suddenly from his monastery, and his colleagues blandly assured the faithful (or trustful) that he had "gone on the foreign missions." Their mental reservation was that in fact he had apostatized with all the funds of the monastery and was enjoying himself in a Brussels hotel of dubious repute (*Twelve Years in a Monastery*, 1930 ed., p. 210).

Mercier, Charles Arthur, M.D., F.R.C.P., F.R.C.S. (1852–1919), alienist. He began life as a cabin-boy and ended as a distinguished authority and writer on mental diseases (*Conduct and its Disorders*, 1911, etc.). The spread of Spiritualism, during the war of 1914–18, drew from him a caustic and devastating criticism, *Spiritualism and Sir O. Lodge* (1917). Mercier was an Agnostic and Materialist.

Mercy. [See *Philanthropy*.]

Meredith, George (1828–1909), poet and novelist. Spending his early years in a lawyer's office, and writing in leisure hours, he took twenty years to secure recognition. Even *The Ordeal of Richard Feverel* (1859) took nineteen years to reach a second edition. In the later decades of the century he was generally acknowledged to be the finest literary artist in the country. He told Clodd (*Memories*, p. 153): "When I was quite a boy I had a spasm of religion, and it lasted six weeks . . . but I never since have swallowed the Christian fable." In his later years he was an aggressive Atheist and a strong supporter of Foote and the *Freethinker*.

Mérimée, Prosper (1803–70), French poet. He was the illegitimate son of an artist and educated in law, which he deserted for letters. He was Conservative in politics—a friend of the Royal family, and a Grand Officer of the Legion of Honour—and his exquisite poems, novels, and dramas have been compared to carvings in ivory. But he was an Atheist, and when his friend Beyle [see] died, he published a memoir (*H. B. by P. M.*, 1853) in which he shows their identity of views.

Meslier, Jean (1678–1733), French sceptic. Meslier remained a priest all his life, and had a high repute for austerity and charity. After his death his parishioners were astounded to find that he had left the manuscript of an anti-Christian work, *Mon Testament*. Voltaire, to whom he left his property, published it, and it was used with great effect in Deistic propaganda. Voltaire proposed this epitaph for him: "Here lies a very honest priest who at death asked God's pardon for having been a Christian."

Messiah, The. A slightly altered form of the Hebrew word Ha-Mashiah (the Anointed). On the basis of an ancient superstition that anointing had a semi-magical effect, kings and priests were thus "oiled," and the word is applied to them in the Old Testament. In the narrower meaning of Deliverer it comes late in the Old Testament, and by that time the idea was widespread in the ancient world. In the *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics* Prof. Jeremias, the leading authority on such matters, describes how Babylonian tradition said that men lived at first in a golden age, and after their fall aspired to and expected a deliverer. As Babylonian religion was markedly astral, he connects this with the struggle of light and darkness and the triumph of the sun in the spring. Prof. E. Abegg (*Der Messias-glaube in Indien und Iran*, 1928) gives much evidence of such an expectation in Persia and India, and says that it is found "in almost all the great religions of antiquity and among many savage peoples" (p. 1). Marduk was to send the deliverer in Babylonia: Ahura Mazda in Persia. Many of the American Indians had the same idea. The Jews assimilated the idea after the Babylonian captivity, expecting Jahveh to send a warrior-king who would restore them. The priests met sceptics, as age succeeded age without deliverance, by spiritualizing the idea, or making the deliverance invisible to the eye. See W. O. E. Oesterley, *The Evolution of the Messianic Idea* (1908) and (for examples in the lower peoples) K. Breysig, *Die Entstehung des Gottesgedankens und der Heilbringer* (1905).

Metaphysics. The Greek phrase *ta*

meta ta physica, or "the things beyond the study of Nature," was used by the disciples of Aristotle to indicate intellectual considerations of reality other or higher than those based upon observation. It is commonly taken as synonymous with philosophy. Some restrict the word to ontology (the abstract study of reality) and epistemology (the theory of knowledge), while philosophy also covers logic, ethics, and aesthetics. Modern philosophy does not include the latter, which are independent sciences, and in most cases avoids the word "metaphysics," which has stood for too much verbiage and futile speculation.

Metchnikov, Prof. Il'ya (or Elie), (1845-1916), Franco-Russian zoologist and Nobel Prize winner. He was professor of zoology at Odessa, but migrated to France and devoted himself to research. For some years he was Director of the Pasteur Institute, and his work brought high international honours as well as the Nobel Prize. Metchnikov was an outspoken Monist (really Atheist), and contributed to Haeckel's *Monistische Jahrhundert*. His views are expounded in the *Nature of Man* (Engl. trans., 1904, 2nd ed., 1938).

Metempsychosis. [See Transmigration.]

Mexico, Religion in. The anti-clerical laws of Mexico go back to the days of the Rationalist Presidents, Juarez and Diaz. The chief law is that, on account of intrigues to restore the country to the Spanish crown, no priests, monks, or nuns of Spanish birth are to be permitted to reside in it. Diaz's Catholic wife thwarted his efforts to apply the law, and after the war (1918) the very numerous Spanish clergy and nuns intrigued freely. On account of the spread of Socialism they began to work up a plan of annexation in the United States. In 1923 the Government had to expel the Pope's representative for "direct intervention in Mexican affairs" (Prof. Calcott, *Liberalism in Mexico*, 1931), and found that the Church had accumulated large funds for the purpose, and that the religious orders had opened schools in defiance of the law. In 1925 the Government, which had the

solid support of the majority of educated Mexicans at the polls—the workers were particularly anti-clerical in the towns—began to close the schools and expel Spanish priests and nuns. The bishops defied it and radioed to the world a cry of persecution. The American Catholics issued a booklet with a significant appeal to Wall Street for funds—it is notorious that American enterprisers want their country to annex Mexico and its great mineral wealth—and a long list of priests who were said to have been executed by the Government. The present writer was in Mexico at the time, and can testify that none were then executed—many were later, for leading armed rebels—and that the expulsions (strictly legal) which he witnessed were conducted with courtesy, although the wives of the Catholic ambassadors tried to provoke riots. The latter fact was later learned in Cuba from articles in the Conservative chief Havana paper by a Mexican Catholic journalist who was disgusted with the lies told by his clergy. The worst phase of the struggle followed, the provincial Catholic bishops and priests organizing bands of armed rebels who committed appalling outrages. A Catholic article in *Liberty* (August 24, 1935), distorting the facts, was riddled by the Mexican Catholic Moreno in the *Forum*, who showed that all the brutality was on the side of the Cristeros (ignorant Catholic Indians led by priests). An American business man had a similar article in the *World-Telegram* of June 8, 1935; yet, on June 16, 15,000 American Rotarians in Mexico City paraded the streets (with impunity) insulting the Mexicans and denouncing "persecution"; while the Pope repeatedly called upon the Governments of the world to "destroy Bolshevism in Russia, Spain, and Mexico." During all this time the electors solidly supported the Government, and even the peons, the vast majority of whom are illiterate Indians, quitted the Church in such numbers that governors of provinces (Chihuahua, Vera Cruz, etc.) safely reduced the number of priests to 1 to 50,000 people, or compelled them all to work. The artisans and town-workers generally are in the great majority Atheists, and cling to a Govern-

ment of Atheists which has done more for the country (in education, reduction of crime, and social and economic betterment) in twenty years than had previously been done in 200. An article in the Protestant *International Review of Missions* (January, 1937) admitted all these facts, adding that "the attention of the Government continues to be directed to improving the well-being of the people" (p. 79).

Michelet, Prof. Jules, D.-es-L. (1798–1874), French historian. He was supervisor of the historical records of the Imperial Archives, and professor at the Sorbonne, although before his appointment he had written caustic anti-Catholic works (*Le prêtre, la femme, et la famille, Histoire des Jésuites*, etc.). His *Histoire de France* (18 vols., 1833–66) and *Histoire de la Révolution Française* (7 vols., 1847–53) were the greatest historical works yet published in France, and were distinguished by a brilliant picturesque style which gave them a very large circulation. All his works reflect his disdain of the Church, and often reveal his Atheism. In the Preface to the 1869 edition he says that "man is his own Prometheus" and that he has "no faith but humanity" (pp. viii and xvii).

Middle Ages, The. An awkward phrase used in English—other languages (Latin, Italian, French, German, Spanish, etc.) say "the Middle Age"—for the period between Ancient and Modern times. As the stages of transition are themselves lengthy, the chronology is not fixed; especially since the criteria marking the beginning of Modern times are extremely unsatisfactory. Roundly, the Middle Age is dated from 450 (or 500) to 1550 (or 1600). The first section (450–1050 or 1100) is the Dark Age [*see*]—a term which no responsible Rationalist writer has ever extended to the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. The whole chronological scheme is profoundly unsatisfactory, but our concern here is to endeavour to reach an impartial estimate of the period 1050–1550, the better part of the Middle Age. That it witnessed great achievements, notably in art and commerce, and an advance immeasurably greater than

had been made in the previous 500 years, is a platitude of history; and that its chronicle contains the names of large numbers of good men or very able men, like every other period of history, it is superfluous to state. But Catholic writers, taking advantage of the leniency to their Church which they have secured in so much writing of modern history, now claim that it was libelled by the historians of the last century; they even claim sometimes that it was the finest epoch of civilization. We have therefore found it necessary in the present work to state the critical facts in scores of articles, and from a summary of these we may here form a discriminating estimate. It is equally important to ascertain to what extent either good or bad features of the period were due to the Church, which kept in check by brutal violence the constantly recurring revolt against it and had such power over the race as no other religion ever had.

Apart from Modernist conceptions of art, no one questions the grandeur of the mediæval artistic achievement, but it has been shown [**Architecture; Art; Cathedrals; etc.**] that to attribute this to the inspiration of religion is a poor fallacy, which the great majority of modern experts pointedly reject. It was due to the very human exaltation which always occurs—compare the periods of great art in Egypt, China, Greece, and Persia—when a people passes from a long period of stringency or demoralization to one of rapidly expanding wealth; and it was as great in profane as in sacred production. In regard to the intellectual achievement which is next lauded, we must carefully discriminate. The period opened with a feverish school-movement [**Abélard; Education; Universities; etc.**] which, from its appearance in the South of France and from historical testimony [**Arabs; Gerbert; etc.**], we easily trace to the magnificent intellectual life which had already lit Moslem Spain for more than a century. But the Church destroyed the early freedom of discussion in the movement, actively checked [**Bacon; Cecco d'Ascoli; Copernicus; Galileo; Vesalius; etc.**] that cultivation of science which was its most promising feature,

and, apart from the development of law and medical schools, which was required for practical purposes, converted nearly the whole into a sterile and arid activity that merely consecrated the worst powers and practices of the hierarchy. Literature grew in spite of the Church, but the amount of genuine religious literature was extraordinarily small in comparison with the vast literature of the Age of Chivalry [see] and the Renaissance [see] which was contemptuous of religion and most licentious from the Christian point of view. Progress in law is the third achievement pressed upon us. We have to remember the appalling lawlessness of the Dark Age, which had to be remedied, the rapid growth of a body of lay lawyers which the improvement of social and economic conditions necessitated, and the eagerness of kings and cities to take over the administration of law from churchmen when, as now occurred, heavy fines were substituted for ordeals, duels, and mutilations. But the net gain was far less than a really great age would have achieved. Law remained in many respects barbaric [see **Crime; Law; Justice; Torture**] until the Rationalist and humanitarian attack upon it began in the eighteenth century with Montesquieu's *Spirit of the Laws* and Beccaria's *Treatise on Crimes*. The immense advance in wealth, banking (in spite of Church Law), commerce, industry, civic forms, and in some respects manners and modes of living, had obviously nothing to do with religion.

On the other hand, the influence of so dominant a religion ought to have been felt primarily in morals, and here the very extensive literature of the period is consistent and decisive. Both in individual and social morals the Middle Age is one of the worst in civilized history, apart from the recognized periods of a collapse of civilization. Precisely that virtue which the Church most stringently enjoined—sexual virtue—was flouted by the great majority in every class, and at least as flagrantly as in the worst periods of history, although these had no dominant creed and ecclesiastical caste enjoining chastity. Alexandria under the Ptolemies, or Rome under Nero, Caracalla, and Elagabal, had had no

Church living on the teaching of a Christ. And the situation was the more revolting because those whose task it was to enforce such teaching—large numbers of the Popes, cardinals, and bishops and the general body of the innumerable priests, monks, and nuns—were as bad as the laity. Even the new friars [see] degenerated within a generation. Probably no thesis here stated will seem to many—such is our modern literature—more startling, but the facts, and the agreement of all the leading authorities on them, are given in a large number of articles in this work. [See especially **Baths; Celibacy; Chivalry; Feast of Fools; Liber Gomorrhæicus; Marriage; Monasticism; Papacy; Prostitution; Renaissance; Roman Church.**] The Crusades [see] were very far from being eruptions of piety and virtue, and mediæval chivalry is a myth in the most blatant contradiction to the facts. On the social-moral side the record is almost as bad. The really religious Popes, such as Gregory VII [see] and Innocent III [see], were indifferent to social welfare, and sacrificed it repeatedly in securing the power of the Church; the other Popes were either sensual and selfish or absorbed in maintaining the power of the Church and the docility of the people. The serfs [see] were emancipated owing to economic and political developments, but they continued in a state of abject dependence on arbitrary and cruel masters, and lived like animals; and they were at least four-fifths of the people of Europe. All authorities agree that the princes, nobles, knights, and their ladies acknowledged no rights in any class below their own and robbed and tortured burghers as well as peasants. Justice [see] was the second great virtue of the Christian code; and injustice was the second rampant vice of Christendom. Moreover, the Church itself set up new and appalling injustices, such as the death-sentence and horrible suffering for honest opinions, torture for other ecclesiastical offences, the gross tribunals of the Inquisition, and a terrible exploitation of the ignorant people to support priests and monks who were generally corrupt. No one can sum up that extraordinary age in a phrase, but

that this is a correct broad characterization of it will be found by collating the hundreds of authorities cited in the above articles. Modern American attempts to give a different estimate, under Catholic pressure, consist of an exclusive and greatly exaggerated presentation of the few good features which are connected with religion, or a fallacious emphasis on secular developments which no one ever questioned, while the evil features are ignored. [See *Christianity and Dark Age* for literature.] A later article on the *Thirteenth Century* will examine the facts in regard to what Catholic historians describe as "the most beautiful" part of the Middle Age; and for the "beautiful characters" of the period see the observations under the titles *Religion and Character and Saints*.

Mill, James (1773-1836), philosopher. He was a son of a poor Scottish shoemaker, and was sent to Edinburgh University by patrons to train for the ministry. A thorough study of Greek literature and philosophy, as well as theology, destroyed his faith. He devoted himself to literary work in London, and a *History of British India* (3 vols., 1817-18) won for him an important position in the East India Company. Close association with Bentham—Bain adds conversation with Miranda [see]—made him an Atheist and a leader in social and educational reform. His chief work is his *Analysis of the Phenomena of the Human Mind* (1829). His son, **John Stuart Mill** (1806-73), could, under the father's tuition, read Greek at the age of seven, and studied political economy at the age of thirteen. He was a commanding figure in Victorian days, one of the leading authorities on logic and political economy, and an idealist of great zeal and exceptional character. Gladstone called him "the Saint of Rationalism," but after his death refused to contribute to the erection of a statue when he learned that in youth Mill had been a Malthusian; whereupon Morley wrote indignantly to Holyoake (but refused later to allow the present writer to publish the letter) that Mill was "as much superior to Gladstone morally as he was intellectually." About 1830, influenced by Wordsworth

and Berkeley, he began to use Theistic language. He told Carlyle, in 1834 (*Letters*, p. 90), that he believed in a "probable God"; but at his death he left, in manuscript, *Three Essays on Religion* (published 1874), in which he professed belief in a finite and impersonal God—"Limited Liability God," some said—though not immortality, and wrote very uncritically about Jesus and Christianity. Morley (*Recollections*, I, 106) tells of the pain and surprise of his admirers.

Millikan, Prof. Robert Andrew (b. 1868), physicist. As the distinguished American physicist, Director of the Norman Bridge Laboratory in California, is one of the few leading scientific men quoted in support of religion, a short comment on his position may be useful. The extraordinary power which Fundamentalism seemed to be acquiring in American education, and the analysis of the beliefs of scientific men published by Leuba and others, caused some alarm about the freedom of science, and Millikan and Dr. H. F. Osborn drew up in 1924 a manifesto declaring that science furnishes "a sublime conception of God." Of the thirteen (many *not* scientific men) whom they could induce to sign it, Millikan was the chief representative of science, and on account of his connection with the discovery of the electron, the popular periodical press and publishers kept him in eruption for several years. He betrayed a complete ignorance of serious literature on the various aspects of the religious problem, and even said (*Collier's Weekly*, October 24, 1925) that he had "never known a thinking man who did not believe in God." He said this at a time when, as Leuba showed, more than 80 per cent. of the greater scientific men of America did not believe in God. His God is the "power" or "force"—Eddington ridicules this use of the terms, while Millikan scorns Eddington's indeterminism—from which all things proceed, and, since there are love and intelligence in the world, there must be love and intelligence in the source: a statement which treats biological evolution as a Fundamentalist preacher would. What precisely he believes in addition is not very clear,

but he writes about Jesus, Greek philosophers, etc., as uncritically as a junior student in a seminary.

Milnes, Richard Monckton, Baron Houghton, M.A., D.C.L., LL.D. (1809–85), poet and politician. A Liberal M.P. who was conspicuous in the support of reform and at various periods President of the Social Science Congress, Foreign Secretary of the Academy, and Trustee of the British Museum. He was created a Baron for his distinguished services. He described himself as “a Puseyite sceptic,” and said that “Christianity is the consummation, the perfection, of idolatry” (Sir T. Wemyss Reid’s *Life, Letters, and Friendships of R. Monckton Milnes*, 1890, II, 491–2).

Milton, John (1608–74). While he is now almost universally described as “the great Christian poet,” Macaulay caused no surprise when, in his essay on Milton, referring to his Latin treatise *Christian Doctrine*, he said that he was “emancipated from the influence of authority,” and spoke of his “Arianism” and “heterodox views on the nature of the Deity and the eternity of matter.” *Paradise Lost*, to which religious writers appeal, is no more orthodox than Dante’s *Purgatory*. It rationalizes, or attempts to rationalize, the melodrama of the Christian story of mysterious devils fighting God for the souls of men, using an old legend that the devils are angels who refused blind worship. It is a superb failure. “The finest thing about this Paradise is its hell,” Taine said.

Milyukov, Prof. Paul Nikolaevitch (1859–1943), Russian historian and statesman. Professor of History at Moscow University 1886–95, he was banished for his advanced opinions, and taught for some years at Sofia and Chicago Universities. On his return to Russia he led the Liberals, and was the most important figure in the first (or Kerensky) revolution in 1917. He retired to England when the Bolsheviks seized power. He was an Agnostic (personal knowledge).

Mind. [See *Brain and Mind* and *Psychology* for the modern use of the word, and *Evolution of Man* for the evolution of mind.]

Mirabeau, Count Honoré Gabriel Victor Riquetti de (1749–91), French statesman. Before the Revolution, when he was an officer in the army, he was several times prosecuted for his courageous criticisms of the feudal system. In the Revolution he was the chief leader, and he helped to keep the Government on the temperate lines which it followed for two years. He advocated a reformed monarchy and a destruction of the power of the Church. Mirabeau was nearer to Atheism than Deism—“if that isn’t God it is at least his cousin,” he said, pointing to the sun on his death-bed (Carlyle’s *French Revolution*, II, 120)—and rejected the belief in immortality.

Miracle Plays. A primitive type of play, also called in modern times the Mystery Play, that was performed in churches during the Middle Ages. Recent writers on them trace them to expansions of the antiphonal responses and the adoption of costumes to represent characters in the Bible, and liturgy; but, as explained in the article **Fools, Feast of**, the Catholic historian, Cardinal Baronius, of the sixteenth century, shows that plays in church definitely began with the dissipated archbishop Theophylactus of Constantinople, in the tenth century, and spread over Christendom. Many writers now represent them as pious expedients for impressing sacred truths on the mind of an illiterate age. The play was often used by genuinely religious priests or monks in this sense, but the edifying type that is occasionally reproduced to-day was exceptional. They had broadly farcical, often very coarse, passages, the sole aim of which was to provoke gusts of rustic laughter. Pious bishops and puritans like the Lollards heavily censured them. A popular favourite, included in both the Towneley and the Chester collections, was *Noah’s Flood*, in which Mrs. Noah nearly loses the boat drinking in the ale-house with her gossips (all half drunk and using very robust language). Some experts see in many of them the aim to ridicule religion, but the myth of the piety of the Middle Ages obsesses most writers, and it has to be defended by these suppressions of facts. See *The Towneley Mysteries* (1886) and

A. W. Pollard, *English Miracle Plays* (1914), for the best collections.

Miracles. Occurrences which are attributed to supernatural instead of natural agencies. It is amusing how the definition of them as "breaches of natural law" has in large part compelled educated Christians to abandon belief in them. Law, in science, is not something to be obeyed, but the factual uniformity of nature. Spinoza, who identified the divine will and natural law, had to pronounce miracles *a priori* impossible; but the Rationalist, who does not see the logic of believing in an omnipotent power and then limiting its capabilities, makes it entirely a question of evidence. There is no more sound evidence of such things at Lourdes than in the Middle Ages or ancient Judæa, and the fact that they were once understood to happen daily, and to have decreased with the progress of exact inquiry, is significant enough. Modernists, however, take a pride in having rejected the idea, and their "explanations" of what really happened in Judæa are rather childish. "The old view of miracles," says Bishop Barnes, "as breaches in natural law belongs to a supernatural dualism which modern science has made obsolete" (*Should Such a Faith Offend?*, p. 165). If God is now part of nature, it is theology rather than science that has effected the change. One prefers the bluntness of Dr. Inge: "Miracle is the bastard child of faith and reason" (*Christian Ethics and Modern Problems*, 1930, p. 198).

Miranda, General Francisco (1754–1816), South American soldier. A Venezuelan officer who fought in the American War of Independence and the French Revolutionary Army (in which he became general). On his return to South America he tried an insurrection, which failed, and he spent some years in the United States and England. He was a Benthamite and Atheist, and J. S. Mill attributes his father's conversion to him. In 1812 he liberated Venezuela and became Vice-President of the Republic, but he was captured by the Spaniards and shipped to Spain, and he died in the dungeons of the Inquisition.

Mirbeau, Octave (1850–1917), French novelist. Educated by the Jesuits, who taught him "above all things to detest his masters," he says he became one of the most artistic of the many fine writers of the time. He was a friend of the Goncourt brothers and, using the same language as they, said that religions are "the monstrous flowers and the hideous instrument of the eternal suffering of man."

Missions. In the ancient world the Buddhist King Asoka made very extensive use of missionaries to spread his purely humanitarian creed, and the modern Japanese Buddhists use them in Asia to conduct a mixed religious and political propaganda. Christian zeal, apart from individual apostles, began with missions to the Moslem, which were quite futile, and acquired a great extension with the opening up of the East. The Jesuits entered upon the work with equal zeal and unscrupulousness, and began the practice of making "rice Christians" (bribed converts), so as to be able to boast of their numbers. In 1600 they claimed to have 600,000 converts in Japan. To-day there are, in Japan, fewer than 150,000 Christians of all sects, though the Pope has won "most-favoured-nation" treatment by supporting the brutal Japanese aggressiveness. In China [see] Christians of all sects were said to number about 3,000,000 before the Japanese war, though a large part of the missions are now in ruins. For half a century Protestant missionaries have complained bitterly of Catholic (chiefly French) methods. The French Government ("of Jews and Atheists," the Vatican said) had, for political reasons, exacted remarkable privileges for their priests and "converts" while the country was helpless. In the *English Missionary Societies' Report* for 1899 we read: "It is now a very common practice for men whose sole object is to avoid paying their debts and to avoid punishment by the authorities to place their names as Romanists on the Register" (p. 329). Both sides won converts by schooling, medical aid, food, etc.; yet on the estimate of Dr. Morrison of Australia the missionaries converted "nine-tenths of a Chinaman per person per annum"

(*An Australian in China*, 1895, p. 5). Until Chiang Kai-shek betrayed the ideals of Sun-Yat-Sen, Atheism made ten times as much progress in fifteen years as the missionaries had made in fifty years. See also E. Teichmann's *Travels of a Consular Official in North-West China* (1921) for the cost and the picturesque uses by the Chinese of the paper of Bibles. At the beginning of the century the missionaries claimed 2,000,000 converts in India. The Census next year returned them as fewer than 1,500,000, and they were to a large extent nominal Christians. They now claim about 5,000,000 (in 450,000,000). The British officials have at all times facilitated their work and profited by it. The missionary, Dr. J. N. Ogilvie (*Our Empire's Debt to Missions*, 1924), boasts that Polynesia, New Zealand, New Guinea, Nyasaland, and Uganda were won for the Empire by the missionaries: "This was the avenue along which the enrichment actually came" (p. 56). How it was really done is shown in K. L. P. Malin's *Missionaries and Annexation in the Pacific* (1924). In twenty-three years, at a cost of £13,000,000 a year, missionaries converted only 151 out of 500,000 Maoris, so the country was annexed and the Maoris were reduced by war from 500,000 to 50,000. In the Pacific Islands the depopulation and suffering have been terrible. In Honolulu alone the natives were reduced from 300,000, when the first missionaries arrived in 1820, to 30,000, not of an admirable type. When war broke out, in 1914, and the Australian Government ignored their sacred function and examined the books of the German missionaries in Melanesia and Polynesia, they found that societies of "The Sacred Heart of Jesus," "The Holy Ghost," etc., had made vast sums by trade and the labour of the natives. Usually the stream of gold flows in the opposite direction. Between £10,000,000 and £20,000,000 have been spent yearly on foreign missions for decades, so that the 10,000,000 nominal converts on missions may be said to have cost about £400,000,000. The 20,000 priests and helpers on the missions have an average of eight converts each—as long as the

money lasts. No one can fail to respect the zeal and self-sacrifice of very many of the missionaries, but the work as a whole is not impressive, especially when we remember that in England, America, France, and Germany four-fifths of the people have abandoned the Christianity which is presented to natives as the secret of white civilization. See H. Bradlaugh Bonner's *Christianizing the Heathen* (1922).

Mitchell, Sir Peter Chalmers, M.A., D.Sc., LL.D., F.R.S., F.Z.S., O.B.E. (1864–1945), zoologist. Educated at Aberdeen, Oxford, Berlin, and Leipzig Universities, he took honours in mental philosophy and was university medalist in literature, but he devoted himself to anatomy and zoology. He was lecturer on biology at Charing Cross Hospital 1892–6, examiner in zoology to the Royal College of Physicians 1901–3, and secretary of the Zoological Society from 1903 until he retired. His Materialist views are best seen in *Evolution and the War* (1915). He describes himself as "one who dislikes all forms of supernaturalism and who does not shrink from the implications even of the phrase that thought is a secretion of the brain as bile is a secretion of the liver" (p. 107). Like all the leading Materialists, Mitchell was a man of ardent social idealism. He was an Hon. Associate of the R.P.A.

Mithraism. A religion of Persian origin which spread in the Roman Empire and was, like Manichæism, more respected, and possibly more widespread, than Christianity until the bishops persuaded the Emperors to destroy all rival religions. Mithra, though not important in the *Avesta*, was a very ancient Aryan sun-god, as he is mentioned both in Sanscrit and Persian literature; which means that he was a deity of the common ancestors of the Persians and Hindus before 1400 B.C. With the imperialist expansion he advanced rapidly in the Persian pantheon, and in the shape of a young and handsome god, the god of light and brightness, he became very important in the cult. It spread over Asia Minor, where there were Persian colonies, and the conquests of Alexander favoured its expansion in the West. It reached

Rome in the first century before Christ, and two centuries later spread over the Empire, especially when the Emperor Aurelian instituted the worship of the Unconquered Sun, with which Mithra was identified. Its martial note made it appeal particularly to soldiers, who took it to every country, and its note of deliverance recommended it to slaves, while it was popular among merchants. Unlike Manichæism, it collapsed at the fall of Rome and the disbanding of the armies and slaves. In the third and fourth centuries it had troubled the Fathers by its analogy to Christianity both in its legend and cult, and it is hardly possible to doubt that the Church borrowed extensively from it. The fully developed legend was that Mithra, who had no human mother, emerged at birth from a rock in a cave or stable, with a few shepherds for witnesses. Some experts dispute, feebly, the obvious fact that this is a symbol of the emergence of the sun from its winter abode, but the solar note continues. Mithra waged war on evil (which is much the same as darkness in Persian ideas), and was in the end assumed into heaven, where his devotees would join him.

Mithraism was virtually unknown in the days when Gibbon wrote that the special attraction of Christianity was that it promised a blessed immortality. Cumont has gathered an exact knowledge of it from surviving inscriptions, and he says that Mithra "assured them [his followers] salvation both in this world and the world to come" (p. 143). The wicked went to hell and the good to heaven, and "it was Mithra who presided over the judgment of the soul after its decease" (145) and also at the general judgment when the world was destroyed by fire. To complete the parallel with Christianity, "the doctrine of the immortality of the soul was rounded off by the doctrine of the resurrection of the flesh" (146). He "sustains his devotees in their frailty through all the tribulations of life" and is "the anchor of salvation for mortals in all their trials" (143). The cult of this Redeemer and Saviour, who came closest to the Christian Redeemer because of the intensely ethical note of the religion, is

generally described as equally close to that of the Church, and, although there has been at times some strain or exaggeration in claiming Christian borrowing from paganism, no man accustomed to scientific methods can doubt that here the Church actually borrowed from the Mithraists. The chief Mithraic temple in the West was on the Vatican, in the Christian district. It was underground, so that candles were lavishly used, and incense also was burned; and on the altars were "twigs," which may mean flowering branchlets of trees or shrubs. The chief ceremonies were a blood baptism of neophytes—baptism by water was so common in Judæa that we do not suggest Mithraic influence here—and a rite like the Eucharist or Mass, into which the primitive Christian supper was developed. On an altar—bas-reliefs of this may be seen in Cumont—priests in special dress consecrated bread and wine and distributed them; especially on December 25, when the birth of Mithra in a cave or stable was celebrated. Originally the cup had contained water or a Persian drink, but in Italy wine was used. And these rites were called by the Roman Mithraists *Sacramenta*. It is only by enlarging on certain other rites of the Mithraists—curious initiation rites of rich Oriental symbolism which the Fathers ridiculed—that the apologist distracts attention from the identical features and the most probable borrowings of the Church. Prof. F. Cumont's small work *The Mysteries of Mithra* (Engl. trans., 1903) is still the best source of information.

Modernism. The name given by the Vatican to liberal or semi-rationalist movements in the Roman Church and adopted by the small body of rationalizers of theology in the Church of England. When the somnolence and dense ignorance which were imposed upon Catholic countries after the triumph of Protestantism were disturbed by the currents of modern thought, in the nineteenth century, the rebellion against the sacerdotal system began again. France had never been docile [*See Gallican Church*], and Austria under Joseph II had seriously troubled the Vatican. Before the end of the last century revolt against mediæval dogma,

or a claim to adapt theology to modern thought, already heavily condemned in the Syllabus [see], spread in all countries. In England the historian Lord Acton [see] and the scientist Prof. Mivart (who was little more than a Deist—personal knowledge) had a considerable following. In America a movement known as Americanism [see] was taken up even by the bishops, and France, Spain, Italy, and Portugal had liberal Catholic parties. Pope Pius X, with all the courage of the glorified peasant he was, solemnly condemned the entire movement in 1908 and 1909, and actually struck a gold medal commemorating the slaying of the dragon of Modernism, or the expulsion of honest scholarship (Tyrell, Loisy, etc.) from his Church. For the most part educated Catholics were merely driven into silence, and a new Inquisition was established in the Church to see that their mouths remained closed. Anglican and Anglo-American Modernism suffered a few early attacks by bishops, but they soon decided that it was a necessary safety-valve; and, indeed, the bishops to a very great extent endorsed it at the Lambeth Conference [see]. Many Rationalists are misled by this surrender and imagine that "the battle is won." A survey of the Church literature and periodicals which have by far the largest circulation shows that even in the Church of England the great majority are, like the still larger body of Romanists, Methodists, etc., Fundamentalists. As long as the essence of Modernism is to put new meanings on all formularies it will not, and does not, appeal to the majority. They prefer to say that Paul and Jesus either did or did not err.

Mohammedanism. The religion, properly called Islam, of the followers of Mohammed (570–632). As there was no sort of biography of the Prophet until more than a century after his death, and his environment was even less civilized than ancient Judæa, we cannot form a confident estimate of his personality. Most experts agree that he was neuropathic; many say epileptic. He made a confused collection, on a monotheistic basis, of the religious ideas (chiefly Jewish) which were known in his half-barbaric region of Arabia [see

Koran]; but to what extent he was sincere in thinking that the result of his neurotic brooding was "revelation" it is now impossible to say. Modern historians make two points clear. The war which his followers at Medina, to which he was forced to fly in 622 (the Hejira, the beginnings of Moslem chronology), waged with his critics at Mecca was real savagery. The "ladies of the chief families," as some call them, stabbed the wounded, ate the livers of the dead, and wore necklaces of their ears. The second point is that the "Holy War" to convert Arabia, Persia, and the world, was no more religious than the Christian Crusades. The *Cambridge Mediæval History*, which would be better described as *The History of Mediæval Christendom*—it devotes many thousands of pages to half-barbaric Europe and almost ignores the great Arab-Persian civilization—did at least find (though not in England) a scholar to tell the truth on this point. In the second volume Prof. Becker explains that "hunger and avarice, not religion, were the impelling forces" of the Arab expansion, and that "it was not the religion of Islam that was disseminated by the sword, but political sovereignty"; that "the acceptance of Islam by others than Arabs was not only not striven for, but was in fact regarded with disfavour" (p. 330). After the death of the fanatical Omar, the Caliphs and Emirs preferred the vanquished to remain unbelievers and pay for "protection." Prof. A. von Kremer agrees, in his authoritative *Orient under the Caliphate* (1920), and shows that the familiar picture of rugged Arab virtue and effete Persian vice is absurd. The Arabs were savages in war, and as corrupt as the Persians in peace. Mecca and Medina were scented cities of exotic vice within two generations. Fortunately sceptical descendants of the most disdainful opponents of Mohammed got the Caliphate in Syria and then in Spain [**Arabs, Civilization of the**], while the sceptical Persians won the ascendancy there after the death of the hypocritical Harun [see]. They created a splendid civilization from the Atlantic to India while the Christian descendants of the Aryans continued in barbarism. See also I. Goldziher,

Mohammed and Islam (1917), and R. F. Dibble, *Mohammed* (1927).

Moleschott, Prof. Jakob, M.D. (1822–93), German physiologist. Professor at Heidelberg who was censured for the Materialism of his great work on metabolism (*Die Physiologie des Stoffwechsels*, 1851) and went to teach at Zurich and then Turin. To the great anger of the Catholics, he was called to the chair of physiology at Rome University, and became one of the leading figures in Italian science. Lange calls him “the father of the modern Materialistic movement,” and, while not using the label Materialist, he did not refuse it. See Büchner’s *Last Words on Materialism* (Engl. trans., 1901, pp. 40–61).

Molesworth, the Right Hon. Robert, first Viscount Molesworth, F.R.S. (1656–1726), Irish statesman. He supported the Prince of Orange in the Revolution of 1688 and was summoned to the Privy Council. He sat in both the Irish and English Parliaments, was created Viscount, and was elected a Fellow of the Royal Society. He was a friend of Toland and Shaftesbury, and is Deistic in his *Account of Denmark as it was in the year 1692* (1694).

Molesworth, Sir William (1810–55), statesman. He entered the reformed Parliament in 1832, and became First Commissioner of the Board of Works, and later Secretary for the Colonies. He bought the *Westminster Review* in 1856 and made it the organ of the Philosophical Radicals. Molesworth was a great friend of Mill and Grote, and shared their Atheism. J. S. Mill says that “he died a firm adherent of anti-religious opinions” (*Letters of J. S. Mill*, 7, 187), and Harriet Grote tells us that he “refused to go to church, and laughed at those who did so” (*The Philosophical Radicals*, 1866, p. 3). He had high ideals and did much for social reform.

Molière Jean Baptiste Poquelin (1622–73), French poet. Few are now aware that the famous satirist was a student of science and an advanced Rationalist. He had the greatest admiration for the poem of Lucretius, and had it not been for the protection of the King, to whom (like his father) he was valet for a few

years, the clergy would have made him pay dearly for the Rationalism in his plays. The last scene of *Don Juan* was described at the time as “a school of Atheism in which, after making a clever Atheist say the most horrible impieties, he entrusted the cause of God to a valet who says ridiculous things.” He quotes two lines of Lucretius in *Le misanthrope* (Act II, Scene IV, 723–4), and *Tartuffe* was recognized as a bitter satire on the clergy, who got it proscribed. He died excommunicated, the priests whom his wife summoned refusing to come, and it was only under pressure from the King that they gave him some sort of burial service. Now the *Catholic Encyclopedia* blandly describes him as a Catholic. See Prof. Lanson’s *Histoire de la littérature française* (1896, p. 520), and Trollope’s *Life of Molière* (1905).

Molteno, Sir John Charles, K.C.M.G. (1814–86), first Premier of Cape Colony. He migrated at an early age to South Africa, and made a fortune in banking. He was Premier 1872–8, and later Colonial Secretary. His son and biographer, A. Molteno, uses the painfully familiar formula: “Mr. Molteno’s life was in the highest sense deeply religious, but the prevailing forms of religion repelled him” (*The Life and Times of Sir J. C. Molteno*, 1900, II, 465). It is rather too polite a way of explaining that though reared as a Catholic—he was of Italian extraction—he became an Agnostic. Sir John was fond of quoting Pope’s couplet: “For modes of faith let graceless zealots fight—he can’t be wrong whose life is in the right.”

MommSEN, Prof. Theodor (1817–1903), German historian and Nobel Prize winner. The famous historian was a professor of law at Leipzig University when he took part in the Revolution of 1848, and was deposed. In 1858 he was appointed Professor of ancient history at Berlin University, and came to be regarded as the greatest authority on ancient Rome and one of the foremost scholars of Germany. His biographer, L. M. Hartmann (*Theodor Mommsen*, 1908), says that he “left Christianity for Deism, then Deism for Atheism” (p. 64). In later years he used a vague Theistic language, but hated what he called *Kaplanocracy* (the

rule of priests), and he left his superb *History of Rome* (5 vols., 1854-85) unfinished because "he found no pleasure in describing the substitution of the Nazarene for the ancient spirit."

Monasticism. The Greek word of which "monk" is a corruption means a man who lives "alone" (on religious grounds), but it has come to be the accepted name for bodies of men who live a communal life after taking vows of poverty, chastity, and obedience. Long before the Christian period, groups of men, even Atheists like the Jains [see] and the early Buddhists, lived ascetic communal lives. With the contamination of Buddhism by Asiatic superstitions, and its enrichment by royal and wealthy patrons, monasticism in Asia attained enormous proportions. The Chinese traveller, Fa-hsien (whose work is translated by Dr. Giles, *The Travels of Fa-hsien*, 1923), described communities of 3,000 to 5,000 monks, and at one place saw 50,000. He found relics and superstitious practices, but says that the monks were uniformly ascetic and devoted to learning. In the seventh century of the Christian era another Chinese Buddhist, Hiuen Tsung, again found in India rich monasteries with thousands of monks, and described them as very ascetic and learned. See S. Julien's *Histoire de la vie de Hiouen Tsung* in his *Voyages des Pèlerins Bouddhistes* (tom. I, 1853). They were, we know, not always so blameless, but Asiatic monasticism never had any approach to the gross scandals, century after century, of Christian monasticism. This was remotely inspired by the Therapeuts and Essenes [see] of pre-Christian Alexandria and Palestine, who in turn seem to have been inspired by the strict communities of the priests of Serapis and priestesses of Isis in later Egypt. The persecutions of the Christians drove many to the desert, where the weird story of "the Fathers of the Desert" began. The deliberate filth of the life of so many, and the occasional scandals caused by the admission of women disguised as men, offended many in the Church—it was "the life of beasts, not men," said Lactantius—but the comprehensive corruption began in

the fourth century, when monks were brought to Rome and so petted that a vast unorganized brood of monks spread over the Western Church. Jerome, who eventually joined them in Syria, severely criticizes them (*Epp.* XXII, XXV, etc.), and an Imperial Rescript of the year 370—Jerome says they richly deserved it—which had to be read in the churches, sufficiently branded their greed by declaring legacies to them invalid. Augustine paints a terrible picture of their fraud and hypocrisy in his work *De Opere Monachorum* (about the year 400), and wrote a Rule of Life which a few Communities accepted. The great majority in the West wandered about individually, and in the East the vast monasteries poured out crowds of fanatics like those who tore Hypatia's flesh from her bones and stormed Church Councils with staves. In the sixth century Bishop Isidore of Seville found Spain overrun by these wandering monks—"they have in common nothing but their impure and vagabond life," he said—and Benedict had the same painful experience in Italy. Historians who now tell their readers that the world was so disturbed by the movements of the barbarians (most of whom had settled down long before) that Benedict was inspired to inaugurate houses of retreat and study for good men, and wrote a Rule for them, misrepresent the facts. Benedict expressly says—his words and those of Isidore and half a dozen others are in the Migne collection of the Fathers—that he formed his famous and secluded abbey at Monte Cassino *because Europe was overrun by swarms of corrupt monks*. Most of the Augustinian monks were as bad as the other orders; and we may add that every subsequent foundation of a new Order was due to the same cause, the general corruption of the existing Orders.

The history of Christian monasticism from that date (about 550) to the Council of Trent—that is to say, during the 1,000 years of the Church's complete domination of Europe—is the most sordid chapter in the history of civilized religion; even more sordid than the story of the Popes and prelates of the Church. For while the many

long periods of Papal corruption are nevertheless (between the years 350 and 1650) only about a third of the entire stretch, it is the periods of decency which are exceptional in the monastic record, and this decency was never more than regional. Apologists, and some non-Catholic writers, who first pretend that the critic says all monasteries at all times were corrupt, and then triumphantly quotes evidence of particular abbeys which were not corrupt, use the familiar trickery of the apologist, while those modern historians who in describing the Middle Ages insert a chapter on the ideal or theoretical Benedictine abbey, and at the most delicately hint that some of them were irregular or "worldly," convey a monstrously false impression. No complete history of the subject has been written, even Lea's *History of Sacerdotal Celibacy* giving only part of the evidence, but the present writer has fairly covered the ground and quoted contemporary Catholic authorities in his *True Story of the Roman Catholic Church* (6 vols., 1930, published in America only), and is in a position to state that at least four-fifths of the monasteries—"abbeys"—are monasteries of the older Orders—of Europe during the 1,000 years were corrupt. Except in certain periods and places—Irish and British monasticism in the first fervour, groups which followed the Cluny or the Cistercian reform for a few decades, and so on—a monastery was generally a nursery of sloth, sensuality, and vice. We have, for instance, an ideal witness in the eighth century, the monk Boniface, who was equally familiar with conditions in Germany, France, and England. Religious writers ignore the letters in which he reports the general corruption, and quote Bede—omitting to say that even Bede, a very isolated monk, talks of God destroying some communities by fire for their vices—but Boniface had far greater authority at Rome, and expressly describes general conditions. They quote the reforming zeal of Dunstan, and not the declarations of bishops and councils, that it had little effect and died with him. Records of Councils (in Mansi's collection, for instance) of the ninth, tenth, and eleventh centuries, in England, France,

Germany, and Italy bemoan the corruption of the monks. The Norman monk-historian, Ordericus Vitalis, gives a dark picture of monastic life in England and France in the tenth and eleventh centuries; and Abélard and Cardinal Jacques de Vitry testify to a general corruption—Heloise says the same of the nunneries—in the thirteenth. Cardinal Damian's *Liber Gomorrhæicus* [see] imputes the most perverse vices to the monks generally. Pope Alexander III, in a letter of the year 1171, scourges the English bishops for the state of the monasteries, and Pope Innocent III repeatedly refers in his letters to monastic corruption. The new monks [see *Dominicans and Franciscans*], we saw, speedily became as corrupt as the old, and songs and stories of the most cynical character (as in the work of Walter Map) about monks circulated throughout Europe. In the fifteenth century monastic corruption was the first point made by the few who appealed to Rome for reform. Pico Della Mirandola, appealing to Leo X (himself a vicious Pope) in 1519, said the vices of monks were "such as would not be found among the devils of hell" (*On the True Causes of our Calamities*), and when the Council of Trent at last met, bishop after bishop demanded the abolition of monasteries on account of their general corruption.

The testimony is so overwhelming that in the first volume of the *Cambridge Mediæval History* (Ch. XVIII) even the Catholic Canon Barry admits the corruption in England. He weakens his concession by claiming that it was very different in Germany, where in point of fact we have even more evidence of vice. Not only do Erasmus, Ulrich von Hutten, and Luther, denounce the general condition, but even Luther's fiery monk-opponent, Thomas Murner (*Narrenbeschwerung*), admits it—he jokes in one sermon about the nuns in one convent electing as abbess the one who had most children—and it was the German bishops at Trent who most insisted on the general corruption. In recent years it has become the fashion to regard Cardinal Gasquet's *Henry VIII and the English Monasteries* (5th ed., 2 vols., 1893) as a satisfactory answer to

all libels of the English monks. He does not notice the terms in which Henry VII speaks of the monasteries in 1487 and the Pope's confirmation (Wilkins's *Councils of Great Britain and Ireland*, III, 630), or in the same work the letter in which the Archbishop of Canterbury described the monastic group at St. Albans (a Benedictine Abbey with a cluster of priories and nunneries) as amazingly corrupt, the monks desecrating even their chapels by "fornicating with nuns and the shedding of blood and seed," and "prostituting themselves to whores inside and out of the monasteries almost publicly and continuously"; and in 1511 the next Archbishop (also in Wilkins) finds no improvement. Gasquet does not notice the state of the convents of Kilburn, which we find described in Archdeacon Hale's *Series of Precedents and Proceedings in Criminal Cases* (1847), or that we learn from the same records that the friars had special brothels in London. We find, in fact, that even after Trent the corruption continued in Catholic countries, especially France (where the convents were notorious up to the Revolution), Spain, Italy, and Spanish America (see the amazing picture in *Noticias secretas de America* anon; 1826). For eighteenth-century Italy we have a remarkable picture in the *Memoirs of Scipio de Ricci* (Engl. trans., 1829), a reforming bishop of high character. He found that the Dominican monks of Florence slept in the dormitories of nuns, that practically every convent was "a brothel," and that the head of the Dominican Order in Rome, a loose monk, obstructed all his efforts at reform. We must, in fine, recall the extraordinary exposure of monastic corruption in Germany in the last few years. The facts are given, and the Catholic acceptance of them and reliability of the trials shown, in the articles *Franciscans* and *Germany*. If entire provinces of several hundred monks could be infected with sodomy in Europe in modern times, it is futile to protest that mediæval accounts are "incredible"; and every witness cited in this summary, and the hundreds who could be cited in a complete history of

monasticism, are Catholics, for the far greater part strict Catholics.

Monboddo, Lord. [See Burnett, James.]

Moneta, Ernesto Teodoro (1838–1918), writer and Nobel Prize winner. A journalist who fought the Papal troops in the war for the liberation of Italy and afterwards edited the anti-Papal *Secolo* for thirty years. Moneta was one of the leading workers in Italy for peace and reform. He founded *La Vita Internazionale* and the Lombard Union for Peace and Arbitration. He received the Nobel Prize in 1907.

Monge, Gaspard, Count de Paluse (1746–1818), French physicist. Monge was so precocious that the priests of his school made him teacher of physics and mathematics at the age of sixteen, but his father frustrated their attempt to capture him for the Church, and had him educated in engineering. He became professor of mathematics and Minister of Marine. Napoleon, who took him to Egypt, made him Senator and Count. He is said to have astonished Napoleon by the fineness of his character, and he refused to submit, and lost all his dignities, at the Restoration. Lalande, his equally illustrious friend and colleague, told Maréchal (*Dictionnaire des Athées*) that he was an Atheist.

Mongez, Antoine (1747–1835), French archæologist. He was the archæologist of the Canons Regular of Ste. Geneviève, and won the prize of the Academy of Inscriptions, but he left the Church at the Revolution and was put in charge of historical monuments. Napoleon made him Administrator of the Mint, but the clerical-royalists deposed him in 1827. In a speech that he made on being admitted to the Institut he said that he had "the honour of being an Atheist."

Monism. A form of Rationalism introduced by Haeckel, to replace the usual German "Freethought" as a positive philosophy of reality. He disliked the term "Agnostic," which never had much support in Germany, and thought Atheism too negative, while Materialism seemed to him to fail to recognize the importance of energy. He held that matter and energy are two

aspects or manifestations of a single (*monos*) reality or substance. British jibes at his philosophy as "out of date" look foolish in the light of modern developments in physics. The Monists were the largest body of Rationalists in Europe, and recovered after the War of 1914-18, but were suppressed by the Nazis.

Monotheism. The development of monotheism from polytheism is a natural process of simplification, but in the ancient civilizations was generally delayed by the multiplicity of rich priesthoods. The claim that it was introduced by the Hebrew prophets is now seen to be quite unsound, apart from the fact that the early prophets did not say that other gods than Jahveh did not exist, but that Jahveh alone was the God of the Hebrews. Egyptian literature (the *Maxims of Ptah-hotep*, etc.), going back earlier than 2000 B.C., shows that educated men were Monotheists, and the priests repeatedly explained other Gods as aspects of the chief god, or tried (in the days of Amenhotep IV) to introduce a definite monotheism. Ahura Mazda was the one god of the Persians, who followed Zarathustra; educated Chinese had one God (Heaven) or none; and monotheism (in the Brahmanic sense) was common in educated India. None of the Greek philosophers or their followers were polytheists, but had, like Plato, one God or (generally) none. The claim for the Hebrews is based upon the old superstition that they had a revelation. They were not solidly monotheistic until the priests fabricated the Old Testament as we have it. [See also *Hebrews and Hymns*.]

Monsey, Messenger, B.A., F.R.C.P. (1693-1788), physician. He was physician to Chelsea Hospital, and a man of great social and cultural distinction in London, an intimate friend of Sir R. Walpole and Lord Chesterfield and other leading sceptics. As is quaintly said of him in *Monk's Roll of the Royal College of Physicians* (II, 85), he "shook off the manacles of superstition and fell into the comfortless bigotry of scepticism."

Montague, Basil, M.A., K.C. (1770-1851), reformer. A natural son of the

Earl of Sandwich who won a high reputation at the Bar. As Commissioner in Bankruptcy, and later Accountant-General in Bankruptcy, he secured many reforms of the law, and he was active in other reform movements. Besides editing the works of Bacon (16 vols., 1825-57), he wrote a number of books on law and philosophy. Harriet Martineau tells us that "before his death he distinctly declared in a message to me his approbation of the avowal his friend W. Atkinson and I made of opinions like his own" (*Autobiography*, I, 402). These "opinions" were Atheism.

Montagu, Edward, first Earl of Sandwich (1625-72), admiral. He fought on the Parliamentary side in the Civil War, and Cromwell made him admiral and Commissioner of the Treasury. Charles II confirmed him as admiral and made him Knight of the Garter. Pepys (a Christian) was his secretary, and tells us that he was "very indifferent in all matters of religion" (*Diary*, October 7, 1660). Elsewhere (October 20, 1660) he says: "I found him to be a perfect sceptic," and describes him on one occasion laboriously composing an anthem in the King's Chapel and cursing volubly.

Montague, Lady Mary Wortley (1689-1762), writer. She was very precocious, and her father, the Earl of Kingston, got her elected a member of the Kit Kat Club at the age of eight. She translated Epictetus from the Latin at the age of twenty. After her marriage, to a grandson of the Earl of Sandwich, her house was one of the most brilliant social and intellectual centres in London, especially for the Deists. She was considered the most accomplished woman in Europe, and her letters are part of the best literature of the time (*Letters*, 1906 ed.). They are full of Rationalism. "Priests can lie, and the mob believe, all over the world" (p. 88), she writes. She condemns "the quackery of all the Churches" and, while professing a belief in "the Author of Nature," despises "all creeds and theological whimsies" (p. 108).

Montaigne, Michael Eyquem de (1533-92), French essayist. He spoke Latin fluently and had a fair knowledge of

Greek at the age of six, and had finished his schooling at the age of thirteen. Trained in law, he succeeded his father as Councillor of the Bordeaux Parlement, and Charles IX made him a Royal Councillor and Chevalier of the Order of St. Michael. He began, after his resignation, to write his famous *Essays*, which have rendered immortal service to Rationalism. He professed to be a Catholic, and once, in illness, sent for a priest—"You can at any time get a priest to hold your hands and rub your feet," he says in one essay—but the *Essays* were put on the "Index," and few Catholics venture to claim him. We must remember that the St. Bartholomew Massacre had occurred only a few years before he began to write. Clearly he was a Deist with a great disdain of the Churches and their quarrels, but his expressions are necessarily so guarded that his *Essays* have only a literary interest to-day.

Montesquieu, Charles de Secondat, Baron de la Brède et de, F.R.S. (1689–1755), French jurist. A lawyer of the Bordeaux Parlement of such distinction that he became President of it at the age of twenty-seven. In 1721 he wrote a caustic criticism of the Church, *Lettres Persanes*, which the clergy warmly resented. He resigned in 1726, and travelled all over Europe, studying law and the people, and in 1748 he published his monumental *Spirit of the Laws* (2 vols.), the basis of later legal reform and a work that did much to prepare the way for the Revolution. From these works, and his posthumously published *Pensées*, we learn that he was a Deist, though, like Montaigne, very discreet. No one questions that he was a Deist, but under pressure he admitted a priest to his deathbed, so Catholics now claim him.

Montgolfier, Joseph Michel (1740–1810), inventor of the balloon. A French paper-maker and chemist who invented the first balloon (inflated with warm air) in 1783. Next year he invented the parachute. He adhered to the Revolution, and was appointed Administrator of the Conservatoire des Arts et des Métiers. Lalande, an intimate friend, told Maréchal (*Dictionnaire des Athées*) that he was an Atheist.

Moore, George (1853–1933), novelist. He was educated in a Catholic college, but abandoned the Church while studying art in Paris, as his first work, *Flowers of Passion* (1877), plainly showed. He was a severe artist, and had not a large circulation until he wrote *Esther Waters* (1894). Moore used to explain to the present writer that he called himself a Protestant for political reasons, and was an Agnostic. In the first edition of his literary drama, *The Apostle* (1911), he made Paul strike Jesus dead on finding him alive years after his supposed resurrection, and Catholics tried to get him prosecuted for his *Brook Kerith* (1916). He based both books upon the present writer's theory that Jesus was an Essenian monk.

Moore, Prof. George Edward, Litt.D., LL.D. (b. 1873), philosopher. Professor of moral science at Cambridge and Fellow of the British Academy. His *Principia Ethica* (1903) was an important contribution to naturalistic ethics. In a smaller work in the Home University Library (*Ethics*, 1912) he says, with a candour that is startling in that series: "I think myself that in all probability there is no such thing—neither a God nor any being such as philosophers have called by the names I have mentioned" (p. 151). He is one of the most distinguished of British philosophic writers.

Moors, The. The lamentable lack of appreciation of the Spanish Arab civilization in modern history, which helps to prolong the life of the myth that the Church restored culture in Europe, is in part due to the practice of calling the Arabs "Moors" (black men). The Spanish civilization, the greatest between the Greek and the modern, was created by men of pure Arab or Arab-Syrian blood. They crossed North Africa rapidly, and took over Spain in 711, and in 756 a fresh body of Arabs, under Abd-er-Rahman I, arrived and began to organize the country. In the ninth and tenth centuries—the Iron Age of Christendom—Spain was brilliant in art, science, letters, commerce, and industry, and nearly all its greater leaders were sceptics. The Africans, including the Moors, remained at a low level, but the

more fanatical Muslim converted them to Islam, and for several centuries North Africa was a reservoir of robust and fanatical believers upon which the orthodox drew in their struggle against the sceptics. With few exceptions, the Moors were vandals, and it was they and the Spanish Catholics (heavily assisted by French, English, and German knights who scented plunder) who destroyed the very fine and advanced civilization. In McCabe's *Splendour of Moorish Spain* (1935) the word is used only in deference to the prevailing convention. The Moors themselves were swarthy, not black, and the remnant spared and driven from Spain has been mostly absorbed by the North African peoples.

Moral Ideals. In the Christian apologetic work *Foundations* (1912) Moberley protests that the old conception of a moral ideal as an arbitrary divine command is "feudal" and has been "undermined by the spread of democracy" (p. 462). The widespread decay of belief in God has been a much more important factor in bringing on the modern controversy about the nature of moral ideals. Theoretically the controversy ought to be of primary importance: in practice few are interested in it, and hardly one in ten even of people who no longer have religious instruction is aware of its existence. Most philosophers probably still seek to find a new basis, like Kant, in moral intuitions, but as psychology excludes the idea of intuition, and such a theory is not calculated to influence more than a small refined minority, experts on the modern science of ethics usually follow the social theory, that moral ideals in the individual were implanted by education, and in the race are evolved standards of conduct based upon experience; as is suggested by the fact that character improves while religion and philosophy decay. [See *Conscience; Ethics; Intuition.*]

More, Sir Thomas (1480-1535). The fact that More wrote the *Utopia*, which is plainly sceptical and anti-clerical, yet is now a "saint" of the Roman Church, raises questions about his religious beliefs. One of his chief biographers says that he was "a bundle of con-

tradictions," but the evidence suggests that he was sceptical in his youth and prime, and very sincere in his later sacrifice for his faith. The Catholic argument that he was not serious in writing the sceptical second part—as published: it was written first—of the *Utopia* is frivolous. He had been one of the enthusiasts for Greek studies at Oxford, and was fired by Plato's ideal commonwealth. Many details in his own picture are doubtless merely whimsical, but no Catholic could have written as he did about religion. The canonization, on the other hand, is not to be taken too seriously. Like that of Joan of Arc, and others in modern times, it was a political and financial move. British priests—the fact was concealed from the laity—were outraged to find at the close that they had to pay Rome £15,000, besides £4,000 for a present to the Pope. [See *Canonization.*]

Morellet, André (1727-1819), French Encyclopædist. He was educated by the Jesuits, and he kept all his life the title of the Abbé Morellet; yet he "did more than any in spreading the views of the philosophers" (*Grande Encyclopédie*). He was intimate with Voltaire, Diderot, D'Alembert and Franklin. His writings, including a translation of Beccaria's *Treatise*, were published in 4 vols. (1818).

Morgan, Conway Lloyd (1852-1936), biologist. He was professor of zoology and geology at Bristol University College, and Principal of it 1887-1909. When it became a university he was Vice-Chancellor, but resigned the position and took the chair of psychology. As he was a Vitalist and author of the Emergent Evolution [see] theory, he is often quoted in a very misleading way. He was a more advanced Rationalist than Voltaire and Paine. In 1904 he was invited to join in the general attack on Haeckel, and in an article in the *June Contemporary Review* he disconcerted the orthodox. He rejected the belief in immortality, admitted only an impersonal "First Cause," and said that "the general trend of Haeckel's constructive scheme of scientific interpretation is on lines which are winning or have won acceptance" (p. 776).

Morgan, Sir Thomas Charles, M.D. F.R.C.P. (1783–1843), physician. After some years in surgical practice in London, he went as physician to the Marshalsea, Dublin. He travelled much in France, and was a close friend of the Materialists Bichat and Cabanis, whose ideas he adopted and expressed in *Sketches of the Philosophy of Life* (1815) and *Sketches of the Philosophy of Morals* (1822). He lost a good deal of his practice through clerical persecution.

Morier, Sir Robert Burnett David, K.C.B., LL.D., P.C. (1826–93), diplomat. He had a long and very distinguished career in the diplomatic service, ending as Minister at Lisbon, Madrid, and St. Petersburg, and was richly decorated. Sir Robert was a great friend of Jowett and, like him, a Theist of a very undogmatic character. In 1892, just before his death, Jowett wrote him: "I fear that we are both rather tending to some sort of Agnosticism" (Jowett's *Letters*, p. 182).

Morison, James Augustus Cotter, M.A. (1832–88), writer. A friend of Morley, L. Stephen, and Meredith, he shared their scepticism and had much influence by his later writings. The earlier (life of St. Bernard, etc.) were weakly Positivist and uncritical—his references to Abélard are particularly biased and unjust—and he was a member of the Positivist Church. He made amends by his *Service of Man* (1887), which is very candid and valuable on mediæval morals. The account of French life is especially useful, as he had for years gathered material for a history of France under Louis XIV, which he never wrote. A sketch of his life by F. Harrison is prefixed to the reprint of *The Service of Man* (1903).

Morley, the Right Hon. John, Viscount Morley of Blackburn, M.A., LL.D., D.C.L., F.R.S., O.M., P.C. (1838–1923), statesman. He became a Positivist under the influence of Cotter Morison at Oxford, but, like him, later preferred Agnosticism. He was called to the Bar, but he had already begun to edit *The Fortnightly Review*, which was then virtually a Rationalist publication, and he deserted law for letters. *On Compromise* (1874) was openly Rationalistic, but he entered politics and became

more reserved. He was Chief Secretary for Ireland 1886 and 1892–5, Secretary of State for India 1905–10, and Lord President of the Council 1910–14. Radicals whispered jokes about his early attacks on compromise, but he still generally held the title of "Honest John Morley," and was a great force for progress and enlightenment. In 1917 he again, in his *Recollections* (1917), gave expression to his Rationalism, and in 1919 he became an Honorary Associate of the R.P.A.

Morris, Gouverneur (1752–1816), American diplomat. A lawyer who took part in the movement for independence and the drafting of the Constitution of New York State. He was Assistant Superintendent of Finance 1781–5, and American Minister to France 1792–4, retiring in disgust at the excesses. Morris detested Paine, and is responsible for much of the libel of him, but he was himself a Deist. Jefferson, a close friend, wrote: "Morris often told me that General Washington believed no more of that system (Christianity) than he himself did" (*Memoir, Correspondence, etc., of Thomas Jefferson*, IV, 512).

Morris, William (1834–96), poet and artist. At Oxford he was a zealous student of theology, and was expected to join the Roman Church. He founded a "brotherhood" for the production of religious art, but they later turned to house-decoration and the production of beautiful books. In 1883 he joined the Socialists and finally abandoned the faith. "It's so unimportant, it seems to me," he said to the poet Allingham (*Diary*, 1907, p. 316). He published *News from Nowhere* (1891) and other Socialist works and became an aggressive Atheist. Belfort Bax, who knew him well, told the present writer that Morris used to recite aloud, with great pleasure, an unpublished scurrilous couplet of Swinburne's on the Trinity. See J. W. Mackail, *Life of William Morris*, 1899.

Mortillet, Louis Laurent Gabriel de (1821–90), French anthropologist. He was expelled from France for taking part in the Revolution of 1848, and settled in Switzerland. He there took up the study of prehistoric man and

came to be recognized as one of the highest authorities on the science. His *Préhistorique* (1882) is a classic, and he founded (with Broca) the School of Anthropology. He was an Atheist, and in 1882 he entered the *Chambre* to join in the struggle against the Church.

Moscheles, Felix (1883–1917), painter. Son of the famous pianist, Ignaz Moscheles, he studied and won a high reputation as a portrait-painter. He was a great friend of Whistler and Du Maurier. Moscheles was an Agnostic (personal knowledge and passages in his *Fragments of an Autobiography*, 1899) and an ardent humanitarian. He was at one time President of the International Arbitration and Peace Association.

Moses. The (orthodox) article in the *Encyclopædia Britannica* ingeniously observes that his historical reality is "rather postulated than proved." The meaning (if any) of the name is unknown. Hastings's *Dictionary of the Bible* says that there is general agreement that it is derived from the Egyptian *mes* (child), but there is no such agreement. The *Encyclopædia Biblica* emphatically rejects the theory. There is, on the other hand, a general agreement that the Hebrews got the story of the baby in the bulrushes from an ancient Sumerian record about the birth of Sargon, whose mother put him in a basket of reeds by the river, where he was found and adopted. The *Encyclopædia Biblica* gives other parallels from Greek, Roman, and Japanese sources. Persistent search in the abundant remains has discovered no evidence that the Hebrews ever were in Egypt, and it is now the more common opinion that they were not a united people before the tribes straggled into Syria. This and the wholly fabulous character of the Moses story do not dispose us to look for even "a kernel of truth" in it.

Mother Goddesses. The reluctance of the Church until the end of the fourth century, when Paganism was being rapidly destroyed, to pay any special honour to Mary [see] was plainly due to the fact that mother goddesses were worshipped on every side. Mithra was exceptional in having had no mother—an improvement on the Christian idea, based upon a hatred

of sex, that Jesus had no father—otherwise, apart from the many fatherhoods of Zeus, all the ancient religions treasured a divine mother and child. The Greeks had Demeter and Persephone (and later Dionysos), the Egyptians Isis and Horus, the Babylonians Ishtar (hailed as a divine mother in some Babylonian hymns), the Alexandrians Kore and her (unnamed) divine son, the Hittites Ma and her derivatives (Cybele and Attis, etc.). The universality of the cult is intelligible. Not only was the mother-and-child motif a most popular feature of a cult, since it brought the gods nearer to men, but behind it all we see clearly the primitive and very general cult of mother-earth and her divine offspring (either the sun or the spirit of vegetation). It was chiefly the masses of densely ignorant monks, who knew nothing about these things, who forced the cult of Mary as mother upon the Church.

Motley, John Lothrop, D.C.L. (1814–77), American historian. He entered Harvard at the age of thirteen, and finished his studies at Göttingen and Berlin Universities. He was trained in law, spent some years in diplomacy, and eventually settled on history. His *History of the Rise of the Dutch Republic* (3 vols., 1886) put him at once in the front rank of historians, and is a classic of historical literature. It was followed by a *History of the United Netherlands* (4 vols., 1860–8). Motley was American Minister at Vienna 1861–7 and at London 1869–70. L. P. Jacks says, in his *Life and Letters of Stopford Brooke* (1917, I, 312), that Motley became a Rationalist under the influence of Brooke and did not believe in personal immortality.

Mozart, Wolfgang Amadeus (1756–91), Austrian composer. Son of a Catholic musician, he began to compose at the age of five, conducted a Mass of his own composition at the age of twelve, and two years later was made a Knight of the Holy Ghost by the Pope for his playing. For many years he was concert-master to the Archbishop of Salzburg, but he was accused of neglect of religion, threw up his appointment, joined the Freemasons, and began the series of compositions

which made him world-famous. The *Catholic Encyclopædia*, in claiming him for the Church, reminds us that his last composition was the Requiem Mass that is still used in Catholic services. He was, on the contrary, like Beethoven and so many other masters of music, a notorious apostate from the Church. Wilder's authoritative biography (*Mozart*, Engl. trans., 1908) tells us how, being hard pressed for money, he composed the Requiem secretly for Count Walsegg, who was to put his own name on it. Wilder quotes a letter of Mozart to his family, in 1778, saying that he believes only in the Grand Architect of the Freemasons (pp. 232-3). Although he refused to do so, his wife sent for a priest when he was dying. The man refused to come, and Mozart was, without Church service, buried in the common grave of the poor (pp. 310-11). The second leading biographer, A. Ulibiche (Mozart's *Leben*, 1847), tells how, referring once to the orthodoxy of his youth, he said: "That is all over and will never come back" (I, 243). Yet Catholic works generally, as well as the *Encyclopædia*, which solemnly promises the public the exact truth, list him as a Catholic.

Muavia (about 610-85), first Syrian Caliph. Encyclopædias and biographical dictionaries which contain thousands of names of men and women of little interest and less significance never devote a line to the Caliph Muavia. He was not only the man who in a single generation raised the Arabs from barbarism to civilization, but he has been described by a Catholic priest and Orientalist, Fr. Lammens, as "the most accomplished type of Arab sovereign" and the man who saved half the world from chaos (articles on Muavia in *Mélanges de la Faculté Orientale* of the Syrian University, 1906, Tom. I, II, and IV). Sir Percy Sykes, one of the highest authorities, calls him "a great figure in the history of the world" (*The Caliph's Last Heritage*, 1915). His parents at Mecca had, although they were one of "the chief families," been such raw Arabs that his mother was notorious for eating the liver of a dead enemy. Yet in twenty years after

becoming Governor of Syria he, under the inspiration of the old Syrian and Persian civilization, created a fine new civilization, and it was a descendant of his who carried this civilization to Spain. Such authorities as Sir P. Sykes and Sir W. Muir fully describe this, yet probably not one in every 10,000 educated readers ever heard of Muavia. The myth of the creation of civilization in Europe by the Church, and the excuses why it took 1,000 years, have to be protected. Muavia, like Theodoric the Goth, and Liutprand the Lombard, but with greater success, did in a generation what the Church is supposed to have taken thirty generations to do; and Muavia, son of Arabs who despised Mohammed as an impostor, was, like most of his best descendants, a sceptic. See Ch. III of McCabe's *Splendour of Moorish Spain* (1935).

Mummy at the Feast, The. The idea usually associated with this expression, that the Egyptians were so religious that they exposed a mummy even to guests at a banquet, to remind them of death and judgment, is not merely wrong, but the reverse of the truth. Life in ancient Egypt [see] was remarkably merry, especially at the dinners of the well-to-do, and it is a discredited legend that the people were exceptionally religious. Further, the Greek historian Herodotus, from whom the story of the mummy is supposed to come, is incorrectly quoted. He says that it was a painted wooden model of a mummy that was drawn round the room, and that what was said to the guests was: "Gaze upon this while you drink, and enjoy yourself, for you will be even as this is." Archæological discovery has fully confirmed this. The "Harper's Song" [see], of which we now have several versions, said in effect that death was the end, so the guests must "eat and drink and be merry." There was widespread scepticism in the best periods of the history of Egypt [see].

Muratori Fragment, The. A list of books of the New Testament found in the Ambrosian Library at Milan and published by Muratori in 1740. In its present form it belongs to the seventh or eighth century, and is mutilated and full

of blunders. It is the first list or "canon" of such books. But as the experts claim at the most that the original goes back to about the year 170, it does not lend any new credibility or weight to the Gospels [see]. We know that they were in circulation by that date.

Murchison, Sir Robert Impey, Bart., K.C.B., D.C.L., LL.D., F.R.S. (1792-1871), geologist. After some service in the Napoleonic war, he had some idea of entering the Church, but devoted himself to geology instead and became one of the most famous geologists of his time. He was knighted and received a large number of international honours for his distinction in science. Sir Archibald Geikie, his biographer (*Life of Sir R. I. Murchison*, 2 vols., 1875), is too orthodox to discuss his Rationalism, but he includes a letter (II, 338) from Murchison's pious colleague Sidgwick in his last days, hoping that God will give him back his Christian faith and hope.

Murray, Prof. George Gilbert Aimé, M.A., LL.D., D.Litt., F.B.A., F.R.S.L., O.M. (b. 1866), Hellenist. Son of Sir T. A. Murray, President of the Legislative Council of New South Wales, and born in Australia, but educated at Oxford. He was professor of Greek at Glasgow University, then until his retirement Regius Professor at Oxford. Dr. Murray is one of the leading masters of Greek literature in Europe, and has made famous translations of many of the Greek classics. He has occasionally contributed to the *Rationalist Annual* and has given the Conway Memorial Lecture (*The Stoic Philosophy*, 1915). His views are expounded in his *Religio Grammatici* (1918), in which he speaks of "the great unknown purpose which the eternal spirit of man seems to be working out upon the earth" (p. 44).

Musset, Louis Charles Alfred de (1810-57), French poet. In his early twenties de Musset was hailed by critics as "the Byron of France," and there was a defiant anti-religious note in his work. A quarrel with George Sand, in 1833, demoralized him for a time, and it was in this mood that he wrote a work of "banal religiosity" (as Professor Lanson calls it in his history of French literature), *Espoir en Dieu*. He had the weakness of character that is often

associated with delicate art. He remained a Theist during the rest of his short life, but rejected immortality and Christianity.

Mysticism. A word derived from the initiates (mystoi) at the Eleusinian Mysteries, not because there was some esoteric wisdom imparted, but because the ceremonies were not to be described to others. What the Greeks called the Mysteries in Egypt were pageants or plays exhibited to immense crowds of people in the open air to illustrate the legend of Isis and Horus. Plutarch describes them, and there was no more secrecy about them than about the Passion Play at Oberammergau. Our very ample modern knowledge of Egypt makes it certain that it never had a secret wisdom on the mysteries of life. In Christian usage the word meant something to be taken on faith ("I believe it because it is impossible," meaning "I take it on authority because I cannot understand it"), but in modern literature it means knowledge acquired by special intuitions or by the direct experiences of certain rare types of minds. The bankruptcy of arguments for the existence of God [see] has driven a large number of Theistic and Christian writers to fall back upon this imaginary source of knowledge. Modern psychology entirely excludes it. The "mystic" is one who surrenders reason to a kaleidoscopic activity of imagination and emotion. Some find this of high emotional value, but most people prefer methods which have some guarantee of putting them into relation with objective realities. The idea that the mystic method is a very superior way of attaining truth is amusing, especially when one reads the "discoveries" which mystics have made in their visions. This sort of brooding is found in some primitive religions (the Eskimo *angakok*, the Siberian *shaman*, etc.), and was very familiar in Brahmanic India, Taoist China, the later Jews, the Neo-Platonists, and the Gnostics.

Mystery Plays. A title often given in modern times to the old English Miracle Plays [see]. It is misleading even when applied to the Egyptian and Greek pageants referred to in the preceding paragraph.

N.

Naden, Constance Caroline Woodhill (1858-89), poet. She learned French, German, Latin, and Greek, and was for some years a follower of Hinton's Pantheistic mysticism. After a serious study of science she, while still calling herself a Pantheist ("The Pantheists' Song of Immortality" in *The Modern Apostle*, 1887), approached nearer to Spencer's Agnosticism. Her scientific essays were more appreciated than her poems. She won the Paxton Prize (1885) for a geological essay and the Heslop Gold Medal (1887) for an essay on *Induction and Deduction*. Miss Naden was widely respected for her high character as well as her attainments and strong intelligence.

Naigeon, Jacques André (1738-1810), French Encyclopædist. One of the younger members of the Encyclopædist group, and editor of the works of Montaigne, Diderot, and Holbach. He described himself as an Atheist, and defined the morality of the Church as an order "to love above all things a god whom we do not know and priests whom we know too well."

Nansen, Prof. Fridtjof, G.C.V.O., D.Sc., D.C.L., Ph.D., F.R.G.S. (1861-1930), Norwegian explorer. Nansen was not only a traveller, but Curator of the Museum of Comparative Anatomy at Christiania University and professor of geology. For a time he was Norwegian Minister in London, then professor of oceanography at Christiania University. He was an Agnostic and a devoted humanitarian worker. In a lecture published by the R.P.A. (*Science and the Purpose of Life*, 1909) he says that "the religion of one age is, as a rule, the literary entertainment of the next."

Nantes, the Edict of. [See *Edict of Nantes, The*.]

Napier, General Sir Charles James, G.C.B. (1782-1853), soldier. He was A.D.C. to General Fox, cousin of C. J. Fox [see], and was converted to Deism by him. Although he is chiefly famous for his share in the Peninsular War and India, he was a skilful and humane administrator of Cephalonia for eight years. "I would rather have finished

the roads in Cephalonia than have fought Austerlitz or Waterloo," he wrote in his private journal (*Life and Opinions of Gen. Sir C. J. Napier*, by Lt.-Gen. Sir W. Napier, 1857, IV, 96). "Jesus of Nazareth! The thing is impossible," we read on another page (I, 386); and of immortality he says: "'Tis an idle waste of thought thus to dwell on what no thought can tell us" (IV, 325). The *Dict. of Nat. Biog.* says that "his life was one long protest against oppression, injustice, and wrongdoing."

Napoleon I, The Religion of. Napoleon's support of the Catholic Church, yet cavalier treatment of the Pope, have, with his occasional expressions on religion, given rise to a good deal of controversy. The *Catholic Encyclopædia* feebly protests that he was "not an unbeliever" and stresses that he in the end asked for the sacraments. It does not quote the language in which he asked for them because it sustains to the end the purely political or utilitarian character of his profession of religion. His restoration of the Church is acknowledged by all to have been a matter of expediency. Lord Rosebery has the best discussion of his opinions in *The Last Phase* (1900, pp. 168-73). While he rejects some of the claims of the very numerous writers on the subject, he proves, from the record of Napoleon's conversations at St. Helena, that he did not believe in the divinity of Christ, a future life, or the spirituality of the mind. It is significant that Rosebery concludes that he was more sceptical in his later years (when he had ample time for reflection). The excuse he gave in asking for clerical ministrations at the end was that "there is so much that one does not know": a shocking sentiment from the Church point of view.

Naquet, Prof. Alfred Joseph (1834-1910), French chemist. He was associate-professor of chemistry at Paris and later at Palermo. In Italy he adopted the Atheism of Garibaldi, and on his return to Paris was sentenced to eighteen months in prison for outspokenness. As soon as he was free he wrote his

drastic work, *Religion, Propriété, Famille* (1869), went back to prison, and lost his civil rights. After the Revolution of 1871 he was a power on the anti-clerical side in the Chambre and later the Senate. See his autobiography, *Alfred Naquet* (1939).

Natural Selection. The agency selected by Darwin as the chief cause of evolution or of the shaping of new species. The expression is figurative, the direct meaning of the theory being that the agencies of nature (conflict, accidents, dearth of food, predatory enemies, disease, etc.) remove the less fit to survive, and thus indirectly preserve the more fit, and these breed the next generation and transmit their advantages. Darwin did not base his theory upon the assumption that favourable variations acquired by the individual during life were transmitted, nor did he deal with social evolution or say that physical conflict or rivalry for food, etc., is necessary for human progress. By the "survival of the fittest" he meant those best (or better) endowed to meet the exigencies of animal life: speed, strength, brain, arms, armour, etc. The theory has no relation to modern social controversy. Natural Selection as he defined it is obviously at work on every acre of the earth to-day. Now that the temporary exaggerations of the Mendelists or Mutationists have been generally withdrawn, the only quarrel is as to the extent of the share of Natural Selection in evolution. Imperfect as science then was, Darwin never said that it was the only cause of advance. [See *Darwinism and Evolution*.]

Naturalism. The opposite of Supernaturalism. As many religious writers now reject the distinction between natural and supernatural, the term is generally applied to systems which explain phenomena by material agencies only and, where the phenomena are still obscure, leave them to the more advanced science of the future. This refers particularly to mental, ethical, and religious phenomena.

Nature Gods. The supernatural agencies imagined by primitive man as at work in nature—the gods of vegetation, fire, storm, water, the sky, etc.—as

distinct from deified ancestors. [See *Religion*.]

Nature, Laws of. Although scientific writers have explained the point thousands of times, religious writers continue to confuse law in the juridical and the scientific sense. Natural objects do not obey "laws," but we call their consistent behaviour (in the same conditions) "laws." In science a law is a generalization from experience of such consistent behaviour that it is safe ground for predicting behaviour. That unconscious objects should "obey laws" is a superficial phrase on a level with Kepler's theory that spirits moved the planets, and the search for a "legislator" is therefore idle. On the claim that the uniformity of behaviour itself implies a creator see *Uniformity*. In science we should look for a special cause only if a material did *not* act uniformly.

Nebular Hypothesis, The. The phrase is specifically applied to Laplace's theory of the origin of the sun and the planets from a nebula. Descartes, building on ancient Greek speculations, and followed by Buffon and Kant, suggested that the heavenly bodies were formed by the concentration of thinly diffused matter. Laplace gave a scientific form to the speculation, and his theory was accepted in astronomy until the latter part of the last century. See Prof. S. Arrhenius, *The Life of the Universe* (1909, I, 102-9). In the second half of the century the theory—that the condensing mass threw off rings which became planets—was critically tested by mathematicians and found defective. A new form of the Nebular Hypothesis was worked out, especially by Jeans (*Problems of Cosmogony and Stellar Dynamics*, 1919), according to which a star passing within a certain distance of our sun drew out a prodigious tidal bulge of white-hot matter, most of which separated from the sun as an immense cloud (nebula) and formed the planets. The distinguished American astronomer, Russell, has found dynamical difficulties in this, and some reject it. The majority of recent expert writers (R. H. Baker, *Astronomy*, 3rd ed., 1938, W. T. Shilling and R. S. Richards, *Astronomy*, 1939, etc.) give the theory as still generally accepted

or modifiable. Science has not reached a final position on the origin of planets. On the other hand, that all the heavenly bodies have been formed by the concentration of thinly and vastly diffused material, and that such material (gaseous nebulae, enormous clouds, etc.) exists in abundance in space, is agreed, so that in its larger and more important sense the Nebular Hypothesis has survived a century of testing and is securely grounded in science.

Necessitarianism. Another word for Determinism [see] or the denial of Free Will.

Negri, Gaetano (1838–1902), Italian historian. He fought with distinction in the war for the liberation of Italy from the Papacy, but he later became one of the Conservative leaders, and a Senator of the new Kingdom. He was one of the most brilliant historical writers in Italy, and is sometimes, through confusion of his political views, quoted as religious. Several of his works (*Giuseppe Garibaldi*, 1883, *George Eliot*, 2 vols., 1891, etc.) show that this is inaccurate, and while he is too lenient to ancient Christianity in his life of Julian (*The Apostate*, 1905), he calls it “an irrational illusion,” and he remained, Villari says in the Preface, “a confirmed Rationalist.”

Negritoes, The religion of the. The name was given by the Spaniards to the aboriginals (“little negroes”) of the Philippine Islands, but the lowest of these, the Aetas, are recognized by anthropologists to be a branch of the most primitive human family that still survives. They are short (on the average about 4 feet 9 inches) of stature, swarthy or dusky in skin, and the lowest humans in culture. It is agreed that the family, which represents very early prehistoric man, developed in Southern Asia or on land that is now below the Indian Ocean, and the higher tribes, as they developed, scattered round the coast. Some remain in the Andaman Islands, Ceylon (the pure Veddahs), or Malaya (the Semang). The Aetas got round to the Philippines, others to Australia (which had then a land-connection), and were pushed by the later blacks to Tasmania, and others to Africa (the Bushmen and the Pyg-

mies). The Yahgans of Tierra del Fuego were at one time associated with them, but are degenerate Amerindians. The Negritoes are of great interest in connection with the origin of religion. Most sociologists and writers on religion who illustrate their themes by examples taken from “savages” throw together peoples of very different grades of culture, which often falsifies the conclusion. To remedy this Prof. L. Hobbhouse (and two colleagues) worked out a scientific classification (*Material Culture and Social Institutions of the Lowest Peoples*, 1915), and this confirms that the Negritoes are the most primitive race of humans now living, and, as they were driven by the more advanced races into isolated positions (islands, the tips of continents, or forests), we get a very early stage of man’s ideas and practices preserved in greater or less purity according to their geographical position and contact with neighbours. The race is dying out. The Tasmanians are extinct; the pure Veddahs nearly extinct. But reliable writers had recorded their ways and ideas in the last century, and they are of great value in studying the evolution of religion and morals. On the latter point we may say with Prof. Haddon: “They do not recognize virtue, but they do not practise vice.” Broadly, they are monogamous and faithful, honest and peaceful, but they have no idea of moral laws. They act on tradition. But their “virtues” are obviously connected with the fact that the social group is very small, consisting of two or three families, and personal property reduced to the minimum. Their life does not give the least support to the fanciful suggestion that in primitive groups—they have no tribes—the old man ruled and monopolized the females until a younger man slew him, but they exactly confirm the naturalist theory of morals. In regard to religion we have to be on our guard against infiltrations from missionaries or traders or accounts of them coloured by religious ideas. The Tasmanians, for instance, believed in a future life, but when they added that they would be white men after death we recognize adulteration. Beyond the fact that (as the chief authorities, J. Bonwick and

H. Ling Roth, tell us) they had no gods or belief in any forces in nature, we cannot trace their original ideas. The Aetas of the Philippines, the best account of whom is in the works of F. Blumentritt and D. C. Worcester, have no gods and only vague ideas, which are not clearly aboriginal, of survival and spirits. The pure Veddahs of Ceylon, thoroughly studied by the Sarasin brothers sixty years ago—Prof. Seligmann does not separate the few wild Veddahs from the very mixed general body—"have either no or a very vague idea of the continued life of the soul." Their idea of ghosts was, in fact, clearly borrowed, and they had nothing like gods or belief in forces in nature. The Semang (W. W. Skeat and P. O. Blagden) have a definite belief in spirits and in two superior invisible beings, but it is recognized that their ideas have been adulterated. The Pygmies (best described by Sir H. Johnston) have "no very clearly marked religion," but are by no means isolated from more advanced peoples. The Andamanese are the least isolated of all—are, in fact, far from isolated—and have clearly borrowed religious ideas. The Bushmen (described by the missionaries Dr. Theal and G. W. Stow) have had for ages contacts with the more advanced Africans, yet "everything connected with their religion was vague and uncertain." The general situation is that, when we set aside what there is definite reason to regard as infiltrations, these best representatives of man as he was at least a quarter of a million years ago have no "gods"—religious writers who claim a universal belief in God are totally ignorant about them—and no belief in *mana* (or an impersonal force pervading nature), but are beginning in some cases to believe that a man's "shadow" survives death. [See Religion, The Origin of.]

Neo-Hegelianism. A philosophic movement, started in England (Stirling, T. H. Green, Prof. Caird, etc.) in the third quarter of the nineteenth century to combat Materialism by reviving, with modification, the system of Hegel [see]. It was adopted, with further modifications, by Croce, Bradley, Bosanquet, and others. In its earlier form it was allied

with a liberal Christianity, but Bradley and Croce were Rationalists. Few philosophers, and no others, now adhere to it.

Neo-Kantism. Another attempt to meet the advance of "materialistic science" in the last century by rehabilitating one of the discredited German systems of philosophy. The subjectivism of Kant's theory of knowledge and the artificiality of his moral theory [see Kant] make it impossible to attain any wide success in an attempt to restore them to-day.

Neo-Platonism. As is explained in the article Plato, the Greek thinker had very few followers in his time, and after his death his school passed into scepticism. Neither he nor Aristotle had much influence in the stirring Greek-Roman world of the next five centuries, although philosophy was still very widely cultivated. In Alexandria, however, the new mysticism of the last two centuries of the old era was blended by a few thinkers (Jamblichus, Plotinus, etc.) with Plato's fundamental ideas, and there was a considerable Neo-Platonist literature. To-day only an occasional eccentric thinker like Dr. Inge finds it important. See T. Whittaker, *The Neo-Platonists* (1901).

Neo-Vitalism. The theory of a Vital Force was generally recognized before the end of the last century to be the substitution of a word for a real cause in the temporary inability of science to explain the processes of life. Prof. J. Ward, a strong anti-Materialist, said, in his *Naturalism and Agnosticism*, that it was already "for the most part abandoned as superfluous" (II, 9). When Lord Kelvin, in 1902, declared in a lecture that it was returning to favour in science, there was a storm of very disdainful protests from scientific men, led by Sir W. T. Thiselton Dyer, Sir J. B. Sanderson, and Sir E. Ray Lankester, in the *Times*. [See Vitalism for later claims of that character.] Sir Oliver Lodge pointed out that the word "Force" was wrongly used in the expression, and what are called, or called themselves, the Neo-Vitalists (Reinke, Driesch, etc.) tried to restore the mystic theory of life without mysticism. There was no Vital Force, but a "directive

energy," and "Entelechy" (as Aristotle had said), and so on. Like all other Neo-isms, it was a verbal compromise, which appealed only to a few isolated thinkers, now mostly dead. Very few biologists or physiologists now hesitate to regard all vital processes as chemico-physical. [See *Life, the Nature of.*]

Nestorians, The. Followers of the Archbishop of Constantinople, Nestorius, of the fifth century. They opposed the new claim that Mary was the mother of God. The cult of so many pagan mother or virgin goddesses had made the Church very reserved as to Mary [see] until paganism was destroyed. The Fathers left her in the position she has in the Gospels: the mother of Jesus, but of no particular consequence. The declaration of the divinity of Jesus against the Arians and the growing cult of Mary forced the issue. The Nestorians, apparently more alive to the absurdity, to which Christians generally are remarkably obtuse, of the idea of a god living as an infant and boy among the workers, fell back upon the theory that Jesus became God only late in life; but their opponents used every element of savagery and corruption in the new Christian body to defeat them. See Gibbon's polite account (Ch. XLVII) of how the august question was settled. The Nestorians were not extinguished. A large number of them flourished in China in the tenth century, and it was mainly from Nestorian monasteries in Syria that the Arabs recovered what was left of Greek philosophy.

Nevinson, Henry W. (1856-1941), journalist. Nevinston was one of the most respected and most idealistic of British journalists. After a visit to Africa, in 1904-5, he kindled a warm indignation against the surviving traffic in slaves, and next year he visited Russia and exposed Tsarism. He was an Agnostic. In his *Essays in Rebellion* (1913) he notices Maeterlinck's speculations on a future life and says that "talk of that kind rests on no sounder basis than the old assertions about the hours and the happy hunting-grounds" (p. 313).

New Physics, The. The expression is applied to the development of the science of physics since the discovery of the

composition of the atom and the application of Relativity. The phrase is very largely based upon error. Jeans and Eddington and some of the mathematicians informed the public that the "classical" or "mechanical" conceptions of nineteenth-century physics were discredited and we had to begin from new foundations. They did not explain how the application of these "false" conceptions in the last century was so remarkably fertile in great achievements (engineering, optics, gas, steam, and electricity). At the bottom of it was the familiar dread of, or desire to discredit, Materialism. The real continuity of the development of physical science is shown in *Atoms, Energy*, and other articles.

New Testament, The. Paul first used the expression to mark off the new phase of religion from the Jewish. The Greek word, translated "Testament," might be better rendered "Covenant" (of God with his people). [See *Acts; Canon; Gospels; Paul; and Revelation* for the points of interest.] The common plea of apologists that the New Testament marks a notable moral and religious advance on the Old is a poor fallacy. The canon of the Old Testament was closed in the third century B.C., so that the Bible gives its reader no idea of the steady moral and religious advance in the Greek-Oriental world between that date and the first century of the Christian era.

New Theology, The. A title devised by Modernists and liberal theologians or apologists to assure the public that the crudities which had alienated them from the Churches were abandoned. The lack of progress, in proportion to the growth of population, of Congregationalism and Unitarianism, which were free from the worst mediæval dogmas, might have warned them of the futility of the new hope. The Churches have continued to decay at just the same pace because (1) the general public disdains new explanations of old formularies which the framers of those formularies would have heatedly denounced; (2) the new theologians insist on a divine indwelling in the Church while virtually acknowledging that it has taught monstrous errors for 1,500 years;

and (3) modern inquiry goes deeper, and concerns itself with the fundamental ideas of God and immortality.

New Thought, The. An American movement, with small and struggling branches in England, which professes to recommend a religion without a Church—thus differing from Christian Science—as well as without a theology. Generally it retains the belief in God and immortality (at least impersonal), but some writers are content to emphasize the importance of “the spiritual” and the power of thought. It is one of a large number of attempts in America to dispute the appeal of Theosophy, Christian Science, etc., to leisured and wealthy but science-shy women. Some writers stress its usefulness in enhancing one's power to acquire wealth. See A. L. Allen, *The Message of New Thought* (1914).

Newcomb, Prof. Simon (1835–1909), American astronomer. Of Canadian birth, he settled in the United States and became professor of mathematics to the U.S. Navy, and later at Johns Hopkins University. He was considered one of the greatest American astronomers of the last century. He had the Gold Medal of the Royal Astronomical Society, the Copley Medal of the Royal Society, the Bruce Medal, and a large number of other national and international honours. He was so well known to be a Rationalist that Richard Proctor quoted him in *Knowledge* (October 1, 1888, p. 281) saying that “it seems difficult to assign any link in the (evolutionary) series at which we can suppose so great a break to have occurred as is implied in the passage from mortality to immortality.”

Newman, Ernest (b. 1868), musical critic. A Liverpool business man and amateur musician in early years who became, in succession, musical critic to the *Manchester Guardian*, the *Birmingham Post*, the *Observer*, and *Sunday Times*. He writes with particular authority on Wagner, and in his *Study of Wagner* (1899) rejects even the sentimental Christianity of the master.

Newman, Prof. Francis William, B.A. (1805–97), writer. Brother of the famous Cardinal Newman—both were sons of a Rationalist London banker.

F. W. Newman diverged widely from his brother at Oxford and refused to sit for the degree of M.A. because he would have to sign the thirty-nine Articles. He was then a Liberal Christian and was appointed professor of classical literature at Manchester New College, Oxford. Developing further, he became a Unitarian and was professor of Latin at University College, London. He remained a Theist, but passed beyond Unitarianism when he discarded belief in a future life (*Mature Thoughts on Christianity*, 1897). A younger brother, Charles Robert, was an Agnostic.

Newnes, Sir George, baronet (1851–1910), publisher. While in business in Manchester he worked out the plan of *Tit Bits* and became a publisher. By 1897 his firm had a capital of £1,000,000. He was noted for his benefactions and was “a reverent and open-minded Agnostic” as regards a future life (Hulda, Friedricha, *Life of Sir G. Newnes*, 1911, p. 302). In other words, he was a Theist, but rejected Christianity and the doctrine of immortality.

Nicolai, Christoph Friedrich (1733–1811), German literary critic. Although Goethe strongly disliked him, Nicolai, both as writer and publisher, was one of the great enlightening forces of Germany in the eighteenth century. He published translations of the English and French Deists, and his novel *Leben und Meinungen des Magisters Sebalduß Rothanker* (3 vols., 1873–6) was a pungent attack on Christianity.

Nicolle, Prof. Charles Jules Henri (b. 1866), French pathologist and Nobel Prize winner. Professor at the Collège de France and then Director of the Pasteur Institute in Tunisia. He received the Nobel Prize for very valuable work on tropical diseases. His Rationalism is found in *La destinée humaine* (1936). He treats very sympathetically the ideas of God and immortality, but confesses that he is an Agnostic.

Niebuhr, Prof. Barthold Georg (1776–1831), German historian. Most of his life was spent in the civil or the diplomatic service, though he occasionally lectured on Roman history at Berlin and Bonn Universities. During twenty years he gathered material for and

wrote the *Roman History* (3 vols., 1811–32) which made him one of the leading historians in Europe and the pride of German scholarship. He knew twenty languages and had an extraordinary range of culture. His English biographer, I. Winkworth (*Life and Letters of B. G. Niebuhr*, 3 vols., 1852), explains that he rejected Christianity, but thought it good for the masses, and would not attack it. "I would not overthrow the dead Church," he said, "but if she fall it will cause me no uneasiness" (I, 345).

Nietzsche, Friedrich Wilhelm (1844–1900), German writer. Son of a Protestant pastor, he applied himself to the study of philosophy and theology and early discarded his creed. He was professor of classical philology at Basle University to 1877, when trouble with his eyes and brain forced him to resign and live in Switzerland and Italy. It is unnecessary to quote his violent attacks on religion, though much of his criticism of Christianity is based upon the false assumption that it introduced charity or mercy into the world. His error gives many an entirely false impression of his personality. He was a man of very refined and temperate character, stirred to anger by the hypocrisy of life and religion. He had the artistic temperament that makes a man disinclined to study science, and was thus led into a morbid pessimism about the mass of men. That he is responsible for the brutal developments in later Germany, the beginnings of which he fiercely denounced, is absurd. His eventual insanity is not foreshadowed in his splendid prose-poetry, but temperament and lack of exact knowledge perverted his judgment in some directions.

Nightingale, Florence, O.M. (1820–1910), reformer. The well-educated daughter of rich parents who chafed at the limitations of woman's activity and devoted herself to hospital work. Her services in the Crimean War are historic, the nation subscribing £50,000 for a Nightingale School for Nurses when it ended. The fact that she was an advanced Rationalist is never mentioned in references to her to-day, and most Christians regard her as a supreme instance of Christian inspiration. She

detested all the Churches. Sir E. Cook, who writes the official biography of her, is, as usual, diplomatic, but acknowledges that, while she was a Theist, she was outside all Churches (*Life of Florence Nightingale*, II, 343). In two articles on religion, in *Fraser's Magazine* (May and July, 1873), and a pamphlet published by the Unitarians (*Florence Nightingale as a Religious Thinker*, 1914), she puts her position plainly. The author of the latter, W. G. Tarrant, candidly quotes her words: "I am so glad that my God is not the God of the High Church or of the Low: that he is not a Romanist or an Anglican—or a Unitarian" (p. 12).

Nobel Prize, Rationalists and the. Alfred B. Nobel (1833–96) was a Swedish chemist who made a large fortune by the invention and manufacture of explosives and left the bulk of it for the foundation of five annual prizes, of a value of about £8,000 each, for the most distinguished workers in science, letters, and the peace movement. The prizes are awarded by the Nobel Foundation after consulting various Swedish Academies and receiving reports from each country. Three prizes are for the most important discovery during the year in physics, chemistry, and physiology or medicine. The fourth prize is for the most distinguished literary work of "an idealist tendency," and the fifth for the best effort to promote international amity and secure the abolition of armaments. These prizes are the highest recognition in the world (since 1900) of scientific, literary, or humanitarian merit, and the awards ought to be of great value in helping us to decide to what extent the world of culture is still Christian or in any sense religious. We must, however, take certain circumstances into account. The judges and their academic advisers are for the most part conventional Christians, and are apt to understand the qualification "of an idealist tendency" in their own way, while, as men of one of the smaller States, they—as the awards show—are apt to strain matters in favour of small nations or to be swayed by broad political considerations. Thus, while the literary prize has been awarded repeatedly to

men and women who are almost unknown outside their own small countries—G. Deledda, Gjellerup, Selma Lagerlof, Pontoppidan, Sigrid Undset, etc.—or to Christian writers of no literary distinction like Eucken, world-figures, mostly of a decided idealist (but Rationalist) tendency, like Wells, Conrad, Zola, D'Annunzio, K. Capek, Galdós, Ibañez, Santayana, Gorki, A. Tolstoi, Sudermann, Upton Sinclair, B. Russell, etc., have been passed over. Further, the award for humanitarian work has occasionally been rather parochial (Archbishop Soderblom) or very questionable (Elihu Root, Theodore Roosevelt, Austen Chamberlain, A. Henderson, Gen. Dawes, or paid officials at Geneva). Of the recipients of the scientific awards, in fine, not one in five has ever declared his views on religion.

It is with these limitations that we have to appraise the significance of the awards, yet the result is a heavy rebuke to the many who still affect to regard Rationalism as the attitude of an unimportant minority. Of the prize-winners whose position in regard to religion is ascertainable, about sixty are included in this work, while fewer than twenty have declared themselves members of any of the Churches of Europe or America, and not more than three out of more than 200 are claimed in the voluminous *Catholic Encyclopædia*! Of about 150 recipients of the scientific prizes, the vast majority have never written or spoken on religion, and we fall back upon Leuba's proof that 70 per cent. of American scientists (including teachers in institutions under sectarian influence) are Atheists or Agnostics, and, of the greater men, 84 per cent. Of the minority of those prize-winners in science whose opinions are ascertainable, a score are declared Rationalists and are described in this work, while only four or five profess to be Christians (and are generally heterodox), and only one (Carrel) is a Catholic. The peace-prize award is, as explained, not so significant. It is often made to politicians or officials whose opinion on religion has no importance. Apart from these we find thirteen Rationalists, three avowed Christians, and ten of unknown attitude. The literary prize is the most

significant, and here, of thirty-seven awards, no fewer than twenty-seven are to avowed Rationalists included in this volume, and for the most part Atheists or Agnostics. In view of the pointed exclusion of the great Rationalist writers of world-repute named above, this is remarkable enough. Its significance is seen to be the greater when we learn that of the five definite Christians, two (Kipling and Mistral) are of very doubtful orthodoxy, one (Eucken) is a theologian of no literary merit, one (Pearl Buck) has had a serious quarrel with her Church, and one (Selma Lagerlof) is a sentimental writer of little more than local repute. If to the great International Rationalist writers (Björnson, A. France, Galsworthy, S. Lewis, Maeterlinck, Mommsen, E. O'Neill, Pirandello, R. Rolland, G. B. Shaw, Tagore, and Yeats) who have received the prize we add the larger number of those who have not, we get a sociological indication (which no sociologist ever considers) of the greatest importance. No matter how much or little weight we attach to the opinions of the authors, we see that, of the reading public in all but backward countries, the great majority follow Rationalist guides. Few Rationalists seem to be aware of the strength of their position, while the strength of the Churches is now in the less educated Fundamentalist masses.

Norton, Prof. Charles Eliot, Litt.D., LL.D., D.C.L., L.H.D. (1827–1908), American historian. Professor of the history of art at Harvard University 1875–98, President of the Archæological Institute, translator of Dante (2 vols., 1891–2), and author of an important *History of Ancient Art* (1891) and other works. Norton was esteemed one of the finest scholars in New England and a man of very great influence in the cultural life of America. Sir L. Stephen, an intimate friend, dedicates his *Essays on Freethinking and Plainspeaking* to him, and says that Norton suggested the title. Stephen's letters to him (*Life and Letters of Leslie Stephen*, 1906, by Prof. Maitland) show that he was an Agnostic and had a great disdain of Christianity (pp. 235, 245, 247, etc.).

Noumena. "Objects of thought" as distinguished from "phenomena," or

realities accessible to sense-perception. The distinction was made by Kant [see], and depends on the discredited claim of intuition.

Nyström, Anton Kristen, Ph.D., M.D. (1842-1915), Swedish writer. He studied at Uppsala, Stockholm, Copenhagen, Berlin, Vienna, Paris, and London, and was a man of very wide attainments. In medical practice at Stockholm he joined the Positivists and formed a

Positivist Society there. But he was at the same time an aggressive Rationalist, a member of the Freethought Federation of Sweden, and one of the best educative forces in the country. He expresses his views freely in his important history of civilization (*Allmän Kultur historia*, 6 vols., 1886-93) and his *Kristendom v. den Friatanken* (1908). See C. E. Farnell, *Anton Nyström* (1891).

O.

O'Brien, James ("Bronterre" O'Brien, 1805-64), Irish orator. The famous Chartist agitator was not, as is often supposed, a poorly educated working man, but a barrister, educated at Trinity College and Gray's Inn and called to the Bar in London. He, at great sacrifice, flung himself into advanced movements and edited, at different periods, Hetherington's unstamped paper, the *Poor Man's Guardian*, the *National Reformer* (which he founded), and the *British Statesman*. In 1840 he was sent to prison for eighteen months, and he was one of the leading orators of the Chartists. He is sometimes described as a Catholic, but he wrote to Robert Owen after his famous rejection of all religion in the London Tavern: "If I mistake not, your ideas and mine are the same, or nearly so, on these subjects" (Podmore's *Robert Owen*, p. 241).

Obscurantism. A term invented in the last century to stigmatize such mediæval revivals as Roman Catholicism, Romanism, etc. It is now applied loosely to any movements that "darken" the intelligence. Like the word "superstition," it is used relatively to the views of the man who employs it.

Occultism. Any system of thought or propaganda which pretends to provide to a select few a wisdom which is "hidden" from the mass. The information is generally said to have been handed down from earlier ages, when gifted men had a marvellous insight into life and its problems. In Theosophy the occult wisdom is said to come from sages of very ancient Thibet—an imposture that could have been attempted

only in the period when the priests truculently excluded visitors and kept their land mysterious. There are few more grossly ignorant bodies of monks than those of Thibet, and they were never more civilized. Others talk of an occult wisdom of very ancient Egypt or India. It is chiefly the existence of a very large body of wealthy, idle, and often neuropathic, women in the United States which enables these charlatans and adventurers to make a successful start.

O'Connor, General Arthur Condorcet, B.A. (1765-1852), Irish soldier. An Irish lawyer and Member of Parliament who had adopted the ideas of the French Deists and republicans and was imprisoned for joining the United Irishmen. In 1803 he took military service in France, married a daughter of Condorcet and became a General. He, in collaboration with Arago [see], edited the works of Condorcet, and seems by this time to have passed beyond Deism. In the dark years after Waterloo he founded and edited a Rationalist paper, *Le Journal de la liberté religieuse*.

Odes of Solomon, The. A collection of hymns which embody the mystic speculations that pervaded the Jewish-Oriental world in the century before Christ. Harnack thinks the extant work, which is known by a Syriac manuscript of the sixteenth century, Jewish with Christian interpolations. Others (L. G. Rylands, *The Beginnings of Gnostic Christianity*, 1940) assign the hymns to a pre-Christian Gnosticism.

Oersted, Prof. Hans Christian (1777-1851), Danish physicist. After wandering from one European university to another, to hear the most emi-

nent physicists and chemists, he was professor at Copenhagen University. He discovered electro-magnetism, and brought such honour upon his country by his distinction in science that the Danes built a fine house for him and erected a statue to him at Copenhagen. He had the Gold Medal of the French Academy of Science, and many other international honours. The great physicist was a Pantheist, like Goethe (*Aanden i Naturen*, 2 vols., 1849-50).

O'Higgins, General Bernardo (1776-1842), Irish-Chilean soldier. He was a natural son of the Marquis O'Higgins, an Irish Catholic who had settled in South America and become Governor of Chile. Under the influence of Miranda [see] he adopted Rationalist and republican views, and became a general in the army of liberation. At the close of the war he was Dictator of Chile and a beneficent and progressive, as well as anti-clerical, ruler; but he quietly yielded to the demand for a Constitution, and retired.

Oken, Prof. Lorenz, M.D., Ph.D. (1779-1851), German natural philosopher. Son of a peasant—his real name was Ockenfuss—he earned his living while at the university, and then became professor of medicine at Jena. He was required to suppress a Rationalist periodical which he had founded, and he resigned and continued to work for enlightenment in the years of reaction. Later he was professor of natural history at Munich and Zürich Universities, and was one of the great pioneers of evolution in Germany and author of very important works. He shared the philosophical Pantheism of Schelling [see].

Old Catholics, The. When the Vatican Council of 1870 defined the infallibility of the Pope, after months of struggle, Dr. Döllinger, the leading scholar of the German Catholic Church, and other professors of Munich University, broke away and some founded the separate body of the Old Catholics. They held that it was the Papalists, or New Catholics, who were disloyal to the Church. They were excommunicated, but still numbered 130,000 at the end of the century, and had branches in America and England.

Old Testament, The. A name for the collection of Jewish sacred books which came into use when Paul used the phrase "New Testament" [see]. There are few more striking illustrations of the soporific effect upon the intellect of religious organization than the acceptance of this as inspired (in the strict sense) by nearly all scholars in Christendom until the appearance of Deism, and by large numbers of refined or well-educated men and women until recent times. "In the Old Testament," says Bishop Barnes, "are found folk-lore, defective history, half-savage morality, and obsolete forms of worship, based upon primitive and erroneous ideas of the nature of God" (*Should Such a Faith Offend*, p. 74). The detached observer must use even less polite language, and the excuses which are made for still investing it with a unique prestige and imposing it upon children in our national schools are so poor as to seem insincere. It is not a "unique account of the growth of a religion," but an almost unique falsification of such growth. Divines prefer to say that the literature which the Hebrews had at the time of the Babylonian Captivity was, at the close of that period, "redacted" by writers of the sacerdotal class. Since the aim of these writers was to establish solidly the cult of Jahveh and the power of his priests by imposing upon the people an untrue version of their early history and that of the cult and priesthood, the word "redacted" itself verges upon untruthfulness. It is now the general opinion of experts that the Hebrews had no Jahveh before the fourteenth century B.C., and that everything in their history is uncertain for five centuries afterwards. There is not much more sincerity in the excuse that the Old Testament is "great literature." The overwhelmingly greater part of the work is literature only in the sense that it is written composition, and the poetical passages in some of the prophets and psalms are largely unfit for children, and owe a good deal of their beauty to the fact that they were translated in an age of poetry and vivid imagination. The various writings do not in any age reach the best level, intellectually or morally, of contem-

porary civilizations, and, on account of the closing of the canon in the third century, they do not even show how the Dispersal lifted a large number of the Jews to those levels, so that they conceal a very important section of the growth of Hebrew religion.

The chief sections and features of the work are discussed in a score of subsidiary articles. In criticizing it one has to remember that the great majority of Jews and Christians, or at least four-fifths of the readers of the Bible, are entirely ignorant of the Ezraist revision [see] and forgeries, and take it to be in some sense "the Word of God" and incapable of serious error. Better-educated or more liberal Christians complain that Rationalists are out-of-date when they criticize the Old Testament on the lines of Paine or Ingersoll. One might justly retort, since most of the work of Biblical criticism has been performed by clerics, that the Rationalist is merely attempting to bring up the immense half-educated majority of Church-members to the level of enlightenment of the Modernist and of most (perhaps) of the Congregationalists—a very small body. It is a fact of primary importance that it is the official teaching of the Church of Rome, accepted by all Catholics but a very slender minority (who dare not express their views), and of the Methodist and other Churches, and the belief of the majority even in the Baptist and Anglican Churches, that criticism has not substantially affected the traditional conception of the Old Testament; and the concern of the more liberal that we should concentrate on *their* position is mainly due to a consciousness that people are most apt to leave the Churches when their eyes are opened. An examination of the British Museum five-yearly Subject Catalogues, or lists of books about the Bible or the Old Testament or the several parts thereof, will show that at least four books out of five published in this country, and these have generally the larger circulation, run on the old lines and claim that the Higher Criticism is entirely false. American books are represented in these lists mainly by the more scholarly works, and the result is as misleading as

the experience of the Rationalist who meets only educated members of Churches or reads only books they read. The situation in the United States and Canada is worse than in Great Britain. Works on the Old Testament of the crassest Fundamentalist type sell by the million. The Press is compelled to accommodate itself to this aggressive majority. A daily with almost the largest circulation of any London paper published a series of articles of the crudest character on "heroines of the Old Testament"; few papers fail to support topical news from the Near East with notes that imply the soundness of the Fundamentalist idea of the Old Testament. Against all this the output of Rationalist books on the Old Testament is infinitesimal, and the three or four that have been published in a quarter of a century have had no influence.

When we set aside the artificial pretexts of Jews and Christians who accept the modern critical view of the Old Testament—the claims that it is a unique literature or contains a superior moral or religious literature, by which they alleviate their surrender of the old view—their position does not invite criticism, and their plea that Rationalism ought to concern itself with them instead of "flogging a dead horse" (the very live and aggressive four-fifths of the members of the Churches) is foolish. They agree that the stories of the first few chapters of *Genesis* [see] are, directly or indirectly, of Babylonian origin, and that the narrative, to the end of the Hexateuch, is fabulous or is confirmed by independent testimony only on a few points which have no importance. They agree that the so-called "historical books" (*Judges*, *Samuel*, *Kings*, and *Chronicles*) which follow are so full of anachronism, contradictions, and absurdities, that we cannot to-day say what documents or traditions the Ezraist "redactors" had before them and what was their value. They agree that the prophets did not prophesy, that the earlier prophets have a "half-savage morality," and that the later evince a contact with civilization; and they recognize the very different values and dates of "the Wisdom Books."

Except that they are rarely candid about the intensely phallic and polytheistic cults of the Hebrews before the Captivity, and are still too prone, in spite of the overwhelming evidence, to claim superiority to contemporary culture, the Rationalist, whom they like to represent as "extreme" or "outdated," does not substantially differ from them. His aim is to instruct the majority, duped by their cheap literature, in this sound view of the Old Testament; nor will any Rationalist of experience take any notice of the quite untruthful plea that it disturbs or saddens these folk to be disillusioned. Scores of works for this purpose are recommended in various articles of this Encyclopædia [see *Archæology*; *Babel*; *Babylonian Captivity*; *Bible*; *Canon*; *Chaldeans*; *Creation*; *Daniel*; *David*; *Decalogue*; *Deluge*; *Deuteronomy*; *Dispersal*; *Ecclesiastes*; *Eden*; *Elohist*; *Ezra*; *Fall*; *Genesis*; *Gilgamesh*; *Golden Age*; *Hammurabi*; *Hebrews*; *Hymns*; *Isaiah*; *Jahveh*; *Jews*; *Joshua*; *Justice*; *Messiah*; *Monotheism*; *Moses*; *Priestly Code*; *Prophets*; *Song of Solomon*], but these works are hardly suitable for people of little leisure or education. A few plain but substantial small manuals—on the borrowed stories of *Genesis*, the fabulous narrative from Abraham to Joshua, the true early history of the Hebrews as now suggested by Jewish scholars, the Ezraist forgery, and the contemporary moral and intellectual level in each age as compared with the Hebrew—would be of considerable educational value.

O'Neill, Eugene Gladstone, Litt.D. (b. 1888), American playwright and Nobel Prize winner. He was educated at Princeton and Harvard. From journalism and acting he passed to writing plays, and is to-day the most distinguished dramatist in America. He won the Pulitzer Prize (1920), the Gold Medal of the National Institute of Arts and Letters (1922), and the Nobel Prize (1926). He was brought up a Catholic, and, though he discarded that and all other creeds, like Aldous Huxley and other literary men he distrusts the science which purports to replace religion. In his *Dynamo* (1929) he portrays the defects of an age which

has witnessed "the death of an old God and the failure of science and materialism" and is disturbed by "the surviving primitive religious instinct to find a meaning of life" (B. H. Clark, *Eugene O'Neill*, 1933). The artist's lack of exact thinking and knowledge reveals itself in the idea of a "primitive religious instinct" and in making the dynamo a symbol of a science which is not confined to engineering, but reaches as far as ethics and social psychology.

Oppert, Prof. Julius, Ph.D. (1825-05), French-Jewish Orientalist. After brilliant studies of Hebrew, Arabic, Sanscrit and Zend at four German universities, he settled in France, seeing that there was no career for a Jew in Germany. His learned articles attracted Government notice, and he was sent on an expedition to Mesopotamia, where he shared with Rawlinson (another Rationalist) the honour of having found the key to the cuneiform characters. He was appointed professor of Sanscrit, later of Assyrian philology and archaeology, at Paris University. He abandoned the Jewish faith in his youth, and never adopted any other.

Ordeal, The. An attempt to locate and punish guilt by exposing the suspect to extraordinary physical tests: carrying or walking on white-hot iron, plunging the arms in boiling water or oil, poison, submersion, combat, etc. It is, or was, practically universal among savage and barbaric peoples, and the Teutonic nations maintained it when they entered civilization, with the full consecration of the Church. The priests, who called it "the Judgment of God," blessed the tanks, etc., and assisted at the experiment after Mass. Torture was generally superseded in England, after the Conquest, by the "ordeal by combat," but the procedure was little less crude and cruel. Unjust abbots and bishops who stole land had companies of professional swordsmen to prove their innocence. Common folk fought, generally before the church, savage contests with cudgels, and women often fought. Sometimes the man was put in a pit in the ground, while the woman, with a heavy stone in the sleeve of her smock, danced round him. Hallam rightly calls the ordeal a "monstrous birth of

ferocity and superstition." The stupid barbarism did not, as many suppose, die out when lay lawyers and courts appeared, though it was generally abolished. We find the Rationalist humanists protesting against it to the time of Voltaire and Beccaria. The Hammurabi Code, 2,000 years before Christ, limits it to two cases—witchcraft and adultery.

Orense, José María, Marquis d'Albaida (1800–80), Spanish statesman. A soldier of noble family who took part in the struggle against Church and despotism and was expelled several times. After the Revolution of 1868 he returned, and was President of the Cortes. He was for many years the leader of the anti-clericals, and was heavily denounced by the Church.

Original Sin. The doctrine that all human beings—Catholics make an exception of Mary—inherited the guilt of Adam and were under pain of hell for it unless relieved by baptism. The two ideas—inherited guilt and eternal punishment—give an ironic complexion to the claim that the new religion was superior to the moral philosophies and better creeds of the Greek–Roman world. The most amazing feature is that the dogma is based ultimately upon a sentence, the meaning of which theologians now dispute, of the childish story of the Fall in *Genesis*. Jewish apocryphal literature shows that their teachers were emphasizing this inherited guilt just when the general moral culture of the ancient world was rising, and the idea appears in all its starkness in Paul. The modern plea that Paul merely meant that human nature was corrupted by "Adam's sin" is belied by his frequent association of it with the idea of the redeeming death of Jesus. Most of the Fathers evaded the issue, but the sombre Tertullian, and Augustine in his degenerate years, fastened it upon the Western Church. The Schoolmen provided the usual proof that it was entirely just and reasonable, but the Reformers, as one perceives in the language of the Thirty-nine Articles, were uneasy about it. Bishop Barnes calls it "horrible" (*Should Such a Faith Offend*, p. 30), and Bishop Masterman says: "We no longer believe in inherited

guilt" (*The Christianity of Tomorrow*, 1929, p. 52). The Roman Church still insists on it as a dogma or an article of faith binding in conscience upon every Catholic, and it is the reason why babies are rushed to church for baptism as soon as possible after birth.

Osiris. In ancient Egyptian mythology he was, like Set and Isis, the offspring of Keb, the god of earth, and Nut, the sky-goddess. Except that the sexes are crossed, we have here an instance of the customary mating of old deities when political fusion necessitates an adjustment of priesthoods. Later developments caused them to marry Osiris to his sister Isis, make Horus their son, and have him slain by the wicked Set. Plutarch has a long essay describing the ridiculous legends. Frazer (*Adonis, Attis, Osiris*, 1906) shows that Osiris was originally the corn-spirit (analogous to Dionysos and Tammuz), which explains how he came to be the lord of the underworld and judge of the dead. His cult was still very mixed in the last ages of Egypt. In the villages the women used, on his great festival, to cart about a grossly phallic statue, and the official legend, depicted by the priests in tableaux, was in some respects very phallic. We know now, however, that Egypt [see] was not at all so grimly religious and sober as was formerly supposed.

Osler, Sir William, Baronet, M.D., D.Sc., LL.D., D.C.L., F.R.S., F.R.C.P. (1849–1919), physician. A Canadian by birth and education, he was professor of the institutes of medicine at McGill University 1874–84, of clinical medicine at Pennsylvania University 1884–9, of medicine at Johns Hopkins University 1889–1904, and Regius Professor at Oxford. Besides the many national and international honours bestowed for his great work in science, he was President of the Bibliographical Society and of the Classical Association. His high humanitarian and ethical ideals are shown in such works as his *Counsels and Ideals* (1905) and *Michael Servetus* (1909), but his Rationalism is best seen in his Ingersoll Lecture, *Science and Immortality* (1905). It is a fine Agnostic statement of the evidence of science against the belief. He adds: "It may

be questioned whether more comfort or sorrow has come to the race since man peopled the unseen world with spirits to bless and demons to damn him" (p. 52).

Ossietsky, Carl von (1867-1938), Nobel Prize winner. Son of a Hamburg merchant, he, especially after serving in the 1914-18 war, sternly attacked militarism, and in 1933 was, as a pacifist and humanitarian, cruelly treated in a concentration camp. He had been brought up a Catholic, but quitted the Church (A. Williams-Ellis, *What was his Crime?*, 1937, p. 40).

Ostwald, Prof. Wilhelm, M.D., Sc.D., LL.D. (1853-1932), German chemist. He was professor of physical chemistry at Leipzig University, and one of the most distinguished authorities in Europe on that branch of chemistry. He had honorary degrees and diplomas from a large number of British, American, and foreign universities, and was a Privy Councillor. In 1906 he retired from teaching and joined Haeckel in promoting the Monist League, the most powerful Rationalist body in the world. He published three volumes of *Monistic Sunday Sermons* (1911), and paid a glowing tribute to Haeckel in *Was Wir Ernst Haeckel Verdanken* (I, 195-200). Long before the "New Physics" was developed, Ostwald insisted that energy is the fundamental reality (*Die Energie*, 1908).

Ottoman Renaissance, The. [See *Rule of the Whores.*]

"Ouida." [See *Ramée, M. L. de la.*]

Owen, Robert (1771-1858), reformer. Of a Welsh family of moderate means, he began to work in a shop and teach children at the age of nine, and by the age of forty he was a rich manufacturer and known all over Europe as a practical reformer. Taking over a large and, as was then usual, illiterate and foul-living industrial community at New Lanark, he converted it, in less than twenty years, into a model community which drew pilgrims even from Russia. On the principle, which he developed in youth, that "man's character is made for him and not by him"—a principle which social psychology now regards as fundamental—and that "all the religions of the world are false," he

spent large sums on fine schools and social services. When other manufacturers refused to follow, in spite of the immense profits he made, he appealed to the Government, and for a time had statesmen and members of the Royal family among his public supporters. Religious opponents ruined this by drawing from him a public declaration of Atheism. He then appealed to the people, and founded a movement which was known as Socialism (not State Socialism), and later an ethical movement which he called Rational Religion. The latter alone had 100,000 members, and in the trade unions he had influence over more than a million; though he had no skill either in speaking or writing. There was not a reform of the time (peace, trade unions, Feminism, prisons, education, marriage, etc.) that was not included in his ideal, and he spent hundreds of thousands of pounds on it, and impoverished himself. He occasionally used the word "God," but said: "When we use the term Lord, God, or Deity we use a term without annexing to it any definite idea" (*Debate on the Evidences of Christianity*, 1829, p. 104). In his last feeble years he was duped by a Spiritualist medium. Podmore's *Robert Owen* (1906) lacks appreciation of the fact that Owen was the greatest reformer of his age. See also McCabe's short biography (*Robert Owen*, 1920).

Oxford Movement, The. The name originally belonged to a movement, from 1833 onward, for the reform of the Church of England, led by distinguished divines like Pusey and Newman. The modern movement, which, to the disgust of the University, arrogates the title of Oxford Movement, compares with it as a musical comedy compares with an oratorio. It blends snobbishness, love of excitement, unconventionalism, and intellectual sloppiness, with a loose sort of organization. It boasts of instances of lives changed for the better by emotional explosions, and is accused of very different occurrences at the other extreme. Conditions in America, to which it properly belongs, give rise periodically to similar adventurous enterprises.

P.

Paganini, Niccolò (1782—1840), Italian violinist and composer. He composed a sonata at the age of eight, and made his first public appearance at the age of eleven. In the early part of the nineteenth century he was regarded as the greatest violinist who had yet appeared, and his name is still one of the most honoured in musical literature. In Italy, where his opinions about religion were known, he was said to be an Atheist in league with the devil. His Catholic biographer, Count Conestabili, grudgingly admits his "religious indifference" (*Vita di Niccolò Paganini*, 1851, p. 186), and describes how he had neither the ministrations of a priest before death, nor a Catholic burial.

Paganism and Christianity. In a note at the end of Ch. XXI of the *Decline and Fall*, Gibbon traces, with his customary accuracy and learning, the origin and use of the word "pagan." The idea which is now common in literature, that the worshippers of the old gods began to be called pagans when the cult was banished from the cities and had taken refuge in the villages (*pagi*), is inaccurate. The imperial rescripts against the old religion speak of its votaries as pagans about the year 365, when they were still the great majority in the Roman cities; and the word itself, in the sense of "villagers," goes back at least to the first century. Tacitus and Juvenal indicate that in their time it began to be applied to those—generally the rustics—who were not called up for military service and did not take the military oath (*sacramentum*). Since the Christians deemed themselves the soldiers of Christ and borrowed the word "sacrament," they called those who did not take *their* oath "pagans." So Tertullian, *De Corona Militis*, X. The old religion, it is true, lingered longest in the villages; but in the fourth century, when the word "pagans" was commonly used as it now is, the cities were still strong for the Greek and Roman gods. Chrysostom says, in a sermon in 385, that the Christians are only one-fifth of the people of Antioch, and there is ample evidence

that it was the same at Rome. Augustine's greatest work, *The City of God*, was written (after 410) against the pagans, who were, his letters show, the best-educated men of the African cities. This misrepresentation is, however, trivial in comparison with the claim or general belief that the early Christians were an aloof and ascetic body who brought light and virtue into the pagan, or Greek-Roman, world. The letters of Paul to the Corinthians warn us that from the start not all the little communities were oases of virtue in wicked cities, but, except that the fury of the struggles against Jews and Gnostics cannot have edified the pagans, there was doubtless a general maintenance of the primitive severity and simplicity of cult and doctrine. After the middle of the second century these virtues shrank as the Christian body grew. Almost every outstanding Christian writer or preacher from Hippolytus (of Rome, about 220) to Salvianus (in the second half of the fifth century) describes the *majority* as vicious in all parts of the Empire. At the critical period, when the bishops were trying to enforce the new religion by imperial law—the second half of the fourth century—the Roman Church presented [see **Damasus**] a spectacle which astounded the pagans, and it was comprehensively degraded [see **Jerome**]. Chrysostom and Gregory of Nyssa in the East, and Augustine in Africa, are equally unflattering. On the other hand, modern historical experts on Rome, even Protestants like Sir Samuel Dill and Dr. E. Reich, show that the melodramatic idea of pagan vice is as false as the picture of Christian virtue. This has been shown in many articles [**Divorce**; **Juvenal**; **Marriage**; **Philanthropy**; **Rome**; etc.], in which the literature is indicated. Yet we still read in apologists the wildest claims for their Church. In a work issued by an American Catholic organization which boasts of the patronage of Dr. N. Murray Butler (rector of Columbia University) and six other non-Catholic professors, the public are told that "no student worthy

of the name who peruses the story of the world can but be impressed with the fact that it was organized Christianity, the Catholic Church, that laid the foundation for all present-day civilization" (*The Calvert Handbook of Catholic Facts*, 1928, p. 17, a book which circulates by the hundred thousand in America). Such statements are based, if they have any basis at all in the minds of the writers, on long-discredited claims that the Church destroyed slavery, provided schools, taught the Roman world charity and justice, etc., and on the equally discredited melodramatic antithesis of Christian virtue and pagan vice. The non-Catholic "appeasers" of our time would find, on inquiry, that the myth of general Christian virtue is based upon a few exceptional characters and to a very great extent upon stories of saints and martyrs [see] which even Catholic experts now repudiate; and that all modern experts on Roman character refute the charges against it, particularly in the fourth century, when it was brought into full contrast with the Christian character. [See **Rome, Morals in Ancient.**]

That the pagans were not attracted to the Church by either the high character of the Christians or their doctrines is established in every work on the transition from the old religion to the new. It was accomplished by force. Gibbon is here guilty of one of those inconsistencies which we easily understand in a work written in an age of truculent intolerance and imperfect knowledge. In the famous fifteenth chapter, on the progress of the Christian religion, he not only greatly exaggerates the progress made before Constantine, but ascribes a large share of this to Christian virtue and the new hope of immortality (which Christianity had in common with Mithraism, Manichæism, Isisism, and Platonism). But in Ch. XXVIII, on the destruction of paganism, he shows how it took many decades of violence and persecution to win the triumph of the Church. As the persecuting decrees are still found in the Theodosian Code, there was never any obscurity on this point, and special writers on the fall of paganism, Christian

and non-Christian, have always described the decrees and the stubborn resistance of the pagans. Count Beugnot (a Catholic) gives them in the first large work on the subject, *Histoire de la destruction du paganisme* (2 vols., 1835), and Prof. V. Schultze (a Protestant) in the second, *Geschichte des Untergangs des griechisch-römischen Heidenthums* (2 vols., 1892); and the story is retold, with ampler knowledge, in G. Boissier's *Fin du paganisme* (2 vols., 1891), Tzscherner's *Fall des Heidenthums* (1829), and Ferrero's *Ruin of Ancient Civilization* (Engl. trans., 1921). As soon as Constantine was dead the bishops produced a decree, ostensibly signed by that Emperor (who, in their interest, had at first been induced to pass a decree of religious liberty), imposing "condign punishment" on all who sacrifice to the gods. This is acknowledged to be a Christian forgery, but it became law and opened the era of persecution. It is enough here to state that it was renewed, sometimes with express indication of the death-sentence, in 345, 350, 381, 383, 386, and 391. The repetition during nearly half a century proves the reluctance of the pagans to enter the Church, and, although in the East the temples were in large part destroyed, and the revenues were everywhere confiscated, the old religion was still strong when Rome fell (410) and the disorganization of the Empire began.

The extinction of paganism, to which the great majority of the educated Romans clung until that time, since the conduct of the new Emperors generally was as repugnant to them as that of the body of Christians, was facilitated by the paganization of Christianity. The simple supper in memory of Christ, with "overseers" (bishops) of each community and "servers" or assistants (deacons) at the meetings, was, we learn from the Letter of the Romans to the Corinthians [see], preserved until the second century. In the second century doctrine and cult became more elaborate. At Rome this was deliberately effected by Pope Callistus [see], who, in the second decade of the third century, set up the first chapel (a room above an old wine-shop), hardened the line between clergy and laity (or marked off

the sanctuary as a sacred arena), and threw membership open to people of looser character. In the course of the third century the Mass was fully developed and the sacred character of the priests emphasized. Constantine [see] plundered the temples and gave their silver altars and gold vessels to the Church, but it was not until the closing of the pagan temples, between 380 and 390, that the larger borrowing was effected. Lustral (holy) water had been a feature of many religions. The Mithraic temples had had darkened buildings, a blaze of lamps and candles, incense, and some sort of floral decoration. The temples of Isis had statues of the divine mother and child, priests in linen and silk robes with shaven polls, candles, incense, altars, etc. The cult of Cybele had another divine mother (Queen of Heaven) and son, hymns to her, statues, and a "Holy Week." All of them had a handsome young god who was in some sense the Saviour of men. Even the Roman national cult contributed its midwinter festival of the "Birth of the Unconquered Sun," the title of Sovereign Pontiff (Pontifex Maximus), and the attributes of various goddesses for the new cult of Mary. See articles on each. It would be ingenuous to question the borrowing when, as we have seen in subsidiary articles, the Church gets its Holy Week and Birthday of Christ celebrations, its paraphernalia of worship, its cult of Mary and of saints (minor gods), and so many other new features just when similar festivals and paraphernalia had to be abandoned by suppressed rivals. The pagans now found the new religion more attractive; and it must not be forgotten that just at this period the school-system foundered, and the Romans, who had been literate to the extent of at least 90 per cent., became at least 90 per cent. illiterate. There is no substantial Rationalist book on the transformation. J. A. Farrar's *Paganism and Christianity* (1891) is still useful, and H. Cutner's *Pagan Elements in Christianity* (1939) contains much interesting material. Standard works are G. Boissier, *La religion romaine* (2 vols., 1874), A. Loisy, *Les mystères païens et le mystère chrétien* (2 vols., 1930), and

F. Cumont, *Les religions orientales dans le paganisme romain* (4th ed., 1929). A. Baudrillart's *Mœurs païennes, mœurs chrétiennes* (2 vols., 1929) is Catholic, but scholarly and fairly liberal; as is also Mgr. Duchesne's *Early History of the Christian Church* (Engl. trans., 3 vols., 1904-29—the fourth French volume was too strong for English Catholic consumption). The best book on the Protestant side is T. R. Glover's temperate *Influence of Christianity in the Ancient World* (1932).

Pagano, Prof. Francesco Mario (1748-1800), Italian jurist. He was professor of criminal law at Naples University, and he co-operated with Filangieri in disseminating the ideas of the French philosophers and creating the Liberalism which the Church later brutally destroyed in Naples. Chiefly he pressed the legal reforms of Beccaria [see], and he was fiercely accused of "impiety and atheism" by the priests. He was a Deist. He was imprisoned and then exiled until the Revolution of 1799, when he became a member of the Provisional Government. When the royalist-clericals, with the aid of Nelson, defeated it, Pagano and many others, after receiving a guarantee of safety from the King's representative and head of the Church, Cardinal Ruffo, were executed. Nelson, an appalling reactionary, kept the head of one of them and gloated over it.

Paget, Violet (1856-1936), writer. A friend of A. W. Benn—both lived at Florence—who, under the name of "Vernon Lee," wrote a series of valuable works on mediæval history (*Studies of the Eighteenth Century in Italy*, 1880, etc.). She was an Agnostic, and very aggressive in her *Vital Lies: Studies of Some Varieties of Recent Obscurantism* (2 vols., 1912).

Paine, Thomas (1737-1809). Of a Norfolkshire Quaker family, he learned his father's trade of stay-making, but wandered into a wider world and spent some years as a teacher, and more as an exciseman. He went to America in 1774 and worked under Franklin. Two years later he wrote his *Common Sense*, an insurrectionary appeal that sold 120,000 copies in three months and fired the colonies. Congress and the

State of New York later recognized his services by a grant, but he went back to London to sell his invention of an iron bridge, and his *Rights of Man* (1791-2), a defence of the French Revolution, against Burke, brought a sentence of outlawry, and he fled to Paris. He could not speak French, and, as he protested against the violence of the Terror, he was imprisoned. He completed his *Deistic Age of Reason* (1793-4) in jail. He was no scholar, but his vigorous intelligence and forcible style gave this criticism of the Bible and Christianity an immense value that is not yet exhausted. Returning to the United States in 1802, he found that his attack on Christianity had ruined him. The revolutionary leaders affected to have forgotten him, and his last years were unhappy. Dr. M. D. Conway, in his thorough *Life of Thomas Paine* (2 vols., 1892), entirely clears him of the charges against his character, and shows that the story of his death-bed ravings is false. Conway also published a complete edition of his works. His bones were brought to England by Cobbett, in 1819, but disappeared.

Painlevé, Prof. Paul (1863-1933), French mathematician. He was professor of general mathematics at Paris University, and one of the leading mathematicians in Europe. Few Frenchmen of his time had so many national and international honours. Like nearly all the great French mathematicians since D'Alembert, he was an advanced Rationalist, whereas in England distinction in mathematics is apt to be allied with obscurantism.

Paleyism. A term often applied to elaborate manipulations of the Design Argument [see]. Canon Paley had a considerable knowledge of the biology of his time, the period when science was just learning the remarkable contrivances of animal and plant life, and the evolutionary explanation still lay below the horizon. His triumphant demonstration that these proved the existence of God (*Natural Theology, or Evidences of the Existence and Attributes of the Deity Collected from the Appearances of Nature* (1802)) was long regarded as the chief manual of Theism. Modern writers observe that he was "nowhere origi-

nal and nowhere profound" (*Ency. Brit.*).

Palmen, Baron Ernst, Ph.D. (1849-1919), Finnish historian. He was professor of history at Helsingfors University and was decorated for his eminence in scholarship and his zeal for the education of the people. He was a Monist (Atheist) and strong supporter of Haeckel, whom he hails as a second Prometheus, "like every bringer of truth and light" (*Was Wir Ernst Haeckel Verdanken*, II, 314).

Palmer, Courtlandt (1843-1888), American writer. He abandoned Christianity in his youth, and, inheriting considerable wealth, he used it generously to promote Rationalism. He founded the Nineteenth-Century Club, in New York, mainly for the free discussion of religion, and attracted crowds of what the Americans call "socialites" of both sexes. The *New York Sun* said, in its obituary notice of him, that he had "accomplished a surprising feat in making fashionable in New York a sort of discussion which before had been pounced upon as in the last degree pernicious." Palmer's sister married Prof. Draper, and he was intimate with the scientist and with Ingersoll. He frequently contributed to the *Truthseeker* and the *Freethinker's Magazine*.

Palmerston, Henry John, third Viscount (1784-1865), statesman. He entered Parliament in 1807, and was at once appointed Lord of the Admiralty. He was Minister for Foreign Affairs 1830-41 and 1846-51, Home Secretary 1853-55, and Prime Minister 1855-58 and 1859-65. Talleyrand said that he was the only statesman in England, and he was certainly one of the ablest and most respected in Europe. He had open sympathy with efforts to help the oppressed Greeks, Hungarians, Spaniards, and Italians and, in spite of questions in the House, allowed Holyoake to enlist the Garibaldi Legion in Fleet Street. He never wrote or spoke about religion, and his biographers do not mention it, but Morley, in his *Life of Gladstone*, with whom he must have discussed the point, endorses the tradition of the political world that he was a Rationalist. "The Church in

all its denominations was on terms of cool and reciprocated indifference with one who was above all else the man of the world " (I, 543). He seems to have been an Agnostic.

Pangenesiis. A theory which was vaguely sketched by Buffon and was definitely put forward by Darwin in 1867. It is that all the cells of an organism throw off gemmules which concentrate in the organs of generation, multiply by fission, and when the proper conditions arrive, reproduce the cells and the organism. Fertilization is the blending of the gemmules from male and female, and the activity may remain dormant for one or two generations and then reproduce features of a grandparent or earlier ancestor (atavism).

Panpsychism. Any theory which assumes that mind or a psychic element pervades the whole of nature; like the *Nous* of Anaxagoras and the Stoics, in ancient days, though these insisted that mind is material. Pantheism fairly comes under the description, but it is especially applied to eccentric theories like that of Fechner. Clifford's "mind-stuff" (which was material) does not rightly belong to that category, and Haeckel's suggestion of a psychic element in all things uses the word in a figurative sense.

Pantheism. Any theory that admits the existence of a God, but denies that he is distinct from nature. The word (literally meaning "the All is God") was introduced in the eighteenth century, but covers a great variety of philosophies, from ancient Brahmanism or the theories of the Eleatic School in Greece to those of Spinoza, Goethe, Schelling, etc. It was a natural reaction against the old idea of a God or gods creating the world and then working miracles and giving revelations to improve the work they had performed; but the nature of the union of God and the world, the spiritual and material, the infinite and the finite, etc., could not be contemplated in exact thought, and the system was more apt to appeal to poets.

Papacy, The. The Roman Catholic institution of a monarchic rule of the Church by Popes. In Latin, as in English, a word for "father" was

taken from the easy labial muttering (pa-pa) of the infant, and in the early Church this was applied to the superintendents, or "overseers" (*episcopi*, or bishops), of each small community, who were presumably selected from the older men. As long as all bishops were Popes (*Papæ*), as they still are in the East, there was no Papacy (*Papatus*, correctly rendered in English, "Popery"); but the disuse of Greek (which was the official language of the Roman Church during the first two or three centuries) and the growing arrogation of supreme power by the Bishop of Rome restricted the title to him in the West and established the institution of the Papacy. In a famous sentence Hobbes (*Leviathan*, Ch. 47) describes it as "the ghost of the deceased Roman Empire sitting crowned upon the grave thereof." The description, though often regarded as flippant by historians who have not made a critical study of Papal history, is nearer to the truth than Hobbes knew. Since the Papacy does not mean the rule of the Roman diocese by its bishops, but the rule of the entire Catholic Church—it emphatically insists on its right to rule even the Greek and Oriental Churches—it did not exist until after the fall of Rome, and its establishment was in the highest degree facilitated by the general ignorance and demoralization which followed the collapse of the Empire. This is the first point of importance in connection with the nature and history of the Papacy, and the evidence is misrepresented by Catholic apologists with the kind of audacity which one is compelled to regard as untruthfulness. We have then to inquire how, between 400 and 1300, the Popes constructed a power which is unique in the history of religion, and to examine the character of the men who exercised this power and claimed so close a relation to God that they bore the title of "His Holiness," the nature and range of their influence on civilization, and the means by which a power based upon admitted forgeries and false historical statements is maintained, and to what extent it is maintained, in the modern world.

(1) In the most pretentious and most authoritative presentment of the Catholic position, the *Catholic Encyclopædia*,

the important article on the Popes is written by the English Jesuit, Fr. Joyce, and he summarizes the first four centuries in these words: "History bears complete testimony that from the earliest times the Roman Church has ever claimed the supreme leadership, and that that leadership has been freely acknowledged by the universal Church." Under pressure, the Jesuit, and the hierarchy which sponsors the *Encyclopædia*, might plead the vagueness of the word "leadership" (instead of power), but the character of the statement may be judged from the fact that from the time when Rome, in the last decade of the second century, first asserted its authority over other Churches until the fall of the Empire, *the claim was in every single case repudiated*, generally with scorn, and no section of the Eastern half of the "Universal Church" ever admitted it. In Catholic theory the claim is based upon the alleged founding of the Roman bishopric by Peter. Under that title it will be shown that Peter, assuming him to have been an historical character, never reached Rome. The tradition was fabricated in Rome in the second half of the second century. At the end of the first century the Roman community had, as it states in its Letter to the Corinthians [see], a bishop and deacons. That the bishop was named Clement, and that he wrote the letter, is a later tradition; but the letter is a democratic admonition from one small community to another, and not in any sense a Papal document. The Roman Church remained (outside the city) very obscure and unimportant until the time of Pope Victor (189-98), who claimed a right to dictate to the Churches of Asia Minor. By this time the curious pun about Peter and the rock had been successfully interpolated in *Matthew* (xvi, 18), and the Bishop of Rome, Victor, had the new and peculiar distinction of being a friend of the most important person in the imperial palace, the Emperor's very wanton mistress, Marcia. The Asiatic bishops rejected the claim and "bitterly reproached Victor," Bishop Eusebius tells us. [See Victor.] Tertullian, in Africa, apparently refers to this when in his treatise *On Chastity* (c. I) he refers, with

heavy irony, to the Pope as claiming to be "the Supreme Pontiff, that is to say the Bishop of Bishops." It was not until more than fifty years later that the Popes—Cornelius (251-3), Stephen (254-7)—ventured to reassert the claim. They tried to dictate to the bishops of the African province, which was then next in importance to the Roman. Here the attitude of the apologist is amazing. He quotes Cyprian, the head of the African Church and the most saintly bishop of that age, as one who recognized Papal supremacy because, before the quarrel began, he spoke of the Roman as "the principal Church" and "the source of sacerdotal unity": an expression of its importance as being in the imperial city and as the centre from which Africa had been Christianized. But, while every Catholic writer on the subject quotes this and represents it as a recognition of the Papal claim, none of them tell how, when the Popes made their claim, Cyprian repudiated it with anger and scorn in his letters (especially LIV, LXVII, and LXXII). In the last of these he writes in the name of the eighty African bishops, and says in plain and very ironical Latin: "None of *us* regards himself as the Bishop of Bishops or seeks by tyrannical threats to compel his colleagues to obey him." Pope Julius, in 340, attempted to give orders to the Eastern bishops, and their reply, says the ecclesiastical historian Sozomen, was "full of irony and not devoid of serious threats" (*Ecclesiastical History*, III, 8). Pope Damasus repeated the attempt in 382, and the reply was equally disdainful (Theodoret, *Ecclesiastical History*, V, 9). That was the last word of the Greek Church on the matter, and the Popes had to be content to assert themselves in the West. Every Catholic writer quotes Augustine as admitting the claim and closing a controversy with the words: "Rome has spoken." These writers must know that what Augustine actually said was that the case was closed because the African and the Roman Churches had jointly reached the same conclusion, and that Augustine and his African bishops repudiated the Pope's claim of authority as scornfully as Cyprian and the Greeks had done

(Labbé, *Collectio Conciliorum*, 419 and 424). Finally, Pope Leo I, in 445, the African Church being now in ruins under the Vandals, tried to assert the claim in the one comparatively free western province outside Italy, southern Gaul, and its great leader, Hilary, replied to him, the Pope says (*Letters*, X, 3), in "language which no layman even should dare to use and no priest to hear." Leo got the last miserable representative of the Emperors to declare that the Pope had this authority, but the Empire fell, and there was no prelate left outside Rome of sufficient strength or ability to resist. Until Western Christendom was shattered, in the fifth century, every single Papal assertion of supremacy was heatedly repudiated and rebuked.

(2) Gaul now passed under the Frank barbarians, Spain under the Visigoths, and Africa under the Vandals, while the Greek Church finally turned away from Rome. The population of Europe was reduced to less than a tenth of what it had been, the school-system was totally destroyed, and the Popes ruled a field of ruins. Hence the profound historical truth of the saying of Hobbes. In such a situation, with a beggared and densely ignorant people looking to distant Rome, which few now visited, as the "See of Peter" and the source of bogus relics and spurious lives of the martyrs, every strong, able, or covetous Pope began to seek an enlargement of his authority. Leo I, under whom the forgery of Canons of earlier Councils began, and Innocent I were such men, but there was little opportunity until the time of Gregory I (590-604), who was, though the most saintly man who had yet worn the tiara, content to make the Papacy the richest owner of land and slaves in Europe. [See Gregory I.] The Lombards annexed a very large part of the Papal estates, and by a series of forgeries which would have been possible only in an age of the densest ignorance [see *Donation of Constantine* and *Papal States*], the Popes of the eighth century got them restored and enormously enlarged by the Franks. The "temporal power" (the possessions) of the Papacy here reached its greatest extent, and its further history is one of in-

cessant and bloody conflict. In the ninth century Pope Nicholas I tried to use a similar collection of forgeries, the Forged Decretals [see], to augment the spiritual or ecclesiastical power of the Papacy, and from the great French prelate, Archbishop Hincmar, met a scornful resistance such as the early claims had met. But the age was one of deepening gloom and barbaric violence, and the death of Nicholas, in 867, was followed by ghastly outrages in Rome which inaugurated the Rule of the Whores [see] and a century and a half, with a few short intervals of comparative decency, of unparalleled corruption. Thirty Popes occupied the sodden "throne of Peter" in a single century, and the theory of a leadership of the world was forgotten. In the end a body of reformed monks persuaded the Roman (German) Emperors to intervene—with the vices of the Emperors themselves they did not interfere—and one of these, Hildebrand, became Gregory VII [see], and gave the Papal theory of power almost its greatest expansion. The Pope was the absolute ruler of the world, in secular as well as religious matters. But Gregory's reckless use of armies, armed mobs, and forged documents provoked a reaction and a contempt of Papal anathemas. The Romans themselves drove him into exile, and the chief authority on the period, Gregorovius, describes how, three years later, his successor, Urban II, "seated in the deserted Lateran surrounded by rude partisans and no less rude bishops, gazing on the ruins of churches and streets—memories of Gregory VII—and on a city silent as death, squalid, and inhabited by a tattered, murderous, and miserable population, presents a gloomy picture of the decadence of the Papacy" (*History of the City of Rome*, IV, 277). Europe was now rising—the Dark Age was over—but the city of the Popes continued to present a spectacle of barbaric violence and corruption, until the greatest of the Popes, Innocent III (1198-1216) acceded. He completed Hildebrand's scheme of supreme power; but by what means he attained it and how he used it are told in the article on him. We do not doubt that men like Gregory and Innocent

fabricated this power, however unscrupulous the means they employed, in the belief that an omnipotent Pope would make the world virtuous; but the historians who accuse us of overlooking this themselves forget two crucial facts. First, in the belief of such Popes the first virtue to secure was rigid orthodoxy and submission, since it was not sound social conduct in this world, but salvation in the next that they sought for men, so they inevitably destroyed freedom, consecrated violence, and tried to arrest or pervert the new intellectual development. Secondly, the vast new power created was no more used to promote virtue by the successors of Innocent than it had been by the successors of Gregory. The thirteenth century [see], which Innocent inaugurated, is one of the loosest (sexually) in history, and it reeked with cruelty and injustice, especially in Italy. Its Papal history ended in the extraordinary scandal of the pontificate of Boniface VIII (1294-1303), and this was followed by the depravity of the Papal Court at Avignon (1309-77), the disgusting Popes of the Great Schism (1378-1414), under whom even the best Catholic historian, Pastor, says, "the prevailing immorality exceeded anything that had been witnessed since the tenth century" (*History of the Popes*, I, 97), and the Popes of the Renaissance (1450-1650), when, considering the new enlightenment of Europe, the Papacy sank to a lower depth than ever and, except during a few short periods, remained in its corruption longer than ever. [See articles on each of these phases.]

(3) The phrases "Holy See" and "His Holiness," which Catholic pressure or intrigue now compels even the daily papers to use, represent a third aspect of what one is tempted to call the great imposture of Catholic literature on the Papacy. The faithful, who are graciously permitted to know that there were "few bad Popes," are reconciled to this on the singular ground that the Church never claimed "impeccability" for its Popes. It is one of the peculiar growths of the semi-Fascist atmosphere of the Church, with its prohibition to read critics under pain of eternal damnation, that a Catholic regards each

Pope as "the Vicar of Christ," elected by the Holy Ghost and in intimate relation with the Deity, yet considers the inclusion in the series of a number of corrupt men as a matter of no consequence. This can be effected only by representing the vicious Popes as very rare occurrences in a unique succession of wise and saintly men. In point of historical fact no other religion of which we have adequate knowledge—Brahmanism, Buddhism, Taoism, Zoroastrianism, or Islam—presents such a spectacle of corruption in its higher spiritual authorities and their elections to office as does the history of the Popes. No one questions that many of them were able men, or, on the Catholic standard, holy men, but Catholic accounts of them are monstrous. They give the title of "martyr" to nearly every Pope to the year 310, while even Catholic historians like Duchesne admit that at the most only two out of thirty were martyrs. They give the distinction of "Saint" to every Pope except one to the year 530, whereas four-fifths of them are obscure men of unknown character, and the only three whose character is clear to the year 440—Victor, Callistus, and Damasus—were very far from saintly. Of ninety Popes, to the year 870, the great majority are of unknown character, and a number of the remainder, who do "stand out" in history—not the official *Pontifical Book*, which makes martyrs with such fluency and canonizes recognizable bad characters—are there on account of their vices or crimes (Symmachus, Vigilius, Pelagius, Stephen II, Stephen IX, and Paschal I). Then came the Rule of the Whores [see] and the Iron Age, nearly two centuries of chronic and incredible degradation of the Papal Court, during which the vilest types of men [see John XI; John XII; John XIV; etc.] became "Vicars of Christ." For other "monsters of vice," as the contemporary documents call them, see Avignon; Boniface VIII; John XXIII; and Renaissance. But these are only the particularly vicious types. We may sum up the biography of the Popes (and the "holiness" of the Papacy) by saying that, of the 260 Popes one-fourth are of unknown

character and half the remainder had grave defects of character. At least thirty were sexually loose men (in half a dozen cases pæderasts) and a dozen are credibly charged with murder and mutilation. If, moreover, we judge them from the Catholic point of view, more than one half of the 200 Popes, from the year 300 to 1650, were notoriously guilty of vices that are held to be worse than sexual irregularities: simony, nepotism, and protecting the corruption of the Papal Court and the clergy.

(4) The Catholic historian Hayward says, among other painful admissions about this period, that by 1650 "the Papacy began to abandon the guidance of the world" and "its prestige had sunk so low that nobody took any notice" of it (*History of the Popes*, Engl. trans., 1931). This, it should be noticed, was after the Council of Trent and the Counter-Reformation are supposed to have purified it and strengthened it. In the article on the Counter-Reformation we explain that its dozen years of puritanism, and short-sighted neglect of greater evils, really left the Papal Court still very corrupt, and it was the scorn of Europe, with the exception of the pontificate of the genial Benedict XIV, until the French Revolution, the disdainful treatment of it by Napoleon, and the occupation of Italy by the French stirred it, like an aged lady, into a flutter of futile agitation. During the fifty years of grim reaction which followed the fall of Napoleon, it supported the vilest measures of the Catholic monarchs [see *Democracy*] and felt that it could safely return to the old corruption. Two loose but able cardinal Secretaries of State managed the Church for Popes of questionable character, and the period closed with the futilities of Pius IX. Under Leo XIII [see], and largely on account of his blunders, the Papacy lost tens of millions of its subjects, but one of the developments of the new scientific civilization gave it a fresh hope. The scientific conquest of the death-rate led to a rapid increase of population, and, while more advanced countries met this by industrial progress and the control of the birth-rate, the Church forbade any such control, under the usual "pain

of hell," in impoverished Catholic countries, and from these (Ireland, Italy, and Poland particularly) tens of millions of Catholics were drafted into the British Empire and the United States. This caused an illusion of growth in the richest and best-educated countries in the world, and gave the Popes, for the first time since the Reformation, a large power of political bargaining and a new prestige. What vast and continued losses this new situation concealed will be shown under *Statistics*; and an article on the Roman Catholic Church will describe the methods (business organizations, intrigue, censorship, untruthful literature, etc.) by which the Popes retain so many adherents even in advanced countries, and how the present Pope, reverting to the most fanatical traditions of the institution, sought alliance with corrupt forces of reaction to crush the spreading rebellion in Catholic countries, dupe the democracies, and curry favour with what he expected to be the triumphant new autocracies. Apart from two small Catholic works translated from the French and German (Hayward's *History of the Popes*, 1931, and Seppelt and Löffler's *Short History of the Popes*, 1932), which have the defects of their kind, the only general history available is McCabe's *History of the Popes* (1939, with full contemporary and modern authorities). Most works on the Papacy cover only sections of the vast field. Milman's *History of Latin Christianity* (4th ed., 9 vols., 1867) is still of value for the early period, Mgr. Duchesne's *History of the Christian Church* (Engl. trans., 3 vols., 1904-29) is the work of a liberal Catholic scholar. The Catholic work of Mgr. Mann, covering the earlier period (*Lives of the Popes in the Early Middle Ages*, 13 vols., 1902-15), is richly documented, but equally rich in illustrations of the vices of the modern apologist. Prof. Ludwig Pastor's *History of the Popes from the End of the Middle Ages* (Engl. trans., 14 vols., 1891-1924) is a learned and conscientious study of the Papacy during the Renaissance, the Reformation, and the Counter-Reformation, written by a Catholic under the illusion that Leo XIII meant what he said when he threw

open the Vatican Secret Archives to scholars—after, as Pastor admits, abstracting the choicest records—and urged Catholic historians to tell the truth. L. von Ranke's works on the same period (*The Popes of Rome*, Engl. trans., 2 vols., 1846-7, etc.) are invaluable for documents (largely not translated), and Gregorovius's *History of the City of Rome* (Engl. trans., 8 vols., 1900-9) is of great value and candour for the whole mediæval period. Bishop Creighton's *History of the Papacy from the Great Schism to the Sack of Rome* (6 vols., 1897) is weakened by suppressions of ugly facts; Barry's *Papal Monarchy* (1902) is a superficial Catholic effort posing as impartial; and E. Binrey's *Decline and Fall of the Mediæval Papacy* (1934) recalls Gibbon only by its title.

Papal States, The. The provinces of Central Italy which the Popes owned and ruled from the time of Charlemagne to the nineteenth century. Gregory I [see] won very extensive tracts for the Papacy in different parts of Italy, but royal power over about one-third of Italy was secured, mainly by forged documents, from the ignorant Frank monarchs, Pepin and Charlemagne [see] in the eighth century. Pope Stephen III (752-7), who had urged Pepin to usurp the French throne and then found him unwilling to come to Italy to wrest from the Lombards the provinces which the Pope coveted, sent to that profoundly ignorant monarch a letter which purported to have been written by St. Peter himself and sent miraculously from heaven. When the Lombards recovered the cities and territory which Pepin gave to the Papacy, Pope Stephen IV got them back by, at the request of the Lombards, horribly mutilating and killing the two leading officials of his Court who were anti-Lombard. The same official *Pontifical Book* which tells us that Stephen was "a chaste and holy monk"—from such tributes are the biographies of the early Popes in the *Catholic Encyclopædia* compiled—tells us also that Stephen's successor, Pope Hadrian, a much greater man, is our authority for this horrible outrage (Duchesne's edition, I, 487). But the Lombards did not pay the price in full, and Hadrian summoned Charle-

magne. It is admitted even by Catholic historians, since its contents are preposterous, that the document, the Donation of Constantine [see], which Hadrian now produced as the basis of his claims, was a forgery. This not only fatally weakened the very promising Lombard civilization [see] but, by enriching the Papacy, made the Papal elections for centuries a series of sordid squabbles, and turned Central Italy for eleven centuries into "a battlefield of the transalpine and the stranger" (Milman's). Incalculable misery and bloodshed were caused as the Popes appealed in turn to Franks, Germans, Normans, French—even Danes and Hungarians—to recover their profitable dominion for them. But the most ironic feature of the story is that the Popes, who now pose as the moral-social oracles of kings and States, left their own Kingdom, while it lasted, in the foulest condition. Napoleon abolished the Temporal Power, but the Holy Alliance restored it; and there is not a dissentient voice among historians that it was, in the words of the British Ambassador, Lord Clarendon, "the opprobrium of Europe"; that Rome itself was, in the words of the austere French priest Lamennais, quoted approvingly by the Catholic Lady Blennerhassett in the *Cambridge Modern History* (X, 164), "the most hideous sewer that ever offended the eye of man"; and that the Popes, in defending it to the last, were, in the words of the Catholic Lord Acton, "worse than the accomplices of the Old Man of the Mountains," and "contrived murder and massacre on the largest and also on the most cruel and inhuman scale" (*Selections from the Correspondence of the First Lord Acton*, 1917, I, 55). The description, upon which the contemporary Italian historians and statesmen (Farini, D'Azeglio, Cantur, and Balbo), as well as recent experts on the period (Bishop Nielsen, Prof. Orsi, Prof. Croce, Bolton King, Thayer, Okey, etc.), agree, may be read in the authoritative pages of the *Cambridge Modern History*. Nowhere in Europe were there more banditry and crime, denser ignorance, more corrupt (clerical) officials, or more venal courts. There were more murders in a month than

there had been in a year under the French, and there were "80,000 barbarous and conflicting laws." There were at one time 6,000 rebels in the overcrowded jails, and men condemned to twenty years were chained to the wall and not released even for sanitary purposes. Sir Edward Dicey (*Rome in 1860*) says that he found Rome "one of the most corrupt, debauched, and demoralized of cities" (p. 35). Lady Blennerhassett quotes the worst features from the diary of Cardinal Scala; and Mgr. Liverani agrees in his book, *Il Papato e il Regno d'Italia* (1861). In 1856 Prussia, Russia, Austria, France, and England, the "heretic countries," addressed a sharp admonition to these Popes, who are now the world's social oracles, to bring their Kingdom a little nearer the level of civilization! Such was the dominion for the loss of which (and for coming services) Mussolini paid the Vatican £19,000,000. And it had not been taken from the Popes even on the approved lines of conquest. Italy conducted a plebiscite in each province, and in an overwhelming majority the inhabitants voted for transfer from the Popes to the Kingdom of Italy. Catholic writers say that the Italian Catholics, under orders, abstained from voting. The truth is that in the city of Rome itself 40,785 (or four-fifths of the adult males) voted against the Pope, and forty-six for him: in the Roman province 133,681 against him, and 1,507 for him. There was very little abstention. Yet the Italian Government awarded the Pope £120,000 a year, which no Pope would take until Pius XI, who accepted the accumulated sum and interest in order to enter into alliance with an unscrupulous adventurer and arch-murderer. See, for the last century, Bishop Nielsen's *History of the Papacy in the Nineteenth Century* (2 vols., 1906), W. R. Thayer's *Dawn of Italian Independence* (2 vols., 1893), F. Nippold's *Papacy in the Nineteenth Century* (1900), and works mentioned in the text.

Papias. A bishop of Hierapolis, in Phrygia, in the first half of the second century, who is quoted as one of the most important witnesses to the authenticity of the Gospels. It is generally agreed that he wrote between 130 and

140, but his book survives only in fragments quoted by the early Fathers, chiefly Eusebius of the fourth century (*Eccles. Hist.*, III, 39). Eusebius himself says that Papias was "a man of poor intelligence" and that his statements about Jesus are often "rather too fabulous." The *Alexandrian Chronicle* puts his death in 163, and there is no proof that he wrote before 140. Since the admitted reference of Justin to the "memoirs of the Apostles" was written about the same time, the testimony of Papias is merely another indication that Gospels under the names of Matthew and Mark were in circulation by that time. [See Gospels.] Apologists usually attribute special value to his work, on the ground that he claims to have learned from men of the apostolic generation that Mark got the contents of his gospel from Peter, and that Matthew made a collection of the sayings of Jesus. But Eusebius, who quotes these statements of Papias, earlier in his account, quotes a passage in which the bishop plainly says that he knew only "followers" of the apostles. This vague statement, especially on the part of a rather stupid man, deprives his evidence of any special value. The correction was pointed out a century ago—it is, for instance, in the articles on Papias in the 1876 edition of Chambers's *Encyclopaedia*—yet apologists (even Streeter) continue to quote him as a sound witness to the authorship of *Mark* and *Matthew*. Prof. Kirsopp Lake chastises them in his *Introduction to the New Testament* (1937) and gives the complete passage. To translate it from the original Greek in Eusebius, it runs: "Papias does not at all say that he heard and saw the holy apostles, but that he got the rule of faith from those who knew them." Eusebius then quotes words of Papias in which he claims only that he got his information from "the elders" (*presbyteroi*). His information includes stories which even Eusebius admits to be "fabulous," and is of no historical value.

Parables of Jesus, The. One of the most common points in the praise of Jesus as a teacher—in many apologists it becomes a "unique" feature—is that he accommodated his message to the multitude by the use of parables. One would

expect these assiduous Bible readers to remember that the parable, which is a familiar Oriental turn of speech, is used freely in the Old Testament. Solomon is credited with 3,000 "proverbs" (1 *Kings*, iv, 32)—it is the same word as "parable" in Hebrew—and Isaiah often uses parables. A more serious, or more convenient, oversight is that of the fact that Jesus himself is supposed to have said (*Mark* iv, 12) that he spoke in parables to the crowds "that they may hear and *not* understand." But much larger issues are raised when we compare the Gospel parables with those of the rabbis in the Talmud. On the canons of profane history we are then compelled to conclude that the writers of the Gospels borrowed from the Jewish Schools most of the parables they ascribed to Jesus, and in most cases lowered or destroyed the ethical value of the parables in so doing.

The parable is so familiar to the rabbis that there is one on nearly every page of the Talmud. Some theologians (Jülicher, etc.) suggest that they borrowed the practice from the Gospels; but, aside from the question of dates, one can imagine how the Christian leaders of the second century would, in their fierce controversy with the Jews, have rejoiced if they had found such borrowing. They never allege it. What one cannot imagine is the rabbis adopting and using in every lesson a form of teaching that had been peculiar to the apostate, whom they hated. For the composition of the Talmud *see* article under that title. It is enough here to say that the Hebrew prohibition of writing religious books after the canon had been closed led to a remarkable cultivation of memory in the schools, and the teaching of the greater rabbis was so faithfully preserved and handed down that when Rabbi Akiba and Rabbi Meir collected the versions from the different schools in the second century after Christ—their findings were embodied in the Mishna, or older parts of the Talmud, in the fourth century—they found a marked consistency. A large number of the rabbis to whom parables analogous to those of the Gospels are attributed lived in the first century, and so in the alleged time of Jesus (*see*

Rabbi Rodkinson's *History of the Talmud*, 1903). These parables are entirely on the lines of those of the Gospels. Those beginning "Like unto a King" are so numerous that Rabbi Ziegler has a special work on them (*Die Königsgeleichnisse des Midrash*, 1903), and Rabbi Meir, one of the last men to borrow anything from Christianity, is said to have uttered "three hundred fox-parables" (*Sanhedrim* 38b). In many cases the parables in the Talmud are more intelligent than and ethically superior to the Gospel version. Thus, in the parable of the Wedding Feast, which in *Matthew* (xxii, 2) makes men slay royal messengers for inviting them to a banquet, and punish for not being in festive clothes men who had been dragged in from the street, is reasonable in the Talmud (*Gabbath*, 153a, or II, 361, in Rodkinson's translation). The King gives ample notice to his guests, but some put off their preparations and arrive in unseemly garments; and they are not "bound hand and foot and cast into outer darkness," as in *Matthew*, but simply not allowed to dine. The parable of the Talents (*Matthew*, xxv, 14-28), in which usury is heavily praised, has a saner counterpart in *Sabbath* (1525). The parable of the Two Debtors (*Matthew*, xviii, 23-34), in which a man owes his King 10,000 talents, is quite humane in the Talmud (*Rosh ha Shana*, 17b). Experts tell us, by the way, that 10,000 talents is equal to about £2,000,000, and, as if to illustrate the soporific effect of Bible-reading, Spence and Exell's *Pulpit Commentary* recommends the preacher to comment on this text: "The reckoning had only just begun: there may have been other and even greater debts to come" (p. 223). The parable of the Hired Workers, in which Jesus is made to approve of giving the same wage for one hour as for ten, is quite sound in the Talmud (*Barachot*, 5c). See the complete analysis in Dr. P. Fiebig *Die Gleichnisredem Jesu* (1912); but a summary will be found in McCabe's *Sources of the Morality of the Gospels* (1914, Ch. VIII).

Paraguay, The Jesuits in. Jesuit writers still boast of the model colony they created in Paraguay in the seven-

teenth century, but historians and sociologists agree that the main purpose was to exploit the natives, and that, though the harsh discipline imposed on them was alleviated with festivals, they were in fact slaves. The first Spaniards who settled in South America admittedly sought wealth only, and with much cruelty and a complete ignorance of economic law. When the Jesuits arrived in Paraguay, in 1586, eager to swell the lists of converted natives which they flourished in Europe, they found the Indians regarding Christianity with abhorrence, and they [got royal permission to organize agricultural colonies of their own, none of the inmates of which could be taken to work for laymen. Later they secured a permit to organize them in military service and exempt them from general taxation. By the middle of the seventeenth century they had 300,000 Indians creating wealth for them. They got exemption from civic inspection and refused to teach the natives Spanish. In reply to the criticisms that now multiplied they assured the authorities that the natives were happy, prosperous, and virtuous, and to the charge in Europe that they exploited the labour of the Indians, they replied that they "did not wish to give ideas of cupidity to Christians." The charges against them were, however, not simply the cries of jealous traders. The Bishop of Paraguay very severely denounced them, and in the most thorough and impartial recent study of the documents (*Der Jesuitenstaat in Paraguay*, 1926) Dr. Maria Fussbinder finds their system "a mockery of Christianity" and a scheme of "oppression, exploitation, slavery, poverty, misery, depopulation, demoralization, and corruption of the Indians" (p. 160). In 1752 the Spanish King ceded part of Paraguay to Portugal, and on receiving proof that the Jesuits secretly urged their armed Indians (15,000) to resist, Pombal moved the King to suppress the Society. Graham's *Vanished Arcadia* (1924) is a quite uncritical account, and M. M. Mulhall's version in *Explorations in the New World* (1909) is Catholic, and worthless.

Parasites. Of considerable importance in connection with the Theistic

view of nature is the vast extent of parasitism and the misery that it causes. In man alone thirty-one serious diseases, many of them fatal, are caused by parasites, and the suffering throughout the animal world during hundreds of millions of years has been incalculable. Most of them belong to the Protozoa, but the worm family contributes many dangerous or very distressing types. See article in the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, though it is not so much the number of types as the distribution of them in nature that counts. Think of malaria, yellow fever, typhoid, syphilis, sleeping sickness, etc., and the ravages of parasites in the animal world. From the evolutionary point of view parasitism presents no difficulty: judged in a philosophical light, it is one of the features of life which make a denial of the existence of God more reasonable than the affirmation. [See *Dysteleology*; *Order*; *Purpose*; etc.].

Paris, Prof. Bruno Paulin Gaston, D.-ès-L. (1839-1903), French philologist. He was for some years Director of the École des Hautes Études, and then professor of the French language and literature at the Collège de France (Paris University). In its obituary notice the *Athenæum* (March 14, 1903) described him as "one of the most distinguished and most learned Frenchmen of modern times." His works on mediæval literature are of the highest authority. Paris shared Renan's views, as he shows in his funeral discourse on that writer and in his *Penseurs et poètes* (1896). See E. Toza, *Gaston Paris* (1903).

Parker, Prof. Edward Harker, M.A. (1849-1926), Orientalist. He returned from trade in China to study law in London, and was called to the Bar, but joined the Consular Service in China and Burma. In 1896 he was appointed reader in Chinese literature at Liverpool University College, and in 1901 professor at Manchester. His works on China are among the most authoritative, and do not conceal his Rationalism. "The Chinese intellect," he says, "is quite robust enough to take care of itself, and it is not likely that it will ever surrender itself to the dogmatic teaching of any Christian sect" (*Studies in Chinese Religion*, 1910, p. 23).

Parmelee, Prof. Maurice, A.M., Ph.D. (b. 1882), American sociologist. He was professor of economics at Syracuse University and subsequently professor of sociology and economics at Kansas University, and of sociology at Minnesota, Michigan, and New York Universities. He is a Materialist, describing his *Science and Human Behaviour* (1913) as "an attempt to explain human behaviour on a purely mechanistic and materialistic basis." See also his *Personality and Conduct* (1918) and other works.

Parny, the Vicomte Évariste Désirée de Forges de (1750-1814), French poet. He entered the Catholic clergy, but abandoned the creed and joined the Army, and the poetry he published led Voltaire to address him as "Mon cher Tibullus." The Revolution swept away his fortune, but he accepted it and wrote fiery poems to support it. Napoleon gave him a pension, and he was admitted to the Academy. His long poem, *La guerre des dieux* (1799), is a scathing parody of the Bible. See also *Paradis perdu* (1805).

Parry, Sir Charles Hubert Hastings, M.A., D.C.L., first Baronet (1848-1918), composer. In 1891 he became professor of composition and musical history at the Royal College of Music, and he succeeded Sir George Grove as Director. From 1899 to 1908 he was professor of music at Oxford University. He was knighted in 1898 and created baronet in 1902, many critics regarding him as the finest composer in England. Much of his music is sacred, but he was so well known to be a Rationalist that *The Times* observed, in its obituary notice (October 8, 1918), that "from his earliest years Parry had had no sympathy with dogmatic theology, but as his mind concentrated more and more upon the problem of human struggle and aspiration, of life and death, failure and conquest, he found his thoughts most perfectly expressed in the language of the Bible." In less diplomatic language he was a Theist, and he loved the sonorous language of the English version of the Old Testament.

Parsees, The. A name (properly Parsis) now confined to the descendants in India of the Persians who emigrated

to that country after the conquest of Persia by the Moslems. They maintain the Zoroastrian religion as it was elaborated into a cult and became the Persian State-religion under the Sassanid kings (A.D. 240-650).

Parthenogenesis. The Greek for "virgin-birth," or procreation without a male parent. It was discovered among the Aphidæ, in the eighteenth century, and is now known to be general among the Rotifers, and normal in various families of the Crustacea and Insects, and occasional in other classes. In modern experimental embryology, ova of a large variety of animals, from sea-urchins to frogs, are caused to develop (by a needle, acid, etc.) without spermatozoa. It is only by a misunderstanding of theology that this is sometimes quoted in connection with the Immaculate Conception [see]. A few modern apologists have crudely suggested that parthenogenesis in bees and crabs gives plausibility to the Virgin Birth of the creed.

Parthenon, The. The temple of "the Virgin" (parthenos), on the Acropolis at Athens, which is by general consent the most beautiful building ever constructed. It has an important relevance to the question of art and religion, since it was built (447-438 B.C.) in an age of general scepticism among the educated Athenians. Not only their leader, Pericles [see], but the great sculptor and supervisor of the creation of the Parthenon, Pheidias [see], were sceptics and hated by the priests. It was intact to the fifth century of the Christian era, and was further preserved by being converted into a church, but was shattered in the wars of the Turks and Venetians.

Parton, James (1822-91), American biographer. A journalist, of British birth, who won such success by a *Life of Horace Greeley* (1855) that he devoted himself to biography and lecturing. He wrote the best *Life of Voltaire* (2 vols., 1881) to date, and biographies of Franklin, Washington, Jefferson, and other great Rationalists. W. D. Howells, who knew him, says: "In the days when to be an Agnostic was to be almost an outcast he had the heart to say of the Mysteries that he did not know"

(*Literary Friends and Acquaintances*, 1901, p. 143). "No man," he adds, "ever came near him without loving him."

Pascal, Blaise (1623–62). The famous mathematician is quoted as one of the supreme instances of the defence of Christianity by a powerful intelligence, if not a genius. French writers on him greatly enfeeble the weight of his adherence, as it is generally quoted in England and America. The work (*Thoughts on Religion*) from which his opinions are cited was admittedly published seven years after his death, "with suppressions and modifications" which made him seem more orthodox, and, although Cousin published the genuine text in 1844, his words are still current in apologetic literature from the mutilated edition. In youth he had been an assiduous reader of Epictetus and Montaigne, but he had very poor health all his life, and died before his non-mathematical opinions could mature. Some experts prefer to say that he "met scepticism with a deeper scepticism." He wavered between the corruption of the Church, especially of the Jesuits, upon whom he made a masterly attack (in his *Provincial Letters*), the plain fallacy of the orthodox arguments for religion, and what a man of his temperament would regard as the abyss of Atheism. His well-known phrase "il faut parier" (we must bet or take sides, one way or the other) is the best characterization of his attitude. Like the confession of Romanes, it is an outcome of years of grave illness.

Passerani, Count Alberto Radicati (died 1737), Italian philosopher. A noble officer of the Court of Victor Amadeo II, who was so violently anticlerical that he was summoned before the Inquisition. He fled to England, then to Belgium, and wrote scathing Deistic attacks on Christianity, for one of which he was imprisoned. At his death he left his property to the poor of Amsterdam. He rejected the belief in a future life.

Passive Resistance. A common claim for the "unique" and "sublime" character of the teaching of Jesus is based upon his counsel of passive resistance (turning the other cheek to the

smiter, etc.). One would not to-day expect to find such an argument attempted except in ignorant circles. Apart from the Buddhists, passive resistance was one of the chief tenets of the Essenes [see] during more than a century before Christ, and they were well known all over Judæa. In the opinion of many, this was the source of the sentiment in the Gospels. It is not unknown in the Old Testament (*Isaiah* i, 6, *Lamentations* iii, 30, etc.), and is familiar in the oldest stratum of the Talmud. In *Baba Kamma* (92, 2) "If any man demand thy ass, give him also the saddle" is described as "a proverb of the people." It is found in Plato (*Gorgias*, 527), Epictetus (*Discourses*, II, 12, 1), Seneca (*On Constancy*, XIV, 3), Marcus Aurelius, and other philosophers. Epictetus gave it in the same extreme form as Jesus, but modern ethics has not the least admiration of this exaggerated doctrine of meekness. That there is anything "sublime" in a moral counsel which, if it were largely followed, would encourage violence, personal and collective, and menace society, is sheer pulpit rhetoric of a particularly reckless order; yet the claim of sublime and unique features for the Gospel teaching is chiefly based upon such passages.

Pasteur, Louis (1822–92), French chemist. Son of a tanner, he became one of the most eminent and most respected masters of science in Europe. Catholic writers invariably boast of him as one of their "great scientists"—they might almost say "the last of them"—but he was demonstrably a Rationalist and an apostate from their faith. In the last edition of the *Encyclopædia Britannica* the (unsigned) article on him speaks of "this simple and devout Catholic." This is wantonly substituted for the description "simple-minded and affectionate as a child" in the able article in earlier editions by Sir H. Roscoe, and the reference at the end suggests that the evidence is in the standard biography by Vallery-Radot (*Life of Pasteur*, Engl. trans., 1919), whereas this work explicitly states—and its testimony is endorsed by Sir W. Osler, who knew Pasteur, in the Preface—that he was a Rationalist. Vallery-

Radot says that till 1874 Pasteur agreed with Claude Bernard (who also is quoted as a Catholic) and Littré that the mind could not reach "primary realities," but he "believed in an Infinite and hoped for a future life." This Agnosticism Pasteur went out of his way to repeat in 1882, when he was admitted to the Academy (pp. 342-3). He spoke of his belief in "the Infinite," and added that "the idea of God is a form of the idea of the Infinite, whether it is called Brahma, Allah, Jehovah, or Jesus," and referred to "the mystery of the Infinite." The biographer, a Catholic, says that he turned to the Church for spiritual consolation in the last weeks of his life—an admission that he had been an apostate to it during all his splendid life—but the only evidence he adduces is that he read the life of St. Vincent de Paul; and he admits that there was no administration of sacraments or reconciliation. The *Catholic Encyclopædia* can add in the way of evidence only that he died with the rosary in his hands (put there by pious relatives), and that he once said: "Could I but know all I would have the faith of a Breton peasant woman." For this confused expression no authority is given, but in any case it clearly means that he had *not* faith. Yet Sir Bertram Windle, one of the very few English Catholic professors of science in this century, says that no person who knows "anything about him can doubt the sincerity of his attachment to the Catholic Church." In connection with this Catholic practice of annexing men (Pasteur, Littré, Beethoven, etc.) who were acknowledged Rationalists all their lives, but to whom the Church did something or other when they were dying—often unconscious—we may note that no man is included in this work who was not a Rationalist during all the years of his creative work and in the full strength of his intelligence.

Pastor, The. An early Christian work, *The Shepherd of Hermas*, which is generally quoted as a witness to the early date of the Gospels, of which it shows a knowledge. But the date is extremely uncertain and disputed. Most critics locate it between 110 and 140, when we admit that Gospels were in circulation in some form. It reflects

the primitive state of the Church in the first half of the second century. Sacred virgins invite the pious hero: "Thou must sleep with us, as a brother, not as a husband."

Pastoret, the Marquis Claude Emmanuel Joseph Pierre de (1756-1840), French jurist. A Parisian lawyer who was won to Deism and wrote an *Éloge de Voltaire* (1779). He accepted the Revolution, and was President of the Legislative Assembly, and later of the Council of Five Hundred. Under Napoleon he was professor of international law at Paris University, later professor of philosophy. The restored monarchy made him a Peer, and in 1828 Chancellor of France. But he never returned to the Church, and in 1830 he was deposed because he refused to take an oath of loyalty to the King.

Patarenes, The. The name "Paterini" is of unknown origin, but we first find it applied to a democratic party in Milan in the eleventh century. The contemporary Bishop Bonitho says they were called *pannosi* ("ragged"), as they were poor workers, and it is suggested that this was the origin. They followed Arnold of Brescia [see]. Dr. Canney suggests that they were Manichæan heretics of the low quarter of Florence known as the Pataria. The name is, however, best known as that of the mobs, particularly at Milan, whom Hildebrand and his lieutenants fired against the married clergy in the sacred campaign to secure clerical celibacy. They committed very grave outrages and, like all crusaders, took the occasion to loot.

Pater, Walter Horatio, M.A. (1839-94), writer. A descendant of Dutch Catholic immigrants, though his parents had joined the Church of England. Pater began to study for the Church, but adopted Hegel's philosophy and became a tutor at Oxford. "With the accession of humanistic ideas he gradually lost all belief in the Christian religion," says Sir E. Gosse in the *Dict. Nat. Biog.* His famous works *Marius the Epicurean* (2 vols., 1885) and *Imaginary Portraits* (1887) were regarded as thoroughly "pagan."

Pauline Epistles, The. The chief point in the tradition about Paul, as far

as it is accepted by critics, is that he was a Jew, not of the working class, of Tarsus, a coast-city about 100 miles east of Antioch and just north of Syria. It was a city in which all religions of the Greek-Oriental world were richly represented, and it had a university for teaching Greek, especially Stoic, philosophy. The chief deity was the Hittite vegetation-god Sandan, whose great annual festival celebrated, on a funeral pyre, his death and resurrection. See Frazer's *Adonis, Attis, Osiris* (1907, pp. 98-100). Paul became a convert, and is usually believed, on the doubtful testimony of *Acts* and that of the Epistles which purport to have been written by him, to have carried his creed over the Greek-Roman world between 50 and 62, and to have been executed at Rome in the Neronian Persecution. The letter of the Romans to the Corinthians [see] seems to confirm that he reached Rome and was executed there. Of recent literature, A. Deismann's *Paul* (Engl. trans., 1926) is an attempt at a critical Christian biography; G. C. Dove's *Paul of Tarsus* (1927) is a temperate Rationalist study; and A. Spencer's *Beyond Damascus* (1935) is picturesque and uncritical. Prof. van Manen, whom few have followed, attempted to cut the ground from under all these biographical enterprises by denying the authenticity of all the Epistles, and there is a very considerable difference of opinion as to which are authentic and which not. The *Epistle to the Hebrews* is now accepted as authentic only by Fundamentalists and Catholics, while 1 and 2 *Corinthians*, *Romans*, and *Galatians* are accepted by practically all students except the extremists. In addition to these, Biblical theologians generally accept 1 and 2 *Thessalonians*, *Philippians*, *Colossians*, and *Philemon*, or nine in all (G. Kendall, *A Modern Introduction to the New Testament*, 1938). Since, moreover, critics who accept the four chief Epistles often find them composite or much interpolated, all controversy that turns upon the testimony of Paul is very prolix and unsatisfactory. Here only two points are of importance: the relation of Paul's teaching about Jesus to that of the Gospels, and the question whether

and to what extent he accepts Jesus as an historical human personality.

On the first point the rejection of particular passages as interpolations when they do not fit in with a theory is not material. It is the consistent teaching, the *leit-motiv*, of all the Epistles that Jesus, by his death, redeemed men from the consequences of sin, including, if not chiefly, the inherited sin of Adam, and afterwards rose from the dead. This conception is so different from that of the Gospels, in the older versions of which Jesus seems to be quite unconscious of having so solemn a mission, that it has disturbed theologians ever since the critical study of the New Testament began. It is one of Prof. van Manen's strongest arguments that this elaborate theology of the Epistles could not possibly have been developed and applied to Jesus by the time (50-60) when they are said to have been written. Some theologians go so far as to suggest that Paul never heard of the conception of Jesus which was later embodied in the Gospels. The problem is certainly acute for any who hold that *Mark* was, substantially, in circulation in the Church by the year 60. It is rather desperately suggested that Paul was so absorbed in the mighty significance of the death of Jesus that he would pay little attention to details of his life, but we cannot imagine him being acquainted with the extensive reports of the words of Jesus in *Mark* and almost never quoting any of them. The problem is not strictly relevant here, but we may observe that, while it remains intriguing from the historical point of view, it is not hopeless if we approach it on the lines followed by the majority of Rationalist historians: that the Gospel story was still in a very rudimentary shape when Paul, reared in an uncompromising asceticism and hatred of "sin," familiar alike with the Messianic expectation and the idea on every side of slain and resuscitated gods (Sandan, Attis, Osiris, Esmun, etc. [see *Redeemer Gods*]), heard and accepted the story of the resurrection of Jesus and worked out upon that basis his temperamental scheme of theology. On the second point—the human character of Jesus—we have, confining ourselves to the

four generally accepted Epistles, the statements of Paul that Jesus was a man, born of a woman, who lived in Judæa and had followers, was crucified, and rose from the dead. See, for instance, 1 *Corinthians* xi, 23-6, xv, etc.; 2 *Corinthians* iv, 10; *Romans* i, 3-4, iv, 24, v and vi; *Galatians* iv, 4, vi, 14, etc. The death in human form on a cross, and the restoration of life to the dead body, are fundamental to Paul's theology, and do not depend on a few texts that might conveniently be dismissed as interpolations. In the effective sense Paul, rather than Jesus, was the founder of Christianity; and his sombre theology, more suited as it was to the sour puritanism of the chief Fathers of the Church, was the backbone of the Christian scheme. The modern Churches are, in proportion to their freedom and scholarship, increasingly disowning it.

Pauline Privilege, The. A few years ago a Hollywood actress, a strict Catholic, married, and was announced in all the American papers to have married a man who had been divorced from his wife by the usual American court procedure, which the Catholic Church condemns as invalid. British Catholics are so ignorant of the peculiarities of the Canon Law in regard to marriage that when the present writer drew attention to the facts the Catholic weekly, *The Universe*, declared that it was a libel of the Church. It is, on the contrary, the law of the Church to-day, and always has been, and it is based in Catholic theology—the *Catholic Encyclopædia* has the insolence to call it “the Magna Charta in favour of Christian faith”—upon 1 *Corinthians*, vii, 15, where Paul says that a Christian marriage is dissolved (“A brother or a sister is not under bondage in such cases”) if the partner to the marriage is a non-Christian and departs. Theologians call this “the Pauline Privilege,” especially since Pope Innocent III ruled that the Christian might remarry if his or her non-Christian partner would not cohabit or if such cohabitation might lead to “blasphemy”; in other words, if the non-Christian husband ever said what he thought of his wife's religion, or attempted to change it. Canon

Law stipulates that the Catholic partner who wishes to have a change must ask the other if he or she is willing to cohabit “in peace,” but it adds, as usual, that a dispensation from this condition can be obtained (or bought) if it is not feasible. It is just a question of money. In the recent case mentioned above, the man was married to a Jewess, but fell in love with the rich Catholic actress. To satisfy American law he got a divorce from the Jewess, but the Church does not under any conditions recognize divorce as a dissolution of a marriage, and the lady married, not a divorced husband, but a man whose marriage was simply declared null by the Church. And American Catholic writers are the most eloquent of all in assuring the public that their Church law never runs counter to civil law and authority, and that, as Al Smith wrote in the *Atlantic Monthly* (May, 1927) when he was a candidate for the Presidency, they would refuse to obey ecclesiastical authority if it contravened civil authority.

Pavlov, Prof. Ivan Petrovich (1849-1936), Russian physiologist, Nobel Prize winner. A son of a village priest who, after a brilliant university career, became Director of the physiological department of the Institute of Experimental Medicine at St. Petersburg, and in 1897 professor at the Medical Academy. By his research in connection with the brain and nerves, especially in the investigation of conditioned reflexes, he won a very high international reputation, and had considerable influence on the development of psychology. He had the Copley Medal and a long list of other world honours. A man of very high character and of Materialist views, he was an Honorary Associate of the R.P.A.

Payne, John (1842-1916), poet. Payne showed, like so many Rationalists in this work, extraordinary precociousness in youth. Between the ages of thirteen and nineteen he translated the whole of Dante, a good deal of Goethe, Lessing, and Calderon, and parts of other French, German, Spanish, Italian, Portuguese, Turkish, Persian, Arabian, Greek, and Latin writers. His father lost his fortune, and he had to work as a

solicitor's clerk and continue to translate (Villon, Boccaccio, the *Arabian Nights*, etc.) and write poetry in his leisure. In *Songs of Life and Death* (in his collected works, 2 vols., 1902) he rejects the belief in a future life, and T. Wright tells us, in his *Life of John Payne* (1919), that he never went to church, and thought Christianity "of no practical value as a moral agent" (p. 99), so that "the best Church is that without a priest, a faith that is pure of the poisonous parasite" (p. 247).

Peace. [See War.]

Pearson, Prof. Karl, M.A., LL.D., F.R.S. (1857-1936), mathematician. He studied law and was called to the Bar, but, being chiefly interested in mathematics, devoted himself to precise measurements in scientific research. He took up the Eugenic movement, wrote a life of Sir F. Galton, and was appointed Galton Professor of Eugenics and Director of the Laboratory for National Eugenics at London University. In his *Ethics of Freethought* (1887) he advocates "a concrete religion which places entirely on one side the existence of God and the hope of immortality" (p. 8).

Pekin Man. In 1903 certain very primitive teeth were discovered in a Chinese druggist's shop, and were traced to deposits in a cave 37 miles from Pekin (now Peiping). Between 1923 and 1930 further rich finds were made, at a depth of 150 feet, and the remains were identified of a number of individuals of an extinct race (*Sinanthropus Pekinensis*). They belong to the lower Pleistocene, or are as ancient as the remains of Java Man. They combine the features of Java and Piltown Man, and are equally primitive. See the account in Prof. MacCurdy's symposium *Early Man* (1937).

Pelletan, Pierre Clément Eugène (1813-84), French writer and statesman. He studied law, but left it for journalism and letters, and was one of the most brilliant writers under the Second Empire. After the Revolution of 1870 he joined the Senate and became Vice-President. Pelletan wrote a number of valuable Rationalist works (*La profession de foi du XIX siècle*, 1852, *Le Grand Frédéric*, 1878, etc.).

Pentateuch, The. The word means "the five-part document," or the first five books of the Old Testament, which were supposed to have been written by Moses. As the legendary narrative continues in the sixth book, it is now common to add this and to speak of the Hexateuch. Since the books which follow are equally legendary, the division is not important.

Pericles (490-429 B.C.). An Athenian who both in character and in the splendour of his achievement was one of the greatest statesmen of history. After the finest education that the city could give, he devoted himself to public affairs. He was the leader of the democratic party, but in private life gathered round him the finest artists and thinkers who could be attracted to Athens—not hitherto of any distinction in either art or philosophy—and planned and supervised the creation of the city which has proved immortal in history and literature. In this he had to have the consent of the people—it is untrue to say that they were not proud of the monuments—but educated Athenians were at the time generally sceptics [see Athens], and the priests and mob-leaders attacked his morganatic wife Aspasia [see] and his friends Anaxagoras and Pheidias. The *Encyclopædia Britannica* admits that he was "unpopular on account of his rationalism in religious matters." The great oration, preserved by the historian Thucydides, which he delivered in memory of the victims of the war, is significantly free from any religious allusion, but adorned with a very high social idealism. On his death-bed he could remind his friends that in his long career he had never caused the death of an enemy. The man and his age, the Golden Age of Athens, and the greatest in ancient history—only the age of the equally sceptical Hadrian can be compared with it—are an important part of the general testimony of history which makes a mockery of the modern cry that scepticism leads to social decay.

Perier, Casimir (1777-1832), French statesman. A wealthy banker who entered politics as a moderate anti-clerical, though he had had a clerical education. He was Minister of Finance and Commerce under the restored

monarchy, but resigned and supported the Revolution of 1830. Later he was President of the Chambre, President of the Council, and Minister of the Interior. His Deism is found in his *Opinions et discours* (1838). He was the grandfather of President Casimir-Perier [see].

Peripatetics, The. The followers of Aristotle [see], probably so named because he used to teach walking on a path (*peripatos*) of the Lyceum garden at Athens. Even his very material modification of Plato's spiritual philosophy could not be sustained in the sceptical mind of the Greeks, and shortly after his death his theories were generally abandoned by the few who had followed him.

Perrons, Prof. François Tommy, D.-ès-L. (1822-1901), French historian. Professor of rhetoric at the Polytechnic, and Inspector for the Paris Academy. Some of his works on mediæval Europe were crowned by the Academy, but his most valuable work to-day is his study of the Rationalist writers of France in the seventeenth century (*Les libertins en France au XVII siècle*, 1896).

Persecution, Religious. Christianity has the distinction among the historic religions of having inflicted torture and death upon those who rejected it in incomparably greater volume than any other. There have been periods in the history of all religions when fanatics obtained power and enforced their creed. As long as Buddhism remained Atheistic, even when it was taken up, with great proselytizing ardour, by the powerful King Asoka [see], the idea of persecution was abhorrent to it, but there are some traces of persecution when it became a religion. Brahmanism, the oldest of existing religions, has also a comparatively clean record. Taoist Chinese monarchs resorted to persecution of Confucians, but Confucianism is not a religion, and did not countenance coercion. In its finest representatives, like Tai-Tsung, it was ideally tolerant. Persian religion has had several periods of fierce persecution down to the nineteenth century [see Bab, The], and Islam, though very tolerant in its best ages, repeatedly became very intolerant when rulers who

were strict believers replaced liberal or sceptical Caliphs. The Athenian democracy was guilty of many acts of persecution (Anaxagoras, Aspasia, Pheidias, Socrates, etc.) on the pretext of blasphemy or Atheism, but the Greeks generally were very tolerant and hospitable to non-Greek religions. The Greek cities of Asia Minor and Italy, especially paid the highest honours to philosophers who never believed in the Olympian gods, if in any, and gave complete liberty to their large bodies of followers. The Romans had a policy of toleration with certain limitations. It is absurd to represent them as an habitually persecuting people when, from the second century B.C., they gave complete liberty to alien religions which were brought from the East (the cults of Cybele, Jahveh, Isis, Mithra, etc.) and to Greek philosophers and rhetoricians who caused a considerable growth of scepticism. The outstanding exception was the suppression of the cult of Bacchus, and this was on moral-social grounds, since it was accompanied by wild orgies. Roman law embodied this policy in a distinction between "licit" and "illicit" cults, and on the few occasions when, in the course of 250 years, Christians were persecuted there were special conditions which explain why the law against unlicensed cults was invoked. It is now agreed by all experts, even Catholic, that there were only two persecutions, the Decian and the Diocletian, which were general throughout the Empire. In special articles on these it is shown that, not only were the Emperors Romans of the old stern and high character who regarded the State-religion as an important part of the Roman civilization, but the Christians had given very grave offence, and had drawn upon themselves serious suspicion of disloyalty. Before the accession of Decius they had openly rejoiced in the usurpation of the purple by Philip, a worthless and murderous Arab, but a Christian. In the time of Diocletian, who had given them complete freedom for twenty years and allowed his wife and daughter to join the Church, they had publicly affronted the imperial power and dignity. It is, further, more than doubtful if Decius imposed the

death-sentence; and in both cases the number of martyrs (a few hundred in several million Christians) was so small that the Emperors might well believe that they could, without serious cruelty, suppress a religion which, unlike the other imported creeds, taught people to insult the Roman gods, interfered with military service, and forbade the sacrifice of a few grains of incense—a test of loyalty—to the Emperor. We have no desire to extenuate the guilt of executing men for their opinions, but the Christian tradition in regard to the Roman persecution of Christians is based upon so amazing a mass of forgeries that in this respect even Catholic scholars have taken part in exposing it. [See *Martyrs*.] Apart from these two general persecutions there were a few local and temporary spasms on different grounds. There is reason to admit persecution at Rome under Nero and under Domitian, but the Christians were only a small part of the very many victims of those half-insane Emperors. Marcus Aurelius, who, since all admit that violence and injustice were alien from his nature, must have acted from a feeling of Roman discipline, suffered the application of the milder penalties. Other persecutions, which are enormously magnified in martyr-literature, were always due to local fanatics or to deliberate Christian provocation, since there were always a few who sought the “martyr’s crown” (or a front seat in Paradise) by insulting the official cult; and the writings and sermons of the Church leaders habitually spoke of the gods in vituperative language. We understand their action; we understand also the pagan reaction.

The policy of religious persecution which Christianity itself introduced was very different both in principle and in the horrible range of its application. The Romans had never at any time sought to prevent minorities from entertaining *beliefs* which were not those of the majority, but the Christians imposed torture and death for a conscientious abandonment of their creed or for holding any different beliefs. The Romans had maintained a general policy of toleration for six centuries, which had been interrupted only at very rare

intervals, and for a short time, by the persecution of Bacchists or Christians, but the Christians rigorously followed a policy of murderous intolerance during the full thousand years when they had the power to enforce it, and the Catholic Church maintains that policy to-day. [See *Death Penalty*.] How the Christian system developed is explained in separate articles. The haste with which the bishops produced a forged persecution-decree in Constantine’s name, as soon as he died, showed that within a short time of their own liberation from oppression they demanded the enforcement of their religion by violence, and by violence alone [see *Paganism*] they destroyed all rival religions in the course of the next century. In the Arian-Trinitarian controversy thousands were slain and tens of thousands tortured, and when even Augustine, with miserable sophistry, found support for the policy in a stupid and totally irrelevant parable (*Compelle intrare*) in the Gospels, the same ferocity was extended to the Donatists. The Manichæans [see] and semi-Manichæans alone proved refractory, and Pope Leo I expressly formulated and applied the principle that the Church must condemn heretics to death (*Epp.* XVI and XVII). Europe passed into the Dark Age, which was too stupefied to think out heresies—the Byzantine Church maintained the policy on a colossal scale—but, as soon as intellectual life began again, the burning of heretics was resumed and increased. In the article *Inquisition* we show how mean and false is the modern plea that “princes and peoples” demanded this violence. It was an act of self-defence on the part of a generally corrupt hierarchy and body of priests and monks. It is impossible now to ascertain how many were tortured and killed, singly or in massacres (Albigensians, etc.). The one historian who has attempted to make a serious estimate, Sprenger (in his *Life of Mohammed*), says that the victims numbered more than 10,000,000; and if we include the Witches [see]—whose heretical character, on which ground alone they were condemned, is generally concealed by the silly convention that they were neuropathic old women—as well as the Arians, Manichæans, Bog-

mils, Albigenians, Waldensians, Cathari, Beghains, Boghards, Lollards, Husites, Protestants, Jews, and Moors, the figure certainly rises to millions. In France, Spain, and Spanish America the "religious murders," as one may call them, continued to the eighteenth century, and they have been maintained to our own time by bringing rebels against the Church into a common category with rebels against the Fascist State. In Canon Law, as noted above, the Catholic Church defiantly retains the policy today, and says that it is its right and duty to put heretics to death. With the excuses of modern apologists we can hardly be expected to deal. That the mediæval peoples were so deeply attached to the Church that they demanded protection from heretics and the Church reluctantly yielded, or that the heresies persecuted were injurious to the social fabric, are flagrant historical untruths which one could venture to advance only in a literature that is protected by the dogma that to read critics of it is to incur eternal damnation. We have, however, to recognize that the Protestant Churches, which were the first to abandon the policy in its more cruel forms, still indulge in milder forms (slander, economic pressure, interference with circulation of books, etc.) of persecution of heretics. From first to last religious persecution has been a self-protecting device of clerical bodies who were afraid of a free competition of beliefs.

Persephone. [*See Demeter.*]

Perseus. The legendary son of Zeus and Danae, the hero of marvellous adventures, some of which have been used in Christian mythology. The feat of Perseus in delivering Andromeda from a monster reappears in the story of George and the Dragon.

Persian Religion. The Persians and cognate peoples on the hills overlooking Mesopotamia had at first the common Aryan religion, with Asiatic adulterations, of the Indo-Persian branch of the race. It was as primitive as that of the Vedas, and included a very large number of both good and evil gods, or gods assisted by swarms of good and evil spirits. The Avesta [*see*], their sacred book, is no more reliable than the Old

Testament as a guide to religious development—some experts (Darmesteter, etc.) assign the whole book to shortly before the Christian era—but it appears that in the course of time the forces for good were concentrated in one supreme deity, Ahura Mazda, the Sky-Father or god of light, and his angels, and the forces of evil in a very powerful (but not infinite) being, Angra Mainyu, and his demons. It is possible that in this the Persians, as they moved nearer to Babylon, felt the influence of the mythology of the Babylonians, but the development is obscure, and experts put it at various dates from the twelfth to the seventh century. Whether Zarathustra [*see*] was a real prophet and leader in the development is disputed, but the tendency in recent scholarship is to recognize his historicity and place him in the seventh century B.C. All that is clear is that the Persian religion went beyond the Babylonian, which also had a supreme ethical deity, Marduk, and legions of devils, and imagined the life of man as a battle-ground of the good and evil forces, of which light and darkness were the symbols. Whatever influence we attribute to Babylon, there was the profound difference that the Persians now had a vivid belief in the future life, to which the Semites were indifferent, and the battle of light and darkness assumed a tremendous significance—for the devout Zarathustrian, that is to say, as the majority clung to the old religion—because on it depended man's fate in an eternal future. Ahura Mazda not only judged the soul of each man after death, but in the fulness of time would destroy the world by fire, silence the evil spirits, and hold a general judgment of the dead, rewarding the good and punishing the wicked. [*See Kingdom of Heaven and Judgment.*] The later development of Persian religion and the emergence of Mithra, an old sun-god, to a primary position do not concern us here, but it is clear that the Zoroastrian creed had a considerable influence on religious and ethical development in the important period from about 300 B.C. onward. To what extent the beliefs of the Jews were modified by this influence is not clear, though the growth of ascetic sects and

celibate bodies in Egypt (priests of Serapis and priestesses of Isis) and among the Jews (Essenes) strongly suggests the spread of the Persian attitude to matter and the flesh. This strain of thought is very marked in Paul, and continues in Christian literature, and the Christian belief in a coming end of the world and general judgment is unmistakably derived from Persia. Ahura Mazda and his "holy spirit," his coming "Kingdom" and his angels, and the supreme evil spirit and his legions of devils, are little transformed in Christian theology. For the difficult question of early Persian religious development see Prof. L. Gray's *Foundations of the Iranian Religion* (1925).

Persistence of Matter. [See Conservation.]

Personal and Impersonal Gods. The problem of evil and the charge of anthropomorphism have driven large numbers of modern Theists to the position that God is impersonal (a Great Power, etc.), and many theologians believe that they can evade difficulties about God by surrendering or leaving vague and undefined the word "personal." They describe it as a refinement of the "subtle" Greek mind of the early Church: which was no more subtle than that of a modern Theosophist, and is more justly described as prone to verbiage. Whether the idea of a personal God is anthropomorphic depends entirely on the definition. In modern psychology "personality" is an abstract term for qualities of behaviour which are so obviously determined by the individual outfit of nerve, glands, etc., that the word cannot be applied to spirits. We have to remember, however, that in dogmatic theology the word "personal" simply means, and has always meant, possessing self-consciousness or mind. The Schoolmen took the definition from Boetius, a Christian Aristotelian: "A person is a self-conscious substance." Modernist theologians who dislike the word "personal" do not clearly define it, but do attribute mind and self-consciousness of the highest kind to God. Non-Christian Theists who fancy that they escape objections by making God impersonal are equally shy of defini-

tions. The word "Power" [see] is wrongly used in this connection, and they must mean either a dynamic principle or source of activity in nature which is unconscious, and therefore not different from that of the Materialist, or a conscious creative principle, in which case all the objections to Theism remain.

Pessimism and Rationalism. From the fact that theologians bring two contradictory charges against Rationalism—sometimes accusing it of leading to a deification of pleasure and selfishness, and at other times saying that it causes depression and pessimism—we gather that both charges are purely rhetorical. In the very few cases where semi-Rationalist writers have deplored that the loss of faith plunged them into melancholy (Amiel, etc.), the "loss of faith" is a confusion of mind that disturbs a sensitive character and lends itself to graceful literary treatment. The philosophical pessimism of Schopenhauer is quite cheerful in comparison with thousands of works of divines, mystics, and puritans, and the sombreness of such works as those of Ibsen is not due to the loss of faith, but to the contemplation of a world that is predominantly religious (as Scandinavia then was), yet cruel, stupid, and hypocritical in a painful degree. All such writers would recommend a general loss of faith as the preliminary condition of betterment. Literary pessimism (Aldous Huxley, E. O'Neill, etc.) is not an expression of personal loss, but of impatience at the stupidity or defects of others. Regret at having to surrender old beliefs is so extremely rare, as a matter of fact and experience, that to describe Rationalism as a cause of distress is merely a device of controversy. A monumental example was given by the British and American bishops of the 1930 Lambeth Conference. Their Manifesto emphasizes the "significance" of the fact of "the increasing consciousness of men and women that the emancipations which they have lately won do not yield deep or lasting satisfaction and that the heart of modern life, with all its exuberance of interest, is disquietingly void of conviction." Such rhetoric is rapid and utterly untrue to life.

Pestalozzi, Johann Heinrich (1746–1827), Swiss pioneer of education. In all manuals of the history of education the name of Pestalozzi has the place of honour. He was trained for the ministry, but came under the influence of Rousseau, and took to farming. Developing ideas about education, he converted his house into a school for poor children, and in 1805 he founded the Pædagogical Institute at Yverdon. This became the Mecca of reformers, and his works laid the foundation of modern schemes of education throughout Europe. E. Langner shows in his special study of his views (*J. H. Pestalozzi's Anthropologische Anschauungen*, 1897) that he was, like Rousseau, a Deist with a sentimental regard for Christianity. He "rejected all sectarian claims" and said: "National religions which have made emblems of the Fisherman's Ring and the Cross . . . are not the teaching of Jesus" (*Works*, 1869–73, X, 194–5).

Peter and Rome. Catholic theology is, in its most distinctive section, based upon the dogma that Peter reached Rome and founded its bishopric. This claim rests upon a tradition which appears in Christian literature, obviously emanating from Rome, about the middle of the second century. Few notice, in discussing the question, that in the Letter of the Romans to the Corinthians [see] we have an official document of the Roman Church which all Catholic and Protestant divines, and most other experts, ascribe to the first century (A.D. 96). Since it mentions Peter, its importance is paramount, and Catholic writers (the *Catholic Encyclopedia*, etc.) falsely say that it traces the foundation of the Roman Church to Peter and Paul, who were both martyred at Rome. On the contrary, it draws a sharp distinction between Peter and Paul. Of Peter it says only, and briefly, that he was a martyr. In a much longer passage on Paul, which immediately follows, it says that he "preached in the East and the West," that he "reached the farthest bounds of the West," and that he was there brought before "the rulers" (the Prefects) and condemned to death (Lightfoot's edition of the Letter, 1890, II, 275). The weight of this

decisive evidence that Peter never reached the West, to say nothing of having been Rome's bishop, is not lessened if, with Loisy, we assign the Letter to the early part of the second century; but internal evidence is against this. On the Catholic theory that "Pope Clement" wrote the Letter we should have the extraordinary situation that the Pope did not think it worth mentioning, or was not aware, that Peter had, after founding his bishopric, been martyred in Rome some thirty years earlier. Against this evidence, the fact that the Roman clergy of half a century later (when the text about Peter and the rock had got into the Gospel and made him particularly important) said that he had been in Rome and was buried there has no weight. Apart from this we have only the words in the (spurious) 1 Peter (v, 13), "The church that is at Babylon . . . saluteth you." It is in any case a strained interpretation that by "Babylon" the writer means "Rome," and most commentators deny this. Recent Catholic writers help out their feeble evidences by affirming that "all the leading Protestant authorities" agree with them. This is far from the truth. A few Protestant ecclesiastical historians (chiefly Prof. H. Lietzmann, *Petrus Und Paulus in Rom*, 1927, and Prof. E. Meyer, *Ursprung und Anfänge des Christenthums*, 1921) agree. Prof. Foakes-Jackson (*Peter, Prince of the Apostles*, 1927) leaves the question open, but observes that the Catholic evidence is feeble. Against these the negative position is taken very strongly in a number of recent German Protestant works (Prof. Dammenbauer, *Die römische Petrus legende*, 1932, Prof. J. Haller, *Das Papstthum*, 1934, and Prof. K. Heussi, *Neues Zur Petrus frage*, 1939—an excellent short review of the whole question).

Petrucelli della Galtina, Ferdinando 1813–90), Italian historian. He took part in the anti-Papal Revolution of 1848, and was driven to France and his property confiscated at its failure. He gave strong support to the French Rationalist writers—"No other Italian and few Frenchmen wrote French as well as he," said Lavisse—and sat with the anti-clericals in Parliament after

1870. His history of the Papal elections (*Histoire diplomatique des Conclaves*, 4 vols., 1864-5) is a unique work of great value and interest. It was put on the "Index." V. Petrie's *The Triple Crown* (1935) embodies, not very critically, a large amount of the material.

Petty, William, first Marquis of Lansdowne and Earl of Shelburne (1737-1805), statesman. Entering the House of Lords at the death of his father, he was appointed Privy Councillor and President of the Board of Trade at the age of twenty-six. He incurred the royal anger by opposing the prosecution of Wilkes [see], and sat in the Irish House of Lords, but in 1782 he was back in English political life and became Premier, and, with Fox, a courageous opponent of abuses (Irish grievances, Nonconformist disabilities, the American War, etc.). He was created Earl of Wycombe and Marquis of Lansdowne, but it did not restrain him from attacking the French War and the deepening reaction and corruption. He took his stand with Fox, Shelley, and Bentham. "Lord Shelburne," says Sir John Bowring in his *Memoir of Bentham* (*Works*, 1843 ed., X, 88), "avoided talking on religious subjects for fear, he hinted, of getting in a scrape, but he avowed to Bentham that his opinions were what is called sceptical."

Phallism. The *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics* gives the stately definition that it is "the worship of the reproductive forces of nature symbolized by the organs of generation." Probably few devotees of the very numerous religions which had a phallic (from *phallos*, the male organ or model of it) element or a glorification of sex ever thought about the reproductive forces of nature or regarded the realistic carvings as symbols. The general idea was that sex—not only fertility of cattle and crops, but sex in itself—was a very important and beneficent element of life under the special care of some god or goddess (originally, perhaps, the spirit of fertility) whose temples contained exaggerated models of the sex-organs and very commonly had sacred prostitutes in attendance. This emphasis on sex was found in a very wide range of religions all over the world. One finds

gigantic phalli in the ruins of temples in Yucatan and ithyphallic carvings on the walls of temples in Egypt; and Herodotus describes remarkable phallic statues of Osiris in Egyptian villages in the fifth century B.C. Phallism has been extraordinarily rife and candid in the religious life of India, where a combined representation (*lingam* and *yoni*) of the organs was found everywhere until Christian missionaries secured a change, and it spreads over the East Indies and to Japan. Ellis and other writers describe a luxuriant development of it among the peoples of West Africa, and it was prominent in the religious life of Arabia before Mohammed. Traces of it lingered in nearly every civilization, and, as described at length in *The Golden Bough*, it was the main feature of religions which spread from the Ægean Sea to Mesopotamia and from the Black Sea to Egypt. The obscene carving of a woman (Sheila-na-gig), with very exaggerated and exposed *Pudenda*, that formed the key-stone of the arch over many church doors in the Middle Ages is an illustration of the way in which phallism lingered in Christian times on the pretence of being, like certain practices in Italy, a charm against devils or the evil eye. The Irish name for the carving reminds us that, as Dr. S. Hartland says, in the excellent article "Phallicism," in the *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics*, it was "preserved until recently in Ireland." See also Hannay's *Sex and Symbolism in Religion* (2 vols., 1922), which gives a photograph of a specimen *in situ*. There was one over the door of Cloyne cathedral, and one is still preserved in the Royal Irish Academy at Dublin. The priests had them removed in the nineteenth century, and then began to boast of the exceptional chastity of Irish women. [See Eire.] The object was rarer in England in historic times, but Hartland shows that there was one over the door of a Norman church in Hertfordshire; and other traces of an original phallism (Maypoles, etc.) lingered to the Protestant era. In France—where the phalli of saintly men were in some places preserved and kissed—and Italy, traces were preserved all through the Middle Ages.

Voltaire ridicules an Italian custom, in his time, of the priests blessing phallic models on the feast of Saints Cosmas and Damian and selling them to the women. Of particular interest is the very large phallic element in the Hebrew religion which lasted until the Captivity. The clumsy revision of the older literature by the priestly school, after the Captivity, has left full evidence of this, although much of it is disguised in the English translation (in which the words "loins," "rock," etc., are euphemisms). It is clear that priests and people adopted the phallic religions of Syria and had phallic images and sacred prostitutes (of both sexes) in the temple and on the "high places." On the general question see Clifford Howard's *Sex Worship* (1902), and H. Cutner, *A Short History of Sex Worship* (1940). Dr. Maurer has an extensive article in the *Globus* (1907) on the phallic elements of Hebrew religion, and Hannay gives, with occasional exaggerations, some very curious details, notably about the peculiar features of the Tabernacle (*Exodus* xxvi) and the Ark (in the above and other works).

Pharisees, The. Jewish writers have repeatedly pointed out that the account of the Pharisees in the Gospels is a malicious libel. The meaning of the word is unknown, but the party developed in opposition to the new liberalism, or Hellenizing tendency, to which the Dispersal gave birth. The Pharisees were more or less analogous to the Fundamentalists of modern times, but the movement, which Hebrew writers declare to have been not a small sect, but to have embraced the bulk of the people in the time of Jesus, had at that stage a liberal wing, the Hillel party, as well as the zealots, the Shammai group. They were certainly not a group who considered themselves of a higher type than the common people, but a democratic body defending the rights of the laity against priestly encroachments. Apologists feebly suggest that *probably* some behaved as Jesus is made to describe them, and *possibly* these were in the ascendant about A.D. 30. But the picture is false, and clearly due to anti-Judaic writers. The Talmud repeatedly condemns the arrogance and ostenta-

tious piety which Jesus is represented as finding typical of the Pharisees, and the sentiments of Hillel and his followers were the same as the best sentiments, apart from ascetic exaggerations, of the Gospels. See the article in the *Jewish Encyclopædia*.

Philips, Vivian (1860-1939), writer. After a full term in the Indian Civil Service (engineering) he retired to England and began to collect material for his *Churches and Modern Thought* (1906), which had a large circulation, especially when the Bishop of London called it "that most dangerous of books." Of a conservative family, with ecclesiastical connections, he adopted the pen-name "Philip Vivian." *Concerning Progressive Revelation* (1936) is intended to bring it up to date.

Phenomena. Literally "things which appear": that is to say, are apparent to the senses, as distinct from "noumena," or things perceptible only by intuition or intellect. The distinction was made by Kant, and ought to have been abandoned with his philosophy. A great deal of confusion has been caused by the adoption of the word "phenomena" in science and religious-scientific controversy. Many people get the false impression that phenomena (colours, shapes, etc.) are a sort of film overlying realities. Sense-perception and science deal with realities.

Philanthropy and Religion. When the doctrinal basis of Christianity began to crumble, in the nineteenth century, apologists laid more stress on pragmatic considerations. Chief of these was the plea that Christianity had introduced, and it alone could sustain, the ideal of sexual virtue and of unselfish service of others. The first part of this argument was based upon a grotesquely false idea of the virtue of Christians from the fourth to the nineteenth century, as is shown in a large number of articles in this work, and an equally false estimate of pagan vice, which is corrected by all modern authorities on Roman social life. The second part of the argument has been not less fully discredited in a series of articles [*Children; Education; Hospitals; Medicine; Orphanages; Slavery; etc.*], the contents of which may here be sum-

marized. It is necessary in the first place to condemn the language in which Lecky praises Christianity in his *History of European Morals*, since he is the chief authority quoted by apologists. A careful reader will notice that after paying extravagant compliments to some of the ideals (carefully selected) of the new religion, Lecky devotes four condensed pages to pagan philanthropies and quotations of admirable pagan sentiments in the two centuries when Christianity was spreading, and he can then hardly fill two pages with isolated, and in some cases (Telemachus, for instance) discredited instances of Christian charity; and if he had attempted, as he does not, to pursue this line of inquiry through the next five centuries which his work covers, he could not have filled one page with Christian schools, hospitals, and orphanages. In all these aspects of philanthropy, in the best meaning of the word, there is an appallingly scanty record of service between the age of paganism and the age of what the theologian calls neopaganism, or from the fifth century to the eighteenth. Two Catholic French writers, C. Tollet (*De l'assistance publique et des hôpitaux jusqu'au XIX siècle*, 1889) and L. Lallemand (*Histoire de la charité*, 3 vols., 1902), have covered the Christian period, and fully confirm this. Tollet, who is chiefly concerned with hospitals, finds an almost blank record from the fifth to the twelfth century, and then, although the Arabs had set a splendid example, a very poor and shocking record for five further centuries. The article on Hospitals, by Sir F. Burdett (which is now suppressed), in earlier editions of the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, tells the same story, and it is confirmed in B. K. Gray's *History of English Philanthropy* (1905). Lallemand has a wide range, but his story is the same. His first volume is packed with actual works of mercy of the pagan world; the second volume has remarkably few facts, and very much rhetoric, to the time of the Reformation; the third shows little improvement to the Revolution, at which the work closes. French writers make much of the generous work of St. Vincent de Paul, but they do not

explain that while Louis XIV was spending colossal sums on Versailles and a palace for his mistress, a horrible famine, in which parents ate children or bit into their own flesh, tortured whole provinces—see the documents in Martin's *Histoire de France* (Appendix to Vol. XIII)—and neither Church nor State had any help for them until Vincent stirred. For the earlier, or pagan, period authorities are recommended in the articles to which reference is made. Sir Samuel Dill, a Protestant, voices the common estimate to-day when he says: "Anyone who knows the inscriptions may be inclined to doubt whether private benefactions under the Antonines were less frequent and generous than in our days" (*Roman Society from Nero to Marcus Aurelius*, 1904, p. 191). See also *Rome, Morals in Ancient*.

Since we are considering a claim that Christianity wrought, if not a revolution, as the cheaper apologists say, at least a mighty change of sentiment, we may here confine ourselves to the Roman pagan and the Christian records. We give in other articles a few instances [Arabs; Asoka; Tai-Tsung; etc.] of the philanthropic inspiration of humanism in China, India, and elsewhere. It is enough that no statement could be more at variance with the historical facts than the claim that human service began, or was deepened and expanded, in Europe when Christianity was established. We might, indeed, expect that a religion which promised an eternal reward for works of mercy ought to make a vast difference. The only difference was a complete collapse of a fine scheme of social service. The Roman worker had had free schools, free medical treatment, a free and abundant supply of pure water, free food, and free princely entertainments, baths, and libraries. The condition of the slave and of woman had been greatly improved, the law and the treatment of crime reformed, and a vast number of orphanages, homes for the aged, etc., built and endowed. The entire system perished with the fall of the Empire, and at least four-fifths of the people of Europe passed into the bondage and misery of serfdom. It

was in the main an economic collapse, but in a few centuries the Church became rich, by the twelfth century very rich; yet charities, hospitals, etc., remained appallingly few and of a wretched character.

Rationalists, though relatively few in number until recent times, have a superb record in the restoration of the ideal of human service. The French Deists and Encyclopædists and their pupils (Beccaria, Tanucci, Pestalozzi, Jefferson, etc.—even Wilberforce got his inspiration from them, as will be shown under that title) roused Europe. After them came Godwin, Shelley, Fox, Robert Owen, Bentham, Burdett, Place, Fourier, F. Nightingale, and her American counterpart Clara Barton [see notice of each]—an international regiment of sceptics, for the most part Atheists, who actually outnumber by three or four to one the Christian reformers of any importance in the arduous pioneering stage to the middle of the nineteenth century, while the Churches held aloof or opposed, and Catholic countries lingered in a state of semi-barbarism. The recklessness and ignorance with which the controversy has been conducted in this field are well illustrated by the Christian Evidence or Catholic lecturers who derisively ask sceptics: "Where are *your* hospitals?" They have not an elementary idea of the growth of the hospital system even in England as told in Gray's *History of English Philanthropy* or any good encyclopædic article, of the struggle for a school-system, and so on. They exhibit a singular type of mind in contrasting the work of what they regard as a small unorganized body of sceptics with that of an organized and wealthy body of 8,000,000 Church members; and they are blind to the change that takes place rapidly around them. In 1920, for instance, the hospitals of London received £800,000. Of this the Church contributed only £33,000; and in the same year a single sceptic, Alfred Beit [see], left £2,000,000 for charities, including £45,000 for hospitals. Rationalism on the larger scale is, as the clergy lament, a new development; yet the specific sums given or left for charitable or educational purposes by modern

Rationalists who are included in this Encyclopædia amount to nearly £90,000,000, and these are only a score of the richer philanthropists included in the work. The *Dictionary of American Biography* (20 vols.) always notes the fact when a man is a philanthropist, and it gives that title to only about 200 out of the 20,000 men and women in the work. Only one of these was a clergyman. Only six were Catholics, and their donations were almost restricted to Catholic institutions; so that the richest Church in the world has the worst record in regard to philanthropy as well as culture and crime [see articles under those titles]. About one-fourth of the 200 gave only to Churches or church institutions, and one-fourth were not philanthropists on a large scale. Only half the remaining 100 are described as members of Churches, while a dozen, whose largesse amounts to the colossal total of \$400,000,000, were Rationalists, and are included in this work. On such evidence, historical and contemporary, a sociologist should decide whether religion inspires philanthropy and unselfish service and scepticism does not, but no sociologist has dared to make the exact research which could be made or to publish the results.

Philistines, The. There is ground to believe that the more advanced of the peoples of Syria who figure in the Old Testament under that name were refugees from Crete, where the early Greeks had destroyed the ancient civilization about 1450 B.C. The point is disputed.

Phillips, Sir Richard (1767–1840), writer and publisher. A shop-keeper at Leicester who turned his hosiery business into a bookshop, took up printing and publishing, and was so bold and enthusiastic for reform that he went to prison for eighteen months for selling Paine's *Rights of Man*. He moved to London, founded the famous publishing house, and became a Sheriff of the city and a Knight. He continued, however, to express his Rationalism, especially in a work, *Golden Rules and Social Philosophy* (1826), which he dedicated to Bolivar [see].

Phillips, Stephen (1868–1915), poet. After six years in Benson's theatrical company, and a few years as a teacher,

he attracted wide attention and admiration by his poetry. In 1897 his *Poems* was awarded the Academy Prize as the best book of the year. *Christ in Hades and Other Poems* (1896), and *Paolo and Francesca* (1899), show his advanced Rationalism.

Phillipotts, Eden (b. 1862), poet, novelist, and playwright. In his early years he was an insurance clerk in London, but poor health compelled him to settle in Devonshire, where he opened (*Children of the Mist*, 1898) a distinguished literary career. He wrote also graceful fantasies on classical or mythological lines, poems (many in the *R.P.A. Annual*), and plays. He is an Agnostic and an Honorary Associate of the R.P.A.

Philo, Judaeus ("the Jew," about 15 B.C. to A.D. 40), philosopher. Son of a rich farmer of the taxes in Egypt who made a thorough study of Greek literature and philosophy and is the most distinguished Jewish writer and scholar of the age. He was most attracted to Pythagoras, Plato, and the more religious of the Stoics, and he blended their ideas with a very liberal or symbolical interpretation of Hebrew theology. God is little more than an abstract idea in his works, and there are innumerable spiritual beings between him and the world, which was not created but formed from eternal (and essentially evil) matter. His ideas are of value as a witness to the synthesis of mystic ideas (Pythagorean, Platonist, Persian, liberal Jewish, etc.) which was then common, and out of which Christianity, Gnosticism, and Neo-Platonism developed.

Philosophy and Religion. No general definition of philosophy is possible, and any attempt to define it by a summary account of its contents or subjects is frustrated by the fact that these vary considerably in the different systems even of the same age. No definition would comprehend the various Greek philosophies (Ionian, Eleatic, Platonic, Aristotelic, Stoic, etc.), to say nothing of the Scholastic and the Modern. Some writers distinguish it from Metaphysics [see] on the ground that it includes ethics, æsthetics, and logic, as well as ontology (the theory of reality) and epistemology (the theory of knowledge),

but the former three are now independent sciences, and the word "metaphysics," which to the school of Aristotle meant philosophy or first principles, is generally abandoned because of its suggestion of futility and verbiage. Non-philosophical writers are apt to extend this reproach to every sort of philosophic inquiry, and in a measure they have some support in modern philosophers. Sir E. Ray Lankester's malicious comparison of philosophy to "a blind man in a dark room chasing a black cat which isn't there," and Prof. L. Hogben's protest that philosophy is by long tradition "identified with the interests of statesmanship and ecclesiasticism" (*The Nature of Living Matter*, 1930, p. 15), express a general scientific attitude, and it is not discouraged when we find Prof. Bradley describing metaphysics as "the finding of bad reasons for what we believe on instinct," or Prof. Coates (*A Self-Examination of Contemporary British Philosophy*, 1929) confessing that "there is little more agreement to-day among thinkers than there ever has been among the thinkers of any age" (p. 19). On the other hand, it is a mistake to suppose that the study of philosophy is in decay—500 books on the subject have been published in Great Britain and America in the last five years—and certain fundamental ideas which are used in all literature, including scientific, such as reality, substance, existence, unity, plurality, causation, knowledge, etc., must either be examined by philosophic methods or their validity must simply be assumed. Professor Muirhead, admitting the extremely poor crop of definite and agreed conclusions after more than 2,000 years of philosophical speculations, suggests that a system of philosophy is rather a work of art than an attempt to make discoveries. Others submit that while science studies realities, philosophy considers values—a modern version of the theory that the philosopher has to investigate the Good, the True, and the Beautiful—but morality is now the subject of the science of ethics, and beauty of the science of æsthetics; while most scientific men would hold that the nature of knowledge, which is not knowledge unless it is true,

cannot be elucidated until scientific psychology is more advanced. Modern philosophers who respect science and leave morality to ethics and God to theology define their aim as research into the nature of knowledge ("How and what we know") and the nature of reality in so far as philosophic methods can ascertain anything that is not accessible to science. See H. Dingle, *Through Science to Philosophy* (1937) and Bertrand Russell's *History of Western Philosophy* (1945).

The point of interest here is in the relation of philosophy to religion. It is explained elsewhere [Greek Thinkers] that in the first great phase of philosophical speculation (say, 600 B.C. to A.D. 200) nine-tenths of the leaders of thought, and those who had incomparably the largest number of followers and the greatest influence, were Materialists. It is now, in recognition of Catholic influence, usual to count the Scholastic movement as the second phase; but it is enough here to observe that the Schoolmen [see] themselves called philosophy "the handmaid of theology," and were interested in it almost solely because it provided proofs, which are now regarded as popular fallacies, of the existence of God and of the immortality of the soul. The third phase, after the occasional appearance of a British, French, or German thinker, began with Kant [see], and ran through a remarkable series of German systems that are now abandoned. Throughout all this period there was one consistent philosophical dogma, that the mind is spirit. This not only led repeatedly to Idealism (the theory that ideas or spirit alone exists), but provided a basis for the claim that we have a faculty of direct non-sensuous perception of truth, which seemed to be essential to philosophy. A close alliance with religion and a constant antagonism to science were the inevitable consequences. In a minority of the leading philosophic writers of to-day we find every shade of attachment to the old spiritualism (Neo-Hegelians, Neo-Kantists, Alexander, Taylor, etc.), but there has been a very marked development (largely led by Bertrand Russell) in the direction of realism and a general

abandonment of such topics as the existence and nature of God and the spirituality of the mind. Those who still regard the nature of God as an essential topic differ very widely from each other in their arguments and conclusions—see the article "Theism" in the *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics*—and agree only in denying the validity of the arguments used by religious apologists. [See God.] What is specifically called modern philosophy avoids the issue and, recognizing that the advance of psychology has discredited the claim that there is any other source of knowledge than experience and the analysis of experience, seeks an adjustment with science. In *Contemporary American Philosophy* (2 vols., 1930) we have long essays by thirty-four leading representatives (selected by vote) of philosophy in the United States, and they were invited to include a statement of their attitude to religion. Not one of them is an orthodox Christian, and only three profess to be Christian in any sense. Only ten profess to believe in God (in nearly all cases an impersonal God), and many mention "spirit" only to define it as "not an entity, but a function." One professes "spiritualistic materialism," and one "revised materialism." There is more conservatism on the British side (Prof. J. H. Muirhead, *Contemporary British Philosophy*, 1924). See also, besides the works mentioned above, Prof. B. A. G. Fuller's *History of Philosophy* (1938) and Prof. J. A. Nicholson's *Introductory Course of Philosophy* (1939).

Phoenicians, The. A Semitic people of the Syrian coast who played a part in the advance of the ancient civilization which is not yet properly appreciated in history. They are generally known, apart from their adventures in maritime trade, and their great cities (Tyre, Sidon, and Carthage), as a backward people who offered human sacrifices to their chief god and had a licentious cult of a goddess. The new history, paying more attention to material factors, finds their development of commerce and navigation a much more important agency than religious and ethical ideas in the progress of civilization towards the Greek level. From Greek writers

we gather also that they had a notable literature, which has perished. The Ionian cities and thinkers were to a large extent Phoenician, and the Greeks may have owed to them many of the ideas which have been regarded as original.

Phylogeny. One of the many terms invented by Haeckel, who was a good classical scholar. It meant the development of the species or groups, as opposed to the embryonic development of the individual (ontogeny).

Pi y Margall, Francisco (1824–1901), Spanish statesman. At an early age he incurred the anger of the Spanish clergy by remarks in his history of painting, though he was a barrister, and he was exiled for taking part in the revolt of 1866. After the counter-revolution of 1868 he returned and led the anti-clericals in the Cortes, becoming Minister of the Interior in 1873. Spanish Rationalists regarded him as the Grand Old Man of their movement, and particularly appreciated his book *Las luchas de nuestros días* (1890).

Pillsburg Parker (1809–1898), American reformer. A working man who became a Congregationalist minister, but disgust with the defence of slavery by that and the other Churches opened his eyes. He remained a non-Christian Theist, and his powerful oratory made him very prominent in the Abolitionist and other movements. He collaborated with Mrs. Cady Stanton [see] on *The Revolution*.

Pitldown Man (*Eoanthropus Dawsoni*). In 1911–13 the parts of a broken cranium and jaw of a very primitive type of man were found at Pitldown (Sussex) associated with pre-Chellean implements. Another skull of the same type was found in 1915. The race to which the specimens belonged is intermediate between Pekin Man and Neanderthal or Mousterian Man, and is generally regarded as having lived in southern England (which was then an extension of Europe) at least 250,000 years ago. It is in some respects very ape-like, and in others akin to the modern type. Sir Arthur Keith thinks that the race may have been ancestral to Modern Man.

Pineal Body, The, or Epiphysis. A small conical object (roughly shaped like

a hazel nut) in the centre of the brain that puzzled physiologists until modern times and is still a matter of dispute. Descartes considered it the seat of the soul, and Mrs. Besant selected it—though it is as far removed from even the feeblest wireless transmitter as a nut is—as the organ of telepathy. Comparative anatomists pointed out, in the last century, that as we descend in the animal scale, comparing it in different types of animal brains, it rises steadily towards the top of the skull, and in the reptiles appears to be an atrophied third eye. The skull has a circular opening above it, and one can see it bulging under the skin in many living reptiles. In the very primitive New Zealand lizard, the Tuatara, it, or part of it, is clearly an atrophied eye with traces of the retina and the optic nerve. In recent years it has been claimed that it is a ductless gland, certain cases of precocity in youth being, it is said, associated with a tumour of the pineal body. The point is not settled, as Prof. Cameron (*Recent Advances in Endocrinology*, 1936) and Dr. F. Mateer (*Glands and Efficient Behaviour*, 1935) observe. Anti-evolutionists prematurely claim that one of the “vestigial organs” has been discredited. Even if the organ functions as a gland to-day, this does not prevent us from recognizing that it was a parietal eye hundreds of millions of years ago (in Carboniferous or Permian times), and the evidence of comparative anatomy may be said to prove this.

Pinel, Prof. Philippe, M.D. (1745–1826), French physiologist. One of the many scientific Materialists of the revolutionary period who are now lightly dismissed as superficial, but were among the masters of science in their time. In an age when the gross mediæval theory, based upon the Gospels, that insanity was due to diabolical possession still prevailed, Pinel anticipated and acted upon the medical theory. He was Director of the Bicêtre Hospital, later of La Salpêtrière. Under Napoleon he was professor of physics and hygiene, then of pathology, at the Paris School of Medicine. Some authorities claim that he was as great a pioneer in general medical science as in the treatment of insanity. He was a

Materialist and a humanitarian of high ideals.

Pirandello, Luigi (1867-1936), Italian playwright and Nobel Prize winner. His poetry and translations of Goethe drew attention at an early date, but his reputation as one of the most brilliant writers of modern Italy rests upon his long series of comedies. Prof. Croce observes in a careful study of his work (*Poesia*, 1923) that his "conception of reality is the exact opposite to the religious," and the best English biographer, Dr. W. S. Starkie (*Luigi Pirandello*, 2nd ed., 1937) agrees, grudgingly: "God is too absent from his work, and there is no trace of the wonderful balm of mysticism" (p. 266).

Pithecanthropus, The. [See **Java Man.**]

Pitt, William, first Earl of Chatham (1708-78), statesman. After a short turn of military service he entered politics, and by his fiftieth year was the recognized leader of the House and one of the most powerful men in the country. "The Great Commoner," as he was called, had the rare distinction in a corrupt age of a general repute for incorruptibility. He was not rich, yet he never took a penny beyond the legitimate salaries of office. In 1766 he became Lord Privy Seal and Earl of Chatham, but it did not affect his plea for reform. He eloquently opposed the American War and the use of Indians by the British, and he brought on his death by intervention in debate when he was medically unfit to speak. Like several other great British statesmen (Walpole, the Younger Pitt, Fox, Palmerston), he was so advanced a sceptic that he is rather to be considered an Atheist than a Deist. Austin Holyoake, in 1873, republished, as Pitt's, an *Atheistic Letter on Superstition* that had appeared in *The London Journal* in 1733. Pitt's chief biographer, Basil Williams (*Life of William Pitt*, 2 vols., 1931), shows that the pamphlet was more probably written by a civil servant named Pit, and argues that he had "a simple faith in God," or was a Deist. From unpublished documents he quotes a "fierce denunciation" by Pitt of those who "converted a reverential awe into

a superstitious fear of God . . . ran into one of these extremes: mediating, interceding, atoning beings: or representing God hating, revenging, punishing, etc." He was clearly far from Christianity, and if he at times spoke of himself as a Protestant, we have to remember that he called Frederic the Great "the bulwark of Protestantism." On his death-bed he had his son read Homer to him (Williams, II, 331), and the suggestion of Atheism in this is strongly confirmed by Wilberforce, an intimate friend of the younger Pitt, who, following up a reference to the father, says: "Lord C. died, I fear, without the smallest thought of God" (*Correspondence of W. Wilberforce*, 1840, II, 72).

Pitt, William (1759-1806), statesman. Son of Lord Chatham and educated in law, he entered politics, and made at once so deep an impression that he was Chancellor of the Exchequer at the age of twenty-three, and Premier in the following year. He reorganized the finances with remarkable skill and was as distinguished for integrity as his father. Although he had little private income, and was in debt, he resigned the Premiership in 1801, mainly because the King refused to grant Catholic Emancipation; and he refused a gift of £100,000 from the merchants of London, and of £30,000 from the King. He was equally strict in his private life. Rosebery says, in his *Pitt* (1891): "In an age of easy scandal his life was beyond reproach." Satirists called him "the Immaculate Boy," and though he drank, as 'all gentlemen then did, Rosebery finds the charge of drunkenness exaggerated. He was recalled to office in 1804, as he was the only man of something like equal stature to Napoleon, and he wore out his life in his triumphant defence of England. He died in debt, and still a commoner. In earlier years he had been, like his father, on the side of reform, but the French Revolution changed his views, and in later years he very unjustly persecuted the progressives. In this he had the enthusiastic support of W. Wilberforce, the Christian opponent of slavery, but Wilberforce himself confesses that Pitt did not abandon his Rationalism. He prefers

to put it that Pitt "never gave himself time for due reflection on religion," but admits that he read Butler's *Analogy* and said that it "raised more doubts in his mind than it had answered" (*Life of W. Wilberforce*, by his sons, 1838, I, 95). Wilberforce also corrects a story (strangely accepted by Macaulay, Rosebery, and others) which the Bishop of Lincoln told about a death-bed conversion; though even this, it will be noted, implies that Pitt had been a Rationalist throughout life. The story, Wilberforce says, is "impossible to be true." What happened, he says in a letter shortly after Pitt's death, was that Pitt first refused and then admitted the bishop's request to pray with him (*Correspondence of W. Wilberforce*, 1840, II, 72). Lord Brougham said that Wilberforce got this information from the Bishop of Winchester (*Correspondence of Macvey Napier*, p. 334). The best-informed witness, Lady Hester Stanhope, Pitt's niece and intimate friend, who kept house for him until he died, bluntly pronounced the clerical story "a lie," and says that Pitt "never went to church in his life" (*Memoirs*, III, 166-7). She clearly means that Pitt was an Atheist.

Place, Francis (1771-1854), reformer. A London tailor whose shop in Charing Cross Road was one of the most famous meeting-places of sceptics and reformers. He was one of the great figures of the heroic period of reform, an intimate friend of Godwin, Owen, Bentham, and James Mill, and a very effective worker for political reform, education, and the rights of the workers. It was Place who, in 1832, organized the "run on gold" which did so much to secure the passing of the Reform Bill. Graham Wallas says, in his *Life of Francis Place* (1918), that Hume's *Essays* and Paine's *Age of Reason* made him an Agnostic. Paine would hardly have that effect, and the word "Agnostic" was then unknown. Lord Morley (*Recollections*, I, 150) and Benn (*History of English Rationalism in the Nineteenth Century*, 2 vols., 1906) correctly say that he was an Atheist (like Owen, Bentham, and Mill).

Planck, Prof. Max, Sc.D., F.R.S. (b. 1858), German physicist, Nobel

Prize winner. He was professor of physics at Kiel and Berlin, and devoted himself particularly to the study of radiation. His discoveries (*Law of Radiation*, 1901) created a sensation throughout the scientific world and enabled him to establish the Quantum theory of radiation. Although he rejected Eddington's supposed discovery of indeterminism in the electronic world, he confessed that he believed in Free Will in man, and this and various remarks on religion led to his often being quoted as orthodox. As he never studied either psychology or religion, it is not a matter of importance, but in point of fact he is a Rationalist. His biographer, Prof. H. Hartmann (*Max Planck*, 1938), examines his views at length and says that he is "far removed from all dogmatic, mystery-mongering beings" (p. 163). His God is "the ideal Spirit" (183), and he does not seem to believe in a future life.

Plato (428-347). It is an amazing reflection on much that is said in our literature about Athens that Plato was the only Athenian-born thinker whose system has survived, and he had less followers than any other Greek philosopher until his ideas were blended with Oriental superstitions in Neo-Platonism, five centuries later. It seems to have been the beauty of his style that inspired legends of his divine birth—his nephew told the story that his mother miraculously conceived him by Apollo—but his small school was almost destroyed by Aristotle's criticisms before he died. Plato had been a friend of Socrates, and, when that philosopher was put to death (in 399 B.C.), decided to travel. Whether he visited Egypt, which he does not claim, is disputed; but he travelled in Italy and met followers of Pythagoras, who obviously influenced him. For the next twenty years he remains obscure, but he then opened his school in the Academy, a small park in the suburbs of Athens, and began to write his Dialogues. In 368, however, he went to live in Sicily at the invitation of its ruler, and his letters to that prince should be read in relation to his repute for "lofty spirituality." Their authenticity, however, is disputed. He was querulous about his

fees, and "no Puritan," Prof. G. C. Field says, in the best recent study (*Plato and his Contemporaries*, 1930). His system of thought—that all that is good and beautiful comes from another world, and that matter and the study of it are abhorrent—may be read at length in Gomperz's *Greek Thinkers* (1905, vols. II and III) or in summary in Benn's small *History of Ancient Philosophy* (1912). It is the exact opposite of modern thought. Robertson severely criticizes his "ethical ballooning" (as he calls it) in his *Short History of Morals* (1920).

Pleasure. Apologists, sneering at sceptics as "apostles of pleasure," seem to be unaware of the pleasure of intellectual work, philanthropy, work for reform, friendship, or any task satisfactorily accomplished. Hedonism [see] is not a deification of pleasure of the senses. In any case pleasure of any sort is only one, though an important, element of the Rationalist ideal of life.

Plotina (about 70–121), Roman Empress, wife of Trajan, and a woman of very high character and attainments. The Roman historian, Aurelius Victor, says (*Epitome*, CXXXIX): "It is impossible to say how much Plotina enhanced the glory of Trajan." Pliny describes her as "the embodiment of all the virtues," and Dio (LXVIII, 15) says that on entering the palace as Empress she exclaimed: "As I enter here to-day I trust I shall leave it when the time comes," and that "she so bore herself throughout the entire reign as to incur no blame." The Emperor Julian tells how Trajan always consulted her, and one might almost say that the good deeds attributed to Trajan (a jovial and rough soldier) were really due to Plotina and Hadrian [see]. Both were Epicureans, Plotina being a strict and serious student of the philosophy. (See a letter of hers to Hadrian in Henderson's *Life and Principate of the Emperor Hadrian*, 1923). Our literary traditions about ancient Rome completely ignore the existence of such fine Empresses as Livia, Plotina, Sabina, Julia, etc.

Poe, Edgar Allan (1809–49), American poet, son of an actor and actress who died when he was a boy. After a few years as a soldier he began to attract

attention by his poems and tales, and in 1845 *The Raven and Other Poems* established his position. He was a man of unfortunate physique and temperament. A small amount of alcohol was poisonous to him, yet he indulged in it and in drugs. His Rationalism—rather Agnosticism than, as is usually said, Pantheism—is best seen in the prose-poem *Eureka*, which he published in the year before his death. He thinks that the word "God" "stands for the possible attempt at an impossible conception" (p. 23) and that there is no future life. His biographer, G. E. Woodberry (*Life of E. A. Poe*, 2 vols., 1809), says that "the only mention of his religion in his entire life is that the Bible was read to him when he was dying" (II, 345).

Poetry and Rationalism. The natural disinclination of poets and literary men to study science, the belief in intuition which they encourage although it is entirely discredited in psychology, and the convention that there is some sort of antagonism between "the head and the heart," create a widespread impression that the artist, particularly the poet, very rarely adopts Rationalism. This impression itself illustrates the penalty of loose thinking instead of exact inquiry. In other articles [*Architecture*; *Painting*; *Renaissance*; etc.] we show that religious inspiration is by no means the important element in art which many pretend, but the popular fallacy is worst in its application to poets. Poetry is one of the first arts to develop in an adolescent civilization, since the enrichment of the imagination preceded the full development of intellect, and we therefore find the early poets of any national literature—the Vedas, the Gathas, Homer, Hesiod, Æschylus, Dante, etc.—generally religious, but the great poets of the Golden Ages and later periods are sceptical to a remarkable extent. China, India, Persia, and the Arab civilization of the Middle Ages in all its branches, had a magnificent poetic literature that was purely humanist and to a very great extent opposed in its sentiments to the dominant creed. Poetry soon passed in Greece to such writers as Sappho and Anacreon, and even Greek tragedy be-

came sceptical in Euripides as soon as Athens moved to its higher level. In Rome the primitive piety of Virgil is exceptional in a group of great poets—Lucretius, Ovid, Tibullus, Horace, Catullus, Propertius, Lucan, Juvenal, Martial, etc.—although the Emperor, Augustus, for political reasons, rewarded zeal for the old religion. If it be said that the old Greek-Roman religion was not of a nature to inspire, in spite of the Greek tragedians and Virgil, the retort is prompt. Poetic inspiration almost died when Christianity replaced paganism. A few minor poets, like Prudentius and Venantius Fortunatus, are all that we find before the night descends upon Europe. Centuries later, though in the meantime the Arabs and Persians had created a magnificent body of poetry (rarely religious), the spring gushes again in Europe; the new (troubadour) poetry is almost entirely licentious and defiant of the Church; and it begins in the south of France and has all the technical marks of its Spanish-Arab origin. It is still two centuries before a great Christian poet, Dante [see], appears, and he is far from orthodox. Chaucer [see], in England, is essentially humanist and largely sceptical. In France the chief early poets are Jehan le Meung, whose *Roman de la rose* "embodies the mockery and sceptical spirit of the fabliaux" (*Ency. Brit.*) and the dissipated François Villon. When the Church, after a long struggle, masters the sceptical licence of the troubadour literature it almost ruins it. Italy gives birth to the anti-Papal Petrarch, the humanist and probably sceptical Ariosto, the pious and melancholy Tasso; and the triumph of the Church over the Protestant revolt almost makes an end of poetic inspiration in Italy until the new paganism begets the sceptical poets Leopardi, Alfieri, Foscolo, Carducci, and D'Annunzio. If one bears in mind that the question is not whether the Christian religion ever inspires a poet, but whether religion is the superior inspiration that some claim, the chronicle of distinguished Italian, Spanish, and Portuguese poetry, since 1600, gives a decisive reply. Of the English output—Spenser, Shakespeare, Marlowe, Drayton, Milton

[see], Dryden, Pope, Beaumont, Ben Jonson, Herrick, Churchill (a drunken parson), etc.—it is hardly necessary to speak. The bigotry of the times did not encourage men to say what they believed, but in the whole body of poetry of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries very little has real religious inspiration; and the period of strong religious feeling, the Puritan period, is poetically the poorest. From the time of the French Revolution onward an outstanding religious poet is exceptional, and he is rarely orthodox. What members of Churches, Catholic or Protestant, will one place against the list of Rationalist poets in this work—Byron, Shelley, Burns, Chatterton, Clough, Keats, Henley, Arnold, Browning, Swinburne, Tennyson, Watson, W. Morris, D. G. Rossetti, R. Brooke, Meredith, and Galsworthy? In France, of the four classical poets of the Golden Age—Racine, Corneille, Boileau, and Molière—only the first two were Christians, and their inspiration was in most of their work classical, not religious, while we need not discuss the nineteenth century. German poetry practically begins with the aggressive Rationalists, Goethe and Schiller, and on the religious side it has produced little since then to put against Hölderlin, Chamisso, Heine, J. P. Richter, Immerman, and Sudermann. Add, from other countries, Pushkin, Ibsen, Strindberg, Nietzsche, Yeats, etc., and most of the American poets—Barlow, Bryant, Emerson, Longfellow, O. W. Holmes, Whittier, Whitman, Poe, and Lowell—and ask what the modern world can put against the list in the way of specific and genuine religious inspiration. It is almost enough to study modern hymn-books. The Catholic hymn-book in particular is crowded with compositions, often of the crudest character, which must give qualms on Sundays to the distinguished literary men and women who are now almost the only converts of any cultural reputation attracted to Catholicism.

Poincaré, Prof. Jules Henri, D.Math., Sc.D., Ph.D., LL.D., M.D. (1854–1912), French mathematician. He was, from 1885 until he died, professor of mechanics, mathematics, and mathemati-

cal astronomy at Paris University, and one of the half-dozen greatest mathematicians in the world. He had eight gold medals and forty-nine degrees or other academic honours. Poincaré was a thorough Rationalist, and a man of very high ideals. He rejected Christianity, and said that the only God is the moral ideal (*Dernière Pensées*, 1913). His cousin, **Raymond Poincaré** (D.-en-D., L.-ès-L., 1860–1934), was President of the French Republic, after attaining all the highest honours of the political world. In his last spell of office he, driven by the harsh and narrow military requirements of Foch and those of the great industrialists, followed a lamentable policy as regards Germany, but he had been all his life a zealot for moral culture, and was Vice-President of the Society for the Encouragement of Virtue. He was an Agnostic but against aggression, especially as his policy bound up France with the Vatican (*Idées contemporaines*, 1906). His brother **Lucien** (1862–1920) was professor of physics at Paris University and author of several very important works on physics and mathematics.

Poland, Religion in. Poland was, until 1939, probably the most solidly Catholic country in the world, or shared that distinction (and material and cultural poverty) with Eire. The geographical position of each, off the track of the international currents of modern life, largely explains their common features. Under the Jagellans (1386–1572) it had been a great Power, but it then decided to have an elective monarchy, and it unhappily elected Henry of Valois, the morbid son of the morbid Catherine de Medici. He soon returned to France, to become the half-insane Henri III, but, in the rather exaggerated phrase of Michelet, he “took with him the crown diamonds and left behind him the Jesuits.” The Jesuits did not, in fact, arrive until the next reign, but they completed the ruin of Poland by dragging it into the Thirty Years War. It was now isolated between Protestant Prussia and schismatical Russia, and was repeatedly “partitioned” between them, Catholic Austria taking its share. The illiterate and densely ignorant people were, like

the Irish, hardened in their superstition and incapable of seeing the evil that it had wrought, and the heroic fight they made against Russia in the nineteenth century only strengthened their weird religious pride. The recent history of Poland and its Church has been completely falsified in the public mind. At Versailles, to which Paderewski was sent to conciliate the Allied statesmen, a monstrous amount of non-Polish territory was incorporated in the new Republic; and after the Conference the Poles were permitted to make further annexations, especially as they joined enthusiastically in the White War against Russia. The 10,000,000 inhabitants of the eastern provinces that had been torn from Russia were Ukrainians and White Russians, mostly of the Greek or Orthodox Church, and immediately after the establishment of the Republic the Poles entered upon a savage persecution of these. It lasted twenty years, and Catholic prelates were active and the Vatican fully acquiescent in it. During the most brutal period of this persecution the British Press repeated almost daily the charge that Russia persecuted religion and retailed the wildest Catholic untruths, but only two papers in England, the *Manchester Guardian* and the *New Statesman*, published the fact that Poland was chronically engaged in a barbaric persecution of the Orthodox Catholics and German Protestants. The facts and the full evidence will be found in McCabe's *Papacy in Modern Politics* (1937, 115–24). It is these heavily persecuted and entirely non-Polish provinces which Russia took over in 1939.

Pollock, The Right Hon. Sir Frederick, third Baronet, M.A., LL.D., D.C.L. (1845–1937), jurist. After a few years' legal practice he was appointed professor of jurisprudence at London University College (1882–3), then at Oxford (1883–1903), and also taught Common Law in the Inns of Court. He became Judge of the Admiralty Court of the Cinque Ports, Fellow of the British Academy, and Correspondent of the French Institute. Sir F. Pollock had as high a repute for austerity of character as for learning. He was a great admirer of Spinoza, but shows, in his *Spinoza's*

Life and Philosophy (1880), that he was himself rather an Agnostic than a Pantheist. He pays a generous tribute to Haeckel, and says that "it is the makers of articles and dogmas who are irreverent" and expresses his detestation of "the great and deadly serpent Superstition" (1912 ed., pp. 346-7).

Polygamy. Plurality of marriages began to disappear in Judæa about the fifth century B.C. as the Jews came under the influence of more enlightened neighbours with a higher ethical code, and its occurrence in other nations is not of interest here. As it was firmly embedded in the Old Testament, and presumably fully approved by Jahveh, it embarrassed the Fathers from an early date. The Manichæans held that it was a proof of the evil of the Hebrew books, and Augustine made the ingenuous defence that the patriarch "acted from a sense of duty, not a feeling of lust." This compelled him to make the further admission that if a Christian's wife proved sterile he might take a concubine (*De Bono Conjugali*, XV), but the wife had no corresponding privilege, since "it is in the nature of things for there to be only one lord and master." The return to the Bible, at the Reformation, brought back the problem, and many of the Protestant leaders, even the famous jurist Grotius (*Jus Naturale*, Bk. V, CIX), defended the ancient Hebrew ethic. The injustice to woman, unprotected by law in Judæa, though she was so protected in Babylonia and Egypt, was overlooked by these apologists.

Polytheism. The first stage of Theism. A large amount of literature has been wasted on the supposed superiority of the Hebrews in passing from polytheism to monotheism. The Old Testament itself indicates that the worship of Jahveh alone was forced upon them by monopolistic priests, and that these had to have recourse to an extraordinary scheme of literary forgery to complete their triumph. [See *Ezra*, and *Old Testament*.] We find monotheism [see] far earlier in Egypt, Mesopotamia, India, and China.

Pomeroy, Ernest ^{Arthur George}, seventh Viscount Harborton (b. 1867), writer. He served in the army, and

succeeded to the title in 1912. He wrote a number of advanced Rationalist works. In his *Idol of Fear* (1905) he drastically criticizes Christianity, defends Judas, and discourses about Jesus rather on Voltairean lines.

Ponsonby, Arthur Augustus William Harry, first Baron of Shulbrede (1871-1946), writer and politician. Son of General Sir Henry Ponsonby, he was for years in the diplomatic service before he entered politics. He was appointed Under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs in 1924, and for the Dominions in 1929, and he wrote a number of books. In his *Conflict of Opinion* (1919) he rejects Christianity and admits God only as "the spirit of perfection outside of us" (p. 144). "We may conceivably in time succeed in creating God more definitely," he says (p. 145).

Pontoppidan, Henrik (1857-1929), Danish novelist and Nobel Prize winner. In early life he was a journalist, and in 1880 he was prosecuted for blasphemy. Later he became a minister, but reverted to Rationalism, and wrote a series of brilliant satirical novels, some of which are translated into English, that won him a European reputation.

Pope, Alexander (1688-1744), poet. His father had become a Catholic, and the boy had a desultory education, but read Greek, Latin, French, and Italian and wrote poetry of distinction at the age of seventeen. In 1711 his *Essay on Criticism*, soon followed by *The Rape of the Lock* and a masterly translation of Homer (6 vols.), brought him into the front rank of English writers. He had abandoned Catholicism, and was a close friend of leading Deists like Lady Mary Montague and Lord Bolingbroke. The latter supplied much of the material for his famous *Essay on Man* (1733), in which his Deism often finds expression. The line commonly quoted, "The proper study of mankind is man," is mutilated when it is separated from the anti-theological line which precedes: "Know thou thyself, presume not God to scan." In 1738 he published a Deistic "Universal Prayer," and his chief modern biographer, George Paston, shows that Lord Chesterfield is correct in describing him as "a Deist

believing in a future state" (*A. Pope : his Life and Times*, 1909, p. 471). The *Catholic Encyclopædia* includes him (and many other Rationalists) on the ground that he "willingly yielded" to the suggestion of friends, that he should receive the sacraments on his death-bed. We gather that the writer learned the fact from Paston; but what Pope really says in that authoritative biography is: "I do not suppose that it is essential, but it will look all right" (p. 696). Imagine a dying Catholic saying that it is not essential to receive the sacraments! With all his faults of temperament and physique, Pope was a temperate man in an age of general drunkenness, and was kind and generous.

Popes, The. [*See Papacy.*]

Positivism. A word occasionally used in philosophy for empirical as opposed to metaphysical knowledge and adopted by Comte for his system. He had been influenced by Saint Simon, and began, in 1826, to lecture in Paris on "the Positive Philosophy": a philosophy of realities (or a synthesis of the sciences) as distinct from theological myths or metaphysical abstractions. Believing that men needed the new thought in the form of a religion and church, he went on to found the Religion of Humanity on the Catholic model. At one time it was adopted in England by distinguished writers like Frederic Harrison and J. H. Bridges; but the religious form completely failed, as it always does, to attain the purpose for which it was intended: to capture the general public. In Catholic countries many sceptics who rendered fine public service found the name "Positivist" more convenient than Atheist, but were not interested in the essential features of Positivism. Where these are accepted there is a tendency to slip into a very uncritical attitude towards the Church of Rome and to admit the fallacies and untruths of its literature.

Potiphar story, The. Half a century ago the Rev. Prof. Sayce pointed out, in his *Higher Criticism and the Monuments*, that the story of Joseph in Egypt contains details which imply that the writer was unacquainted with Egypt or Egyptian. For instance, in the fantastic account of the King making a Hebrew

governor of the country, his officers cry to the people: "Bow the knee" (*Gen.* xli, 43). The Hebrew word that is thus translated is, Sayce said, a Babylonian title of honour, and he noticed the remarkable resemblance of the story of Potiphar's wife to an Egyptian popular story, "The tale of the Two Brothers," which had been discovered in 1852 (the Orbiney Papyrus) and is in the British Museum. The analogy is, he said, so close that it is "impossible not to see the connection." This is now generally agreed, and Rabbi Jacob Horowitz makes a very poor attempt to disprove it in *Die Josephuserzählung* (1921). Large numbers of such stories have been found in Egyptian tombs, and the adaptation of some of them in *The Arabian Nights* shows that they circulated very widely. The story is more human in the Egyptian version. A married man sends his younger brother, who lives with him, to the house on some errand during the day. The wife solicits him, in almost the exact words used in *Genesis*, and in revenge for his virtuous refusal she accuses him of attempting to seduce her.

Powell, Prof. Frederick York, LL.D. (1850-1904), historian. He was called to the Bar, but was in the same year appointed Lecturer in Law at Christ's Church (Oxford). The historical works he wrote were so distinguished that in 1894 he succeeded Froude (also a Rationalist) as Regius Professor of Modern History. Powell was a scholar of extraordinary range. He knew Irish, Maori, Gypsy, and Persian, besides the usual languages, and wrote authoritative works on the Irish language and history. The account of him in the *Dictionary of National Biography* says that he was "already a strong Socialist and Agnostic" when he went to Oxford. In later years, though he helped to found Ruskin College, he modified his Socialist views, but not his Agnosticism. He called himself "a decent heathen Aryan." Clodd, who knew him well, quotes him saying of Gladstone: "What an extraordinary thing it is that a man with such brains for finance shouldn't be able to throw off the superstitious absurdities of the past" (*Memories*, p. 129).

Power, The Great. A common attitude in the present transition period is to say that one "of course" rejects the Christian God, but "of course" one must believe in a Great Power. It is an abuse of words to cover a superficial compromise. The *Oxford Dictionary* defines power as "the ability to do something." Like "energy," in the older sense, it is an abstract word, just as "ability" is. Since bodies move bodies, they must be "able" to do so. Apart from a special use in algebra and arithmetic, the word is now confined to engineering and physics, and may indicate "energy under human control" or "the rate at which work is performed." It has always a purely mechanical connotation. That the sum of work or movement in the universe has one source in some fundamental reality is a natural assumption, and it is generally assumed, but that such a "prime mover" could be other than material is as crude an idea as Vitalism. Ether, provisionally, fills the bill. [See *Ether and First Cause*.]

Powys, Llewelyn, B.A. (1884-1940), writer. Besides the works (*Ebony and Ivory*, 1923, *The Pathetic Fallacy*, 1930, etc.), of high literary quality, which made his reputation, Powys wrote a number of aggressively Rationalist books in his fascinating vein of irony: *The Cradle of God*, 1927, *A Pagan Pilgrimage*, 1931, *Rats in the Sacristy*, 1937, etc. The vigour and incisiveness of his work were astonishing in a chronic invalid. See R. H. Ward, *The Powys Brothers* (1935).

Pragmatism. The attitude of attaching importance to "practical matters" (praxis) instead of words or abstract ideas. The word in its philosophical sense was first used in print by Prof. W. James in a pamphlet in 1898 (*Theoretical Conceptions and Practical Results*), in which he worked out the earlier idea of Peirce, that we must consider the value as well as the logical correctness of beliefs and opinions. It was understood to be a protest against mere "logic-chopping." Prof. F. C. S. Schiller, in England, took up the philosophy, but called it Humanism (*Humanism*, 1903)—a name adopted by Prof. J. Dewey, now the chief representative in

America. No one questions that in fact most men in forming their opinions consult their interests and emotions—or are subconsciously influenced by these—more than reason, and modern psychology has greatly modified our ideas since the days when reason was set up as a distinct and supreme faculty. It remains true, however, that one of the most fruitful sources of error is the interference of interest or inclinations in the intellectual judgment of realities.

Pre-Animism. Following Tylor, in the last century, it was customary to trace the origin of religion to the fact that primitive man, in his crude attempt to understand movements in nature, imagined that there were spirits everywhere in it (Animism). In the present century it is usual to say that primitive man had an earlier mental stage in which he vaguely imagined or felt a mysterious energy, something like *mana* [see], impersonally pervading his surroundings. [See *Religion*.]

Pre-Existence. The theory that the mind or soul of a man living to-day had lived on earth in some earlier incarnation. The Hindu theory of *karma* involved this, and Plato, insisting that some people have dim recollections of an earlier life, made it part of his philosophy. It is carried to fantastic extremes in modern Theosophy, in which "seers" make such discoveries as that Jesus was in an earlier incarnation the wife—a rather frivolous lady—of Julius Cæsar.

Prehistoric Man. No other branch of science is so formally and emphatically opposed to fundamental religious conceptions as prehistoric archaeology. The idea that an element of man, the mind or soul, is spiritual and will survive the dissolution of the body is essential to Christianity, Buddhism (religious), and Islam. Without it Christianity can become only an ethical culture system falsely claiming a "unique" ethic and personality for Jesus. This is so far acknowledged that, although a remarkable number of Christian writers now admit that immortality [see] cannot be claimed as the natural character of the mind, none of them admits the evolution of the mind from a lower form. Psychology, in-

creasingly rejecting mind and confining itself to behaviour, undermines their position, but prehistoric science makes a frontal attack upon it by furnishing abundant evidence that in fact man's "mind" is just a more highly and gradually developed stage of animal behaviour. Naturally no authority on prehistoric man considers it part of his scientific duty to point out this relation of his facts to theology, but the facts themselves do not require this orientation. The only way in which the religious conception of man can be saved is by supposing that the ape evolved towards the human level and at a certain stage the "soul" emerged from obscure depths or was created and united to the body. Religious writers accept human evolution only in this sense. We show elsewhere [*Emergent Evolution*] that this theory, held at one time by a very few scientific men of religious views, and already fully discredited, never had a scientific character; but it is in any case in complete contradiction to the facts of prehistoric science. The physiologist or the psychologist must smile at the idea of a human "mind" being suddenly associated with an ape or semi-human brain; but even if we waive the absurdities of the supposition, there would at least be a remarkable elevation of prehistoric man's behaviour at some stage, and this is entirely disproved by the facts. No authority on the science ever even mentions the idea. We have, in the case of earlier prehistoric man, more skulls (or parts thereof) than other bones, but we do not depend on these for measurements of man's progress in intelligence. Bones perish unless they happen to be preserved in certain exceptional conditions, but the stone (in the earlier ages always flint) implements, which indicate man's intelligence in each age more safely than the skull, survive in great abundance. These are in the strictest sense facts of science, and they show a gradual and portentously slow advance of intelligence. Whatever is the mechanism of what we call man's mental behaviour, it is a gradual improvement of that of the ape.

The history of prehistoric science since

Boucher de Perthes began to collect implements in the gravels of Paris in the first quarter of the last century, and the scheme of the science to-day, must be read elsewhere. Here it must be simplified in order to make the above fact entirely clear. For the general public the best simplification would be to speak in terms of chronology instead of geological periods, but for recent deposits we have not the assistance, in dating, of the radiological method [*see Age of the Earth*], and there is a wide margin for difference of estimates. Briefly, it is now agreed [*see Man, the Evolution of*] that it is at least 20,000,000 years since a branch of the anthropoid family diverged from the other apes and began the evolution towards the human level. We have no trace of man's ancestors during that period, but since they had arrived at the ape-man stage only a million (or less) years ago, religious considerations of any sort are excluded. At present the earliest traces of man (or ape-man) that we have are, it is generally agreed, flint implements (rostracinate) found in East Anglia and deposited there before the Ice Age. They are described by the discoverer, J. Reid Moir (*The Earliest Men*, 1939), and may have been fashioned by some such race as the Java or the Pekin Man [*see*]. Some geologists would date the beginning of the Ice Age about a million years ago—some half a million—but dates do not affect the issue under discussion here. Next we have the remains of Java Man (*Pithecanthropus*) and Pekin Man [on which *see* the special notices]. Both were lower than any existing human type and very clearly allied to and derived from the ape. A new type of implement (the Eolith) next appears, and is found in great abundance, especially in England and Belgium (which were then connected by land), suggesting that the great plain which is now the floor of the North Sea had a large human population—a race midway between the Java and the Piltown types. With Piltown Man [*see*] we get the familiar "hand-axe," or pointed and edged chipped-flint implement, but in a ruder form than one generally sees it in museums or photographs, and next in time and stage of development is

Heidelberg (or Mauer) Man, known by a lower jaw found, in 1907, under 82 feet of sand and gravel. The next phase, Neanderthal or (as is now generally said) Mousterian Man, is well known: the typical man of the Old Stone Age, not higher in type at least than the Australian aboriginal. But this Old Stone Age (Palæolithic) covers a vast period of time, and in the modern science it is divided into many periods (Pre-Chellean, Chellean, Acheulean, Mousterian, etc.). It is enough here to say that, if we take the more moderate chronological estimate, we have Java and Pekin Man half a million years ago, and Piltdown Man a quarter of a million years ago; and the progress of mind, as embodied in the implements and confirmed by the skulls, in that period was less than a class of school-boys would make at such work in a month. It took another 100,000 years to reach the Mousterian type (or the level of the Australian black), of which we have twenty or thirty skulls and skeletons. If, therefore, we wished to entertain the idea of the emergent (instead of evolving) mind it would have to be placed after this period, but prehistoric evidence during or after this stage is abundant, and it provides no place whatever for such a theory. Dr. H. F. Osborn, who for various reasons was eager to conciliate the religious public, suggested that the development of prehistoric art at this stage pointed to some emergence of new powers. In the article **Art, Prehistoric**, we show how he gives an entirely false account of the period—which covered tens of thousands of years—and the art. The last and most intense phase of the Ice Age had now supervened, and for a period variously estimated at 50,000 to 150,000 years men lived socially in caves. They reached a culture (in stone, bone, horn, and ivory) comparable to that of the Eskimo. But a still larger social life occurred in the green and temperate region south and south-east of Europe, and from there at the close of the Ice Age (and Old Stone Age) higher types invaded Europe. The best works (illustrated) are Sir A. Keith's *Antiquity of Man* (7th. ed., 2 vols., 1929), Dr. G. G. MacCurdy's

Coming of Man (2nd. ed., 1935), and the five symposia of American experts edited by Dr. MacCurdy, *Early Man*, (1937). Prof. L. S. B. Leakey's *Adam's Ancestors* (1934), Sir G. E. Smith's *In the Beginning* (1932), Prof. V. Gordon Childe's *Man Makes Himself* (1936), and Prof. Burkitt's *Old Stone Age* (1933) are admirable popular works. Marett's *Man in the Making* does not deal with archaeology: S. Casson's *Discovery of Man* (1939) is a history of the science; and R. R. Schmidt's *Dawn of the Human Mind* (1936) has a misleading title and is not relevant.

Preller, Prof. Ludwig (1809–61), German philologist. He began to study for the Church, but became a Rationalist and turned to philology, of which he became professor at Jena. His command of the classical languages and his Rationalist interest enabled him to write the finest works to that date on Greek and Roman religion (*Griechische Mythologie*, 2 vols., 1854, and *Römische Mythologie*, 2 vols., 1858), which long remained standard works. His friend Stiehling tells us that his scepticism deepened as he grew older, and he ended an Agnostic.

Prévost, Prof. Louis Constant, D.-ès-L., D.Sci. (1787–1856), geologist, "the French Lyell." He abandoned the study of medicine for that of geology and was appointed professor at Paris University. His work in ridding the science of Biblical adulterations and establishing the principle of uniformity raised him to the position in France which Lyell occupied in England.

Preyer, Prof. Wilhelm Thierry (1841–97), German physiologist. Preyer is well known in the scientific literature of all countries for his work on child-psychology (*The Soul of the Child*, Engl. trans., 1889, etc.), the basis of which was a command of physiology. He studied at five universities, German, Austrian, and French, and at different periods taught zoochemistry (biochemistry), physiology, and psychology. He was one of the first German professors to welcome evolution and apply it to physiology and psychology; and he wrote a fine Rationalist appreciation of Darwin (*Darwin: Sein Leben und Wirken*, 1896).

Priesthood, Christian. It is usually admitted, uncritically, that the Christians had priests, as well as bishops and deacons, from the first century (but the Letter of the Romans to the Corinthians [see] of the year 96 describes that they have in their Church bishops and deacons, and does not mention priests. Especially in Rome the Christians shrank from an imitation of the pagan institution, the *sacerdotium*; hence the adoption of the Greek word *presbyteros* (elder) when the third class of clerics was definitely recognized. In the Roman Church the development of the order of priests occurred chiefly under Pope Callistus (217-22)—an unscrupulous and ambitious bishop who, as is scornfully described by his contemporary and rival Hippolytus (*Refutation of all Heresies*), enriched the Church by lowering the moral qualifications and broadened the gap between the clergy and the laity. Cyprian, the African leader of the third century, was chiefly active in working out the mystic and sacred character of the priest.

Priestly Code. When it was established that in the Old Testament two older writers, known as the Jahvist and the Elohist, were combined in the Hexateuch with a third and much later writer, it was recognized that the latter had "redacted" the whole for the purpose of proving (falsely) that the cult of Jahveh and the organization of his priests went back to the time of Moses and were of divine authority. This third element was called the Priestly Code. It is not so much a third element as a fictitious narrative from the beginning of *Genesis* to the end of the historical books, in which fragments of an older literature are embedded. The work probably began in Babylon—one naturally suspects that the power and wealth of the Babylonian priests stimulated the forgers—and was continued over a long period in Jerusalem by the priests and their assistants. [See *Ezra* and *Old Testament*.]

Printing. The art, with movable wooden blocks, was invented in China in the eleventh century B.C., and it had advanced so far by the beginning of the Christian era that a recent American expert has said, with some exaggeration,

that the Chinese had everything but the linotype. A Chinese word being a single character, printing suited the language, and led to the appearance of an immense literature in the best periods. It seems to have reached Europe, in the fifteenth century, through the Persians, who were in touch with the Chinese, but the early development in Europe is very obscure. Gutenberg is still generally favoured as the man who first learned and developed the idea, but it is warmly disputed even if Germany was the first country to print books. The effect of the discovery in Europe ought to have been revolutionary, and certainly aided the revolt against the Church, but it was restricted by the religious tyranny and the fact that 90 per cent. of the people were illiterate.

Prison Reform. Since the humane reform of the treatment of crime is almost the only moral-social service which apologists do not claim to have been introduced by the early Church, we conclude, and easily discover, that the reform is too clearly due to our more sceptical age, and that the state of prisons during the real Christian era was too vile for even the most desperate apologist to advance such a claim. Reform of the law, the administration of justice, and the prisons, was always effected in a high state of civilization. There was a good deal of reform, especially in law [see] and the treatment of slaves, in the Roman Empire. In pre-Christian times the Buddhist monarch Asoka made quite modern changes in the treatment of criminals, laying down the principle that they were rather to be prevented by education than punished. Several Confucian Emperors, notably Tai Tsung, of the seventh century of the Christian era, had a remarkable record. Tai Tsung exacted that no Chinese monarch should sign a death-sentence until he had fasted three days, and he almost emptied the jails. The Arabs of Spain also had a fine record. We realize that the Christian Church in the West not only found a generally just system of law and administration, but was paralysed in regard to social reforms for a time by the collapse of the Empire. In the East the comparatively

sound system inherited from the pagans, and improved for the last time by Justinian (or by the pagan jurist Trebonian), degenerated lamentably, but it was worse in Europe even after the recovery of civilization. The monumental task that confronted reformers at the end of the eighteenth and in the nineteenth centuries dispenses us from going into detail [see *Justice; Law; and Torture*]. England had no jails until the twelfth century, each lord having dungeons in his castle and treating offending serfs and others with terrible cruelty. The jails, or "houses of correction," which were then created remained on semi-barbarous lines until the eighteenth century, when the horrors of the Fleet and Marshalsea prisons were exposed. John Howard, the Christian reformer—though a Dissenter, not a member of the Church of England—who is now glorified as a pioneer, was at the time of this public agitation (1729) only three years old. Devotedly as he worked for reform, it is admitted, in the article on him in the *Dictionary of National Biography*, that he accomplished almost nothing; and the writer adds that he was harsh and tyrannical in his own home. It is, in fact, a platitude of the history of the subject that when Howard died (1790) the jails of Europe were as vile as ever. We have, while recognizing her service and devotion, to make some reserves also in regard to the second Christian (or Quaker) pioneer, Elizabeth Fry. She worked for female prisoners only, and in the interest of virtue—both sexes and all ages and conditions were still herded together in jails that were more like sections of Hades—while the Atheist Bentham, preceded on the Continent by the Voltairean Beccaria [see] and supported in England by his Rationalist co-workers, worked out a complete system of reform on social grounds. He had, says Sir James Fitzjames Stephen, "a degree of practical influence upon the legislation of his own and various other countries comparable to that of Adam Smith and his successors upon commerce." No Catholic or Anglican and no minister of religion figures in the list of pioneers, and the jails of the Papal States were among the

last to be reformed. It is, in fine, to be noted that if in this case Christian apologists can claim two prominent pioneers—though the Quakers were not at that time recognized as Christian—it is a civilization that had been dominated by their Church for fourteen centuries which they had to criticize, and that the air of Europe was then full of ideas of reform, most of which came from sceptical sources. [See also *Law*.]

Proctor, Richard Anthony (1837–88), astronomer. He devoted himself to theology at Cambridge and became a Catholic, but the study of mathematics, astronomy, and history converted him to Rationalism. Proctor was in his time the most brilliant British lecturer on astronomy, made phenomenally successful tours in America and Australia, and had great prestige as founder and editor of *Knowledge*, the rival for years of *Nature*, and more outspoken in regard to religion. In an article in it (July 1, 1887) Proctor describes himself as an Agnostic, and Clodd tells, in his *Memories*, that he remained an Agnostic to the end of his life.

Progress. The controversy as to whether religion or scepticism (or the rational and humanist attitude that accompanies scepticism) better promotes progress is often needlessly complicated, in the interest of the apologist, by demands for a definition of progress. Zealots for particular social qualities—sexual virtue, peace, temperance, etc.—are prone to lay a narrow stress on that feature; but the word "progress" demands a broad view of the social changes in a civilization unless we state that we mean only an improvement in one particular respect. What we generally mean when we do use the word hardly needs definition. An eccentric social student may dissent—as when Spengler lamented for years that European civilization was in decay, and changed his message to a cry of progress when Nazism secured power—and antagonistic political, economic, and religious creeds necessarily cause a divergence of views; but there is no difficulty among historians and sociologists, whose task it is to judge whether or no an age is progressive. We may just as easily, and more positively,

measure progress by the distance travelled *from* a certain stage as by setting up a future goal—by, in the older language, the *terminus a quo* instead of the *terminus ad quem*—about which opinions would differ. That an age which has cut down crime by at least 50 per cent., enormously reduced drunkenness, raised literacy from 10 to 100 per cent. of the community (over the age of six), destroyed political corruption, doubled the average expectation of life, achieved a very extensive victory over disease, invented anaesthetics, created vast social services, trebled the real wage of the worker, abolished the disabilities of women and of religious minorities, secured freedom of opinion and discussion, etc., has made "progress" only a casuist will dispute; and that some future age, which will preserve these gains and add the abolition of war and poverty, will make further progress may, without any definition, safely be affirmed. Usually, to-day, when a man denies progress it is because he does not know the facts about the *terminus a quo*, the earlier age with which he compares ours—as when Belloc denies that we have made progress beyond the Middle Ages, or G. B. Shaw denies that we have advanced beyond the England of a century ago. In so far as we need a future goal for the measurement of progress, all but a few sophists recognize that we have such a collective aim in the gradual reduction of suffering, cruelty, injustice, violence, selfishness, stupidity, and unsocial conduct of all kinds. It is one of the symptoms of our advance that the very idea of progress, of a possibility of indefinite improvement, was unknown until modern times. Bacon (under the influence of science) and the Deists (especially Bolingbroke, Fontenelle, Saint-Paul, and Rousseau) vaguely perceived it; the Atheistic French Encyclopædists, followed by Shelley and others in England, developed it (under the name of "perfectibility"); and the discovery of the great principle of evolution finally established it. See Prof. J. B. Bury, *The Idea of Progress* (1924). For the general agencies see *Social Progress*, and for the relation to Rationalism see *Scepticism and Social Progress*.

Progressive Revelation. When the tyranny of the dogma of the inspiration of the Bible broke down, and men saw the incongruity of calling the Pentateuch or the early Prophets "inspired," some apologists started the theory of progressive revelation. God was supposed to have revealed moral and religious truth in instalments suited to the capacity of each age: talking things over in a very primitive way with Abraham, sending Moses and his crude Decalogue to a later generation, then the Prophets, and finally Jesus. It occurred to none to ask why this had to be done if a missionary can now present the whole message to simple folk like the Hottentots or the Melanesians. The modern critical history of the Hebrews, showing how they were progressively educated by superior neighbours, is much more impressive.

Prophets, The. A prophet is, by the etymology of the word, "one who speaks out," and only Fundamentalists and Catholics to-day retain the old idea of the Hebrew Prophets as men who made supernatural predictions. The better educated of them, like Isaiah, naturally predicted ruin for the Hebrews if in a time of political crisis they took the wrong side, and the "redactors" of their works, three or four centuries later, were in a position to make the predictions square with the historical events. The allusions in the Gospels to prophecies and the fulfilment of them in the life of Jesus are in part of the same nature—details are invented to fulfil the words of the Prophet—and in still larger part are vague or strained. For instance, in the phrase "a virgin shall conceive," the Hebrew word, which means simply a young woman, is mis-translated in the Greek and Latin. The common religious claim to-day is that, all supernaturalism apart, the Hebrew Prophets taught a unique (or higher than any contemporary) morality. In articles on the earlier Prophets [*Amos; Hosea; Isaiah; etc.*] it is pointed out that in general moral tone—in the grossness and violence of their language and their conception of God—they were, on the contrary, far below the level of contemporary civilizations: indeed, far below the level which Egypt

and Babylonia had reached more than a thousand years earlier. It is symptomatic of the insincerity of religious rhetoric that the early Prophets are claimed to reveal at least a superior sentiment of social justice, while the men who to-day, even in more polite language, rail at the rich are decried as Bolsheviks and enemies of the human race. Obscure as Hebrew history is before the eighth century B.C., we have to-day a fair appreciation of the position of the Prophets. The settlement in Palestine may have been about or a little before 1000 B.C., and the raw desert-tribes, copying their civilized neighbours, presently built towns in which a comparatively rich merchant class appeared. They attracted wives or concubines of a more graceful type from the Syrians and adopted their picturesque phallic cults. It appears—if we look for any authentic details in the historical books—that, from the start, bands of wild zealots for the primitive simplicity and the cult of their old desert god Jahveh wandered about (*I Samuel*, x, 5) and cried a pox on the blood-sucking capitalists and their fine daughters (to render Amos and Hosea in modern English). Some suggest that they formed guilds of professional agitators. There is a fairly close parallel in the development at Mecca, when the Arabs had settled down after looting Persia. Whether the Prophets first became literary (Amos, Hosea, Micah, and the First Isaiah) in the eighth century, or how shaggy dervishes like Amos and Micah came to be immortalized on parchment, we do not know. After 680 there is what religious historians call a "grim silence"—the priests and kings have annihilated the Prophets (with wooden saws and other pious devices, tradition said); but the downfall of Assyria evoked a new brood. From that time the successive prophets reflect the advancing moral sentiments which the Hebrews learn from the great nations with whom their life is now closely connected. Literature is listed under the notices of individual prophets [*Isaiah*, etc.].

Prostitution in Christian Times. Prostitution begins at a very low level of savage life—among the Melanesians—

and was common in all ancient civilizations. The only point of interest here is whether it was less in volume, in proportion to population, or more stringently controlled in Christian than in pagan times. The ban which the Churches put upon sex literature is doubtless sincere; but one effect of it is that on this point the ideas of Christians and some others are grotesquely false to the historical facts, and the language in which their preachers and writers delicately and vaguely refer to it provokes the smiles of the social historian. Their allusions to the "nameless vices" of the Greeks and Romans are really a repetition of Paul's charges against the *Christians* of Corinth, and they are entirely ignorant that these perversities were at least as common in the most Christian period, from the eleventh to the sixteenth century, and are as common to-day in Catholic lands like South Italy and Greece as they ever were (except in certain provinces of China). In the case of prostitution, it is true, no informed student will accuse them of libelling pagan character, as they do in so many other respects. What is culpable in their vague talk about vice and depravity in the ancient world is the suggestion that there was *more* vice, especially sexual perversion, then than in subsequent Christian ages. Even the extraordinary picture of this aspect of Greek life, mainly at Alexandria, in *The Deipnosophists* (Book XIII) of Athenæus is scarcely as bad as the picture of life in Papal Avignon in the fourteenth century left us by Petrarch in his *Letters Without A Title*, or the entirely veracious account of life in Papal Rome in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries compiled from the authorities by Rodocanachi in his *Courtisanes et buffons* (1894). We must remember also two very important differences. In Greek and Roman days there was no general looseness among wives and ordinary unmarried women, and this itself led to a great increase of the professional class, whereas all our authorities are agreed that in Christian Europe during the Middle Ages (*Age of Chivalry and Renaissance*) the women were quite generally unchaste. The second difference is that in Greek and

Roman times men did not violate any religious command, or even the teaching of the philosophers, in having recourse to these women, whereas Christian men defied the most imperious injunction of the Church ethic. Both Xenophon (*Memorable Things*) and Plato (*The Banquet*) tell us that Socrates did not require virtue in unmarried men. Aristotle, preferring his mistress, Herpyllis, to marriage, could hardly do so, and Zeno [see] was remarkably liberal. In spite of these differences, however, there is no evidence that prostitution was worse in ancient Rome than in normal Christian times. A Roman writer of the time of Trajan says that the police, who controlled these women, reported 31,000 of them (to a million people). Compare the statement of the very conscientious magistrate, Colquhoun, that in his time (say 1800-10) the London police reported that there were in the city (with a million people) 25,000 regular and a further 25,000 occasional prostitutes, and in addition a vast amount of vice in the general body of citizens. They had been even more numerous in proportion to population in the later Middle Ages. Equally false is the charge that there was in Rome an extraordinary volume of perversity. The statement that the Romans had vices that are now extinct is quite absurd, yet is sometimes made by other writers than apologists. Dr. Sanger, for instance, says in his *History of Prostitution* (1919) that, in Martial, "pictures of revolting pruriency succeed each other rapidly," and that the poet uses words for which "a man would be turned out of a modern brothel." One has only to read Havelock Ellis or any expert on sex to see the real absurdity of the latter statement. Any man who can and cares to read Martial's *Epigrams* in the original will not find a reference to vice in four pages out of five; and the vices mentioned have been known in all ages.

The chief mistake, however, is the suggestion that prostitution was less in Christian than in pagan times. The Catholic writer Dufour (*Histoire de la prostitution*, 6 vols., 1851-61) shows that, while the collapse of the Empire necessarily led to great social changes,

the Church was not zealous to abolish the class. Augustine (*De Ordine*) declared it to be a necessary evil, and, says Dufour, "one does not find that the Councils attempted to do anything to eradicate prostitution from the civil life of Christian society." But we need not linger over the first part of the Middle Ages. From the work of the priest Salvianus [see] to the Penitentials [see] of the eighth and ninth centuries, the *Liber Gomorrhæicus*, and the Norman History of the monk Ordericus Vitalis (describing an appalling spread of sodomy over France and England) in the eleventh century, we find life comprehensively gross. Professional prostitution on a large scale and of every type grew again with the restoration of trade and wealth and the increase of schools (which were sometimes in the same building as brothels). People who have a natural distaste for reading works on these matters ought at least to hesitate to accept Catholic assurances of mediæval virtue. When one examines any detailed and authoritative history of the subject, such as those of Dufour, Bloch, M. Bauer (*Das Liebesleben in der deutschen Vergangenheit*, 1924), Rabutaux, L. Reuss, Sorge etc., one must conclude that from the twelfth to the end of the eighteenth century prostitution was more rife and more flagrant than ever; and this is in harmony with the lesson of many other articles of this Encyclopædia [**Avignon; Baths; Chivalry; Feast of Fools; Marriage; Middle Ages; etc.**]. A French priest who had a most extensive knowledge of classical and mediæval literature found that while the wicked Greeks had about fifty words for the sex act, and the Romans (including Dr. Sanger's Martial) about the same number, the French of the Middle Ages had 300. Compare Rabelais. And the evil had a brazenness that would never have been tolerated in Athens, Alexandria, or Rome. In 1189 ships took 300 prostitutes to the Crusaders in Palestine, and St. Louis complained bitterly of the same traffic in the Sixth Crusade. Thousands of them—the Swiss, in 1476, found 2,000 left behind in one camp after the defeat of the Emperor—accompanied armies, and hundreds flocked to

important Church Councils. In London the pious Mayor, Sir W. Walworth, drew a large revenue from the colony of brothels which any child could see across the river (Stow's *Survey of London*), and, by 1500, special brothels for priests and monks existed in the city, and some of the suburban nunneries were public brothels (Archdeacon Hale's *Series of Precedents and Proceedings in Criminal Cases*, 1847). In Germany the cities owned brothels, lit the way to them with lamps when princes visited them, and had the choicest of the "cathedral girls" at the chief civic banquets. In both Germany and France the women walked in the processions, with banners of their patron saints, on holy days. Their houses, very often owned by the clergy or monks, and sometimes by nuns, were often known as "abbeys." In Rome the Church (even under the stern reformer Sixtus IV) drew a revenue of £10,000 (or five times as much in modern value) a year by taxing them, and some popes sent choice specimens to the officers of visiting monarchs, or had them to dance in the Vatican, while those who catered to the richest prelates made £10,000 a year or more (Rodocanachi). It was the same in every country, and the situation was little changed by the Reformation and Counter-Reformation. A Huguenot work, *The King's Cabinet* (1581), audaciously declared that the French clergy and monks at that time were served by 300,000 married women and nuns, and 470,000 prostitutes and sodomists. Even if we divide the figure by ten, it is monstrous. In Spain the pious Ferdinand and Isabella gave their steward the right to establish a brothel; and in Spain there were luxurious garden colonies of the most attractive character. For England read Casanova's account of his experience in London, or Traill's *Social England* (Vol. IV), and, for America, A. W. Calhoun's *Social History of the American Family* (Vol. II, Ch. VII). Details must, however, be read in the manuals listed above. These make it clear that from the twelfth to the early nineteenth century prostitution was at least as extensive as, and more brazen than, in the ancient World, and incomparably worse than in recent

times. See McCabe's *Story of the World's Oldest Profession* (1932, published in America).

Prostitution, Sacred. Prof. Toy says, in his *Introduction to the History of Religions* (1913), that there were sacred prostitutes (often called *hierodouloi*) in the temples of Babylon, Canaan, Syria, Phœnicia, Asia Minor, Armenia, and Greece, and are now in West Africa and India (p. 516). Most of the authorities do not admit this as far as Babylon is concerned, though references in the Epic of Gilgamesh suggest it in Mesopotamia at an earlier date; and there is no evidence of sacred prostitution in Egypt. The classic area of the practice was from Phœnicia, Syria, and Asia Minor, whence the Greeks (in the temple of Aphrodite at Corinth) derived it, across early Mesopotamia to India. This is the area in which agriculture began and the earliest civilizations appeared, and we may conjecture that the practice naturally arose in connection with the cult of Mother Earth and fertility. Prof. Toy observes that it was not at all degrading. This is true in the sense that the women and the frequenters of the temples had come to regard the life as normal, but in most cases one would hardly say that the religious impulse which had originated the practice was preserved. It was maintained for very human reasons and for the sake of the revenues of the temples. Even in West Africa (A. B. Ellis, *The Ewe-Speaking Peoples of the Slave Coast of West Africa*, 1890) sensuality and profit are the preponderant motives. The Hebrews came late into the sphere of civilization, and borrowed the practice, both male and female, when it had lost its primitive sincerity. The prohibition of raising money for the temple by "whores" and "sodomites" in Deuteronomy (xxiii, 17-18) would, on the Fundamentalist chronology, put the practice at a very early date, but we have no idea when this was written. However, repeated references in the historical books, which would hardly be invented by the Ezraists, show that it was a common feature of temple life to the time of Josiah. See 1 *Kings* xiv, 24, and xv, 12, 2 *Kings* xxiii, 7 etc., The

latter text, in fact the entire twenty-third chapter, shows the extent of the practice in the seventh century. It is another illustration of the curious psychology of Bible-readers that they shudder at the name of Babylon because sacred prostitution is alleged in a passage of Herodotus which most experts reject, yet they have in what they call the Word of God these very numerous and blunt references to it in the religious life of the Hebrews.

Protagoras (about 481–511 B.C.). A Greek of the Abdera (Ionic) School who taught rhetoric and philosophy with remarkable success in the cities of Greece. It is of interest, in connection with popular ideas about Greece, that he found large audiences in all cities except Athens, from which he had to fly for his life on a charge of Atheism, although he was a friend of Pericles. Diogenes Laertius says, in his *Lives of the Philosophers* (IX, 51), that he had written a book which began: "Of the gods I cannot say whether they exist or not."

Protestantism. All branches of Christianity apart from the Roman, Greek, and Oriental except, in common usage, the Unitarians, who were not considered to be Christians until modern losses persuaded the other Churches to be more hospitable. In 1521 the Diet of Worms put Luther and his followers under the ban of the Empire. A compromise was effected when they became powerful, and when this was annulled at the Diet of Speyer, in 1529, a "protestation" was drawn up by a number of princes and cities. Their followers came to be known as the "protestants," though German Evangelicals prefer the name Lutherans.

Prothyl. A name, meaning "first (or fundamental) matter," invented by Prof. (Sir W.) Crookes for a mysterious "radiant matter" which he found in vacuum tubes. Though its nature could not at the time be understood, it came from a break-up of atoms as we now know it. This was in 1879, and Loeb and Adams say, in their *Development of Physical Thought* (1933, p. 463), that the "consensus of opinion" was with Crookes in his suggestion that this proved that the atoms were composed of smaller particles of some

primitive matter. Haeckel laid stress on this in his *Riddle* (p. 79); yet forty years after Crooke's discovery, which was discussed all over Europe, and twenty years after Haeckel's popularization of it, English literature and journalism echoed everywhere the disdainful assurances of Jeans and Eddington that "nineteenth-century Materialism" had taken up the dogmatic position that atoms were *not* composed of particles of some more fundamental element. [See *Atoms*.]

Proudhon, Pierre Joseph (1809–65), French economist. A self-educated working man who won a 1,500-franc prize for an essay, entered college, and had his scholarship withdrawn for writing his famous book, *Property* (1840). He studied Hebrew for the purpose of criticizing the Bible, and mastered the philosophies of Kant and Hegel. One commonly finds him dismissed as a shallow radical, but the great French encyclopædia (*Grande Encyclopédie*) says that he "occupies an important position in French thought," and the famous conservative critic Ste. Beuve treats him with respect in his study of him (*P. J. Proudhon*, 1873). His works, mainly on economics, run to twenty-six volumes, and often express his Atheism.

Psalms, The. An anthology of Hebrew songs and hymns which were sung to the accompaniment of the "psaltery," a string instrument. They range from deeply religious hymns, sometimes borrowed [see *Boulaq Hymn*] from superior nations, to bloodthirsty chants of vengeance and gay wedding songs. Ever since criticism was permitted in the Churches, scholars have recognized that the ascription of them to David is an audacious anachronism. They belong to the Hebrew literary period from the sixth to the second century. Yet the Biblical Commission which the Church of Rome appointed in the present century solemnly announced to the Catholic world on May 1, 1910: "It cannot prudently be denied that David is the chief author of the songs of the Psaltery"; and of this the *Catholic Encyclopædia* makes a lame defence. It may be of interest that the secretary and one of the chief experts of this

Vatican Commission was a London priest, Fr. David Fleming, friend and professor of theology to the present writer, and he was in private conversation a most advanced critic and a friend of Loisy.

Psyche. Its literal meaning is "breath," and, as many simple peoples regarded the "soul" as passing away with the last breath, it came to have that meaning. It was also the name of a goddess in later Greek mythology. In the Homeric poems the Psyche is, as it was generally among the Semitic peoples, a shadowy double of man. In Pythagoras and Plato it reached the term of its development along this line and became a spiritual self-conscious being imprisoned in a material body (of the comforts of which, nevertheless, Plato was very appreciative, as his letters testify). Aristotle reduced it to an immaterial mind which could not live and function apart from the body. The spiritual idea, however, was strongly maintained in the Orphic and the Eleusinian Mysteries, so that it was no novelty to the Greeks in the Christian religion. No later Greek-Roman thinkers, except the small and eccentric group of the Neo-Platonists, admitted it even in the Aristotelian sense. The notion was preserved in the word "psychology" (the science of the psyche), which Aristotle had invented, and was restored to currency by the Arab-Persians, who had no works of the Ionic school and in any case found Aristotle's philosophy a good protective cloak against Moslem fanatics. The Scholastics, borrowing from the Arabs, heavily adulterated Aristotle's psychology, making it a body of "proofs" of the spirituality and immortality of the soul. Modern psychology [see] replaced "soul" by "mind," and has now for the most part substituted "behaviour" for "mind." Prof Spearman and a few supporters have given the name "psyche" to a vague permanent element which they profess to have detected under the ever-changing phenomena of the mental life.

Psychical Research. The Society for Psychical Research was founded in Great Britain in 1882, when the amazing initial success of Spiritualism had per-

sued even a few scientific men to yield to the gross frauds of mediums; but the exposure of their trickery had checked the movement. The new society professed to engage, without any prepossessions, in an inquiry into the claims put forward, but the names of the early supporters (Lodge, Barrett, Crookes, Sidgwick, Richet, A. Lang, Myers, etc.) sufficiently indicated that it hoped to find some truth in the phenomena, and, on the whole, that has remained the character of the movement. An American Society was formed a few years later.

Psycho-Analysis. A psychological theory, with practical applications, invented in the closing years of the last century by Prof. Freud. It began (1880-2) as a practical method of dealing with hysterical or neurasthenic patients by hypnotism, and gradually developed a theory that disorders and some other features of the mental life were due to phenomena (generally repressed desires or memories) in an extensive subconscious region which could be explored and cured by questioning and by the interpretation of dreams in which they revealed themselves. In 1907 a Swiss psychologist, Dr. Jung, who had a religious dislike of Freud's preponderant emphasis on sex, and in 1911 Dr. Adler of Vienna, proposed alternative theories of the subconscious. The general public found these less attractive than the stress on sex, especially in America. The psycho-analysing of neurotic and other ladies became a very profitable occupation, and the Press and novelists adopted the verbiage to an extraordinary extent. Details of the three systems may be read in any encyclopædia. Professional psychologists now notice the theory very briefly. The only points of interest here are, first, that Freud's theory is out of line with the general development of psychology in insisting on the reality and "psychic" nature of mind, and secondly, that the popular idea that Freud discovered the subconscious is wrong. Long before the end of the last century Prof. W. James insisted on the neglected exploration of the subconscious, and even a popular writer like W. H. Mallock described the mind as an ice-

berg "which floats with most of its bulk submerged" (McCabe's *Haeckel's Critics Answered*, 1903, p. 57). Most psychologists preferred to speak of the "unconscious," and this is more in accord with the present teaching of psychology about the mechanism of memory and about our fundamental (bodily) urges or impulses. C. E. Wager's *Secrets of the Mind* (1940) is a recent exposition of Psycho-Analysis, with very exaggerated claims of its influence on psychology, and much misrepresentation of the influence of Behaviourism. Prof. J. G. Taylor's admirable *Popular Psychological Fallacies* (1938, Ch. VI) has a trenchant criticism of the theory.

Psychological Argument, The religious. The collapse of the old evidences for the existence of God [see] led the better-educated apologists to fall back upon what they call psychological evidence: the affirmation by one's "inner sense" or instinct or intuition or religious consciousness that God exists. The germ of this argument was contained in the feeblest of all the older evidences, the claim that the entire race agrees in affirming the existence of God, and that there must therefore be something in the nature of the mind itself that testifies to it. This old argument always rested upon a false account of the beliefs of lower races, whose testimony in any case it was quite incongruous to invoke, and it is in complete discredit to-day. We have seen [Culture and Religion; God] that, throughout history, disbelief in gods has always grown in proportion to knowledge and freedom of discussion, and is in our age of vastly greater knowledge and freedom enormously more widespread than ever, such shrinkage of Atheism [see] as there has been in the last ten years being due to Fascist-Clerical violence. The position of Theism, or reasoned belief in God, was, however, so desperate that, especially after the publication of *The Varieties of Religious Experience* (1902), by Prof. W. James, religious sophistry concentrated on this line. Some argue that "inner" senses have as much right to be consulted as outer senses, but they do not explain why we should rely on these vague oracles in

regard to religious assertions of fact when we would not dream of consulting them on any other statements of fact. All these writers [a list is given in the article on God] completely ignore the fact that modern psychology does not recognize any such religious consciousness, sense, instinct, or intuition. With their usual irritating narrowness of view, and ignorance of science, the apologists turned to psychology for aid just when it was rejecting as an ancient fallacy the basis on which they built. The development was so flagrant or desperate that other divines repudiated it with disgust. The learned Dean Rashdall says in his *Ideas and Ideals* (1928): "I am personally conscious of no such immediate knowledge of God . . . I am sure that the vast majority of my fellow-men, including the most religious of them, are in the same state of mind" (p. 11); and he adds that his position has "the support of nearly all the philosophers, nearly all the theologians, and nearly all the great religious minds" (p. 21). Prof. R. H. Thouless (*An Introduction to the Psychology of Religion*, 1923) protests that they do not want to "create a new and mystifying psychology for religion." There is no need. Social Psychology [see] fully explains their consciousness of God; it is the result of environment (teachers, home, literature, preachers, etc.), in nearly all cases from infancy onwards, and in the great majority of cases it rests upon unsound arguments or none. [Other works are listed under God.] The symposium edited by Dr. N. B. Harman, *Religion and the New Psychology* (1924), has a very misleading title. Only one article deals with the subject, and it shows that modern psychology gives no support to religion.

Psychology, Modern. Aristotle, the genius who founded psychology, left to the mediæval Arabs and Schoolmen, since no other Greek thinkers attempted a scientific analysis of the mind, a theory that it is an immaterial "form" intimately and necessarily bound up with the body and endowed with a number of separate faculties. Even the most gifted of the Arab-Persian thinkers, Averroes and Avicenna, added little of importance to Aristotle in this field, and

the Schoolmen made psychology a branch of philosophy, which they expressly called "the handmaid of theology." They were less interested in the analysis of the mind than in finding "rational proofs" of its spirituality and immortality. Subsequent thinkers generally followed either Plato or Aristotle until Locke [see] put forward the basis of an empirical science and the method of research by asserting that "nothing in the intellect that did not reach it through the senses." It was, however, not until the nineteenth century that a genuine science of mind, correlating the results of introspection with a study of the brain and nerves, began to appear. The theory of "faculties" was discarded, and the contents of the mind or our "states of consciousness"—the presentations, perceptions, concepts, emotions, etc., known to us by introspection or reflection—were analysed and classified with a steadily increasing precision. This, the main work of psychology and the basis of its practical applications in education, industry, etc., is generally irrelevant to the religious issue. Short notices in this work give the modern attitude as regards instinct, intellect, reason, and emotion, and show how only a few representatives of the shrinking mystic school now admit intuition (or *a priori* ideas), and hardly one authority in ten admits "will" except (in some cases) as a class-name for certain types of emotional-intellectual acts and states. The science is still subject to severe criticism. Some protest that there is no science of psychology (Prof. Wordsworth). One French writer, C. Suarès, has a work entitled *The Comedy of Psychology* (1932), and even McDougall calls it "a chaos of dogmas and opinions." But every modern manual contains, besides much that is common to psychology and physiology, a great deal of accepted and valuable information about our mental processes; the different elements or stages of perceiving and thinking, our fundamental or innate urges (the dynamo), attention, reading, memory, emotion, sensation, etc. Here we have to consider only the relation of modern psychology—which we may decline to call the "new" psychology,

since there has been a quite gradual development—to the Rationalist-religious issue; or, in other words, the present attitude of psychologists in regard to the nature of the mind and the question whether it is something distinct from the brain. Psychologists commonly insist, or until recently insisted, that this question does not fall within the range of their science. The truth is that when science in modern times became impatient of the old ruling that it must confine itself to "material" things and leave "spiritual" to philosophy and religion, when it began to advance along the lines of psychology, ethics, aesthetics, and comparative religion, it protected itself by a timid and really unscientific protest that it aimed only to describe and classify, and would not discuss the nature of mind, the moral sense, or religion. In psychology this led to the general acceptance, during several decades, of a system called "psychophysical parallelism." The work of Bain, Spencer, Ribot, Wundt, Titchener, W. James, and others made it impossible to maintain the old disdain of cerebral processes, but it was held that the work of the psychologist was to establish the reality of the two parallel series of "psychic" and neural processes and decline to speculate on what some still call "underlying" realities. It was, however, well known that most of the leading experts privately held the materialistic view, and the old attitude is being abandoned. The relevant matter here is to inform the reader to what extent this change has proceeded and what is the present trend of the science.

The task is complicated by two characteristics of psychological literature. The first is that, owing to the wide popularity, especially in America (where personal and commercial profit from it are loudly advertised), of the subject, the libraries are littered with works by writers who have no, or very little, authority. Opinions will differ as to where the line should be drawn; but the attempt is made here to ignore all works, whether for or against the materialistic view of mind, which are not seriously representative of the state of the science. The second circumstance

is that, admittedly, psychology differs from all other sciences in the wealth of its conflicting theories, even on fundamental issues. Every manual describes the clash of antagonistic schools (Noegenetic, Gestaltist, Behaviourist, Hormic, Organismal, Psycho-analytic, etc.). Dr. Heilbreder has a description of them in her *Seven Psychologies* (1933), and remarks that her work will give many the feeling that the science is "one of the wasted and hopeless efforts of the human race," though she significantly adds that one of the few points of agreement is that increasingly they "regard man as an animal reacting to his environment as other animals do" (p. 417). Prof. F. S. Kelley (a Gestaltist) surveys all schools in his *Definition of Psychology* (1937), and admits that the whole science now betrays "a strong behaviouristic influence" (p. 104) and that for the last forty years it has ceased to be described as "the science of mind." This confusion is in large part due to the very obvious fact that psychology and theology overlap. We saw in the preceding article that large numbers of theologians now hold that the science actually furnishes arguments for religion—a new "handmaid of theology"—and it is taught in every sectarian or semi-sectarian (under religious influence) university and college; besides that even a professional psychologist who holds religious views (which means about one in ten of the leading authorities in Leuba's analysis) is bound to be influenced by them in regard to the nature of mind. Thus one often finds that conservative manuals are, though it is not stated, written by clergymen (Dr. F. Aveling's *Psychology, the Changing Outlook*, 1937), or by professors in sectarian colleges (L. E. Cole, *General Psychology*, 1939, etc.). Even (S. G. McLellan, *The New Psychology*, 1939, etc.) non-sectarian universities are apt, especially in America, to be sensitive to religious influence, which¹⁰ would certainly not tolerate even a suggestion that mind is not a reality; and some years ago a well-known American journalist attended classes in a number of universities for the express purpose of detecting and publishing heresy in the professors.

When we take all this into account, we find, in the substantial psychological literature of the last ten years, a strong and rapidly increasing tendency to deny the reality of mind or to retain the word only as a name for functions of the nervous system. Chiefly important are symposia or composite works by professors of leading American universities. In *Factors Determining Human Behaviour* (1937), a symposium published by Harvard University, Prof. Adrian says that "human nature is pre-eminently the affair of the cerebral cortex" (p. 8), and Prof. Jung writes: "It is not astonishing to find a widely accepted point of view that regards psychology as merely a chapter in physiology" (p. 49). In *An Orientation of Science* (1938), by nine leading American professors, the section on psychology is by Prof. W. Berry, who says that psychology "is now generally included in what are called the biological sciences," and is defined as "that branch of science which studies human behaviour." In the symposium *Brain Mechanisms and Intelligence* (1929) we read that psychologists are now "less concerned to establish a distinction between physiology and psychology" (p. 8), and that they study "stimulation and response"; and Prof. E. G. Boring (of Harvard), one of the group of writers, goes so far, in his recent *Introduction to Psychology* (1939), as to say: "A man is a mass of protoplasm moving about on the face of the earth" (p. 6), and he defines psychology as "the study of his behaviour." Prof. J. R. Rutter and T. S. Karwoski (*Human Psychology*, 1937) define psychology as "the study of man's reactions to his environment"; Profs. H. C. Warren and L. Carmichael (*Elements of Human Psychology*, 1930) as "the science which deals with the interaction between man and his environment by means of the nervous system and its terminal organs together with the mental events which accompany this interplay" (p. 5); and Profs. Shaffer, Gilmer, and Schoen (*Psychology*, 1940), who never mention the word "mind," as "the science of human behaviour" or of "the adjustment of the individual to its environment." Of works by single writers, we may select those which

embody class-material given in universities or are manuals for college use and published in the last few years. Prof. Hoisington (*Psychology*, 1935) says emphatically that "mind is nothing over and above bodily responses . . . integrated sensory-motor responses." Prof. E. B. Skaggs (*A Textbook of Empirical and Theoretical Psychology*, 1935) says in his introduction: "Mind or consciousness is (here) assumed to be but an epiphenomenon, a curious and most interesting by-product of physiological processes in the body" (p. 9). Prof. G. D. Higginson (*Psychology*, 1936) says: "We have definitely discarded the concept of mind—conscious or unconscious" (p. 424). Prof. J. H. Griffiths (*The Psychology of Human Behaviour*, 1935) says that "to-day many psychologists maintain that mind has no more scientific validity than the soul" (p. 15), and he agrees with them. Prof. K. Dunlap (*Elements of Psychology*, 1936) gives nine meanings of the word "mind" and considers it too ambiguous to be of any use. Prof. J. F. Dashiell (*General Psychology*, 1938) never mentions mind, consciousness, or will. Prof. J. P. Guilford (*General Psychology*, 1939) says that "so far as we know, mental activity cannot take place apart from nervous tissue any more than digestion can take place apart from digestive organs" (p. 4); that the distinction between brain and mind is "merely that between structure and function" (p. 23), and that mind is "the functioning of the entire nervous system" (p. 24). Prof. J. G. Taylor (*Popular Psychological Fallacies*, 1938) says that "modern psychology has abandoned the Cartesian distinction between body and mind" and the idea that mind is a "mysterious and indefinable substance" (p. 24). All these are university professors, writing as they teach in class and speaking in the name of science, not airing individual opinions; and these are the majority of the chief manuals of equal authority published in the last six or seven years. British writers of the same standing are less outspoken, and are apt to say that this issue is a matter of philosophy, not psychology; though most of them accept the definition of the

science as the study of behaviour. British psychology has been largely overshadowed by the work of Prof. (Emeritus) G. E. Spearman, of London University, who holds that there is a vague permanent element in the mind, though he dissociates it from the old mysticism by calling it the Psyche. His masterly historical survey (*Psychology Down the Ages*, 2 vols., 1937) leads up to an exposition of his theory. This element of his psychology, it should be said, is not even mentioned in nine American manuals of the science out of ten. His successor at London University, Prof. J. C. Flugel, makes a useful survey of the modern development (*A Hundred Years of Psychology*, 1933), but does not commit himself on the issue here discussed. Very few keep the old-fashioned view of mind, as Prof. Joad does; and Joad became professor (at Birkbeck College) only after his retirement from the Civil Service. In view of the extraordinary variety of the literature, both in authority and in objectivity, it would be futile to attempt a numerical classification; but the above quotations will show how completely false is the statement of apologists that only a few followers of Prof. J. Watson proceed on materialistic lines, or the claim that Behaviourism [see] has not profoundly influenced psychology. [See also **Brain and Mind**, and, for the evolutionary evidence which has had a decisive influence, **Prehistoric Man**.]

Ptah Hotep. A papyrus (the *Prisse Papyrus*) containing a short and extraordinarily modern manual of moral counsels was discovered in the remains of ancient Egypt, and has the title *The Maxims of Ptah Hotep*. Opinions differ widely about the date and the authorship. Breasted puts it about 2000 B.C. or earlier; Erman about 2700; Amélineau about 3000. There is, perhaps, a growing agreement to regard Ptah Hotep as a real person, an official of about 2600 B.C. He is in his sentiments, says Prof. Parton, "worthy of being compared to Confucius." He completely ignores the Egyptian gods, and speaks occasionally of "God" much as a sceptic might in a pious age. A translation of the work was published by B. G. Gunn (1906).

Ptolemies, The. The rule of the Ptolemies in Egypt (323–31 B.C.) is an historical period of the greatest importance in connection with the question whether religion promotes, and scepticism retards, the progress of civilization. Ptolemy I was a Macedonian noble, a favourite general (and probably half-brother) of Alexander the Great. He obtained Egypt at the division of Alexander's empire, and, however ignorant and sensual he may have been, he proved a most beneficent and constructive monarch, laying in virgin soil the foundations of the chief civilization between the decay of Athens and the rise of Rome. The city of Alexandria, built by him on waste ground, owed nothing of its inspiration to Egypt, which did little more than furnish revenue to the Ptolemies; yet it became the greatest and most prosperous city of the world, and with finer cultural institutions than any other ancient city. These (chiefly the Museum and its Library) were included in the plan of Ptolemy I, who began to attract scholars and poets from the whole Greek world. He resigned in 285 in favour of his son, Ptolemy II, who completed the splendour and cultural life of the city. Isolated from the mythology alike of Egypt and of Greece—though the Ptolemies built fine temples for both races—the constructive class was generally sceptical; yet the city was as happy and prosperous as Rome under Hadrian, science was carried to the highest point it reached in the ancient world, and literature in all its branches was assiduously cultivated by a brilliant colony of State-supported writers. In two generations a predominantly sceptical body had raised one of the finest of the old civilizations out of a waste. The city itself was laid out and adorned with lavish generosity and shone with marble mansions and beautiful parks and gardens, while of the luxury and gaiety of its life we have a rare picture in the *Deipnosophoi* (English translation by Gulick, 7 vols., 1927–41) of Athenæus (which inspired Pierre Louy's *Aphrodite*). London under Elizabeth, and Paris under Louis XIV, were sordid in comparison. Yet, though the clerical Hellenist Prof. Mahaffy wrote an

appreciative *Empire of the Ptolemies* (1895), and Weigall has cleared Cleopatra, the last member of the Macedonian dynasty, of the romantic legends about her (*The Life and Times of Cleopatra* 1914), most people know only the follies of some of the later Ptolemies in a city which somehow cultivated mathematics and begot the absurdities of Neo-Platonism.

Puberty and Religion. For an account of the ceremonies which attend the attainment of puberty in lower peoples see the article in the *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics*. In recent times a good deal has been written on the liability of youths and girls to religious conversion when they reach the age of puberty. The best discussion is in Stanley Hall's *Adolescence* (1928, Vol. II, Ch. XIV, "The Adolescent Psychology of Conversion"). The distinguished educator finds a general agreement of revivalists that most conversions occur at the age of fourteen or fifteen and concludes that "the age of religion and that of sexual maturity coincide" (p. 292). He does not attempt a psychological analysis, and, since such "conversions" are scarcely ever permanent, the phenomenon does not invite a profound inquiry. Nervous emotional instability is almost enough to explain it. Explanation is now, however, superfluous. The Churches to-day admit that their worst losses are of children from fourteen to seventeen (after leaving the elementary school), and public schools do not report any particular religiosity in boys and girls of that age. In Russia and Germany boys and girls of that age were just as easily detached from the Churches as youths and young women. The facts which gave rise to the belief in a special liability to conversion at puberty were due to the peculiarities of the old type of revival meeting. The modern (and professional) American revivalist has not the same effect on the young (personal observation). The Roman Church [see], in particular, admits very heavy losses (up to 60 per cent.) of boys at or just after maturity. The vague saturation of the nervous system with new desires now finds its satisfaction in new institutions (cinema, etc.).

Purgatory. In Catholic theology a

place or state in which the souls of the dead are punished by fire, but not eternally if they have not died "in grievous and unabsolved sin." The grim doctrine of the early Church, that a man who committed any serious sin after baptism went to hell and could not be absolved, shocked the better-educated Christians of Alexandria, and Origen and Clement suggested punishment for a time for the lighter offenders. They were to be "purged" or purified. The idea was based upon vague statements in the Gospels (*Matthew* xii, 32, etc.), and Augustine further developed it. In the Middle Ages it became an extraordinarily profitable doctrine through the sale of indulgences [see] and the performing (for money) of Masses for the dead.

Puritans, The. The word had not at first an ethical meaning, but denoted those who in the sixteenth century stood for the purity of the Protestant reforms and resisted Anglo-Catholic attempts to impose ritual and vestments. These were naturally the more religious Evangelicals, and they went on to oppose dancing and all gay or loose practices. They formed the body of the rebels against Charles I, but there were at first many sceptics (democrats) among them. A sour tyranny rapidly developed, and witch-hunting was intensified. A Royalist officer said to a Roundhead: "In our army we have the sins of men—drinking and wenching—but in yours you have those of devils." What is now generally suppressed, while the dreariness of Puritan life is represented as exaggerated, is the fact that there was a large amount of vice among the Puritans. In Scotland, where the dourness of the prevailing piety is incontestable, this prevalence of vice is equally beyond dispute. Buckle—whom Cotter Morison follows in his *Service of Man* (1903, pp. 60-2)—quoted the evidence in his *History of Civilization* (II, 395-8) from the authoritative Scottish works, Burton's *History of Scotland* (VI, 322) and Chambers's *Domestic Annals of Scotland* (II, 42). Rape, seduction, infanticide, and sodomy were very rife. Chambers says: "The number of cases of uncommon turpitude in a time of extraordinary religious purism forces

itself upon our attention. . . . Offences of a horrible and unnatural kind continued to abound to a degree which makes the daylight profligacy of the subsequent reign (that of Charles II) shine white in comparison" (II, 240). Large numbers of men, from boys to old men, and many women were, he says, burned alive on Castle Hill at Edinburgh. Our politer age now suppresses such facts, and in consequence the modern puritan sighs for the ages of faith. Rupert Hughes made a similar research, with much the same result, in American literature of the Puritan period, but even works like Fisher's *Men, Women, and Manners in Colonial Times* (2 vols., 1898) show a good deal of indulgence. "Bundling"—a practice of engaged but unmarried young men and women sleeping together in their parents' houses—was common in the greater part of New England, and there was much scoffing at the claim that it was innocent. Those who think that if deeply religious ages did not promote art and general civilization, they at least elevated morals, ought to insist on knowing all the facts.

Purpose. [See *Teleology and Dysteleology* for the claim that a purpose or design is revealed in nature or evolution.] It is often made a charge against Rationalism that, when the creeds are abandoned, men and women see no end or purpose in life and yield either to depression or dissipation. It is a piece of insincere rhetoric for which no positive evidence is ever given. Neither in biography, nor in the large body of fiction written by sceptics who faithfully depict life, nor in any contemporary expressions, could one find justification for the statement. The pessimism [see] one sometimes encounters in this literature is due either to the mental confusion of literary sceptics—not noticeably unhappy themselves—of superficial views, or to the bitterness of men like Ibsen, who see that the majority of men, whether Christians or non-Christians, fall very far short of the ideals they recognize. In some religious writers the charge arises from a simple confusion of ideas. The abandonment of the creeds certainly means the rejection of the idea that a purpose was imposed

upon life by God; but this leaves men, as a race or in social groups, free to fix their own purpose or goal of endeavour: an ideal of a finer character in the individual and a higher or better social order. The occasional claim—it was solemnly repeated by Lord Samuel at the 1941 International Congress of Faiths—that the loss of a purpose in life is responsible for the major disorders of our time is not worth discussing. The minority of ambitious and greedy men in Germany and Italy who were responsible for the disorders hardly represent the nine-tenths of the modern race that sternly condemns them. In fact, of its eleven leaders hanged in 1946, six were Catholics and five Protestants.

Pushkin, Alexander Sergeyevich (1799–1837), famous Russian poet. A youth of aristocratic birth, educated in the Imperial Lyceum, who came under the influence of the great French Rationalists. While still a young man he criticized religion so severely in his poems that he was banished for a few years to South Russia. After his return to St. Petersburg he was recognized as the greatest poet Russia had yet produced. His works, including stories and historical studies, were published in twelve volumes (1838–41). He was fatally wounded fighting a duel on behalf of his wife.

Putnam, George Haven, A.M., LL.D. (1844–1930), American writer and publisher. Educated at American, French, and German universities, he rose to the rank of Major in the Civil War, after which he founded the famous publishing house G. P. Putnam's Sons. He was an Agnostic (personal knowledge), a stern idealist and puritan, an enthusiast for reform, and a conspicuous figure in the life of New York. His chief work was *The Censorship of the Church of Rome* (2 vols., 1906–7)—a book of great learning, but weakened by his trust in Catholic priests whom he consulted.

Putnam, Samuel Palmer (1838–92), American writer. A Congregationalist minister who passed to Unitarianism

and then “gave up all relations whatever with the Christian religion and became an open and avowed Freethinker,” he says in his *Four Hundred Years of Freethought* (1894, p. 788). The work is a most valuable and interesting history of Rationalism in America. After resigning from the Civil Service he travelled 100,000 miles in ten years, giving Rationalist lectures, and was President of the American Secular Union and the Freethought Federation of America.

Pyrrho (about 360–270 B.C.), Greek philosopher. A painter who, under the influence of Democritus, turned to the study of philosophy and is counted the founder of the school of Sceptics. There is a tradition that he went to India with Alexander and lived to the age of ninety. His philosophy is said to have been summed up in the saying, “Nothing can be known”; and at least (tradition says) he wrote nothing, though he was greatly honoured in the Greek cities.

Pythagoras (sixth century B.C.), Greek philosopher. He was born in Samos, and is said to have travelled in Egypt before settling in South Italy. He was the first of the philosophers to insist on the immortality of the soul, and this is generally connected with his alleged visit to Egypt; but Benn maintains that he was influenced by a religious movement which ran through the Greek world in the sixth century. We have no works of his, but on account of the religious character of his philosophy (spirituality and transmigration, which in turn led him and his followers to an ascetic vegetarianism) his name is the best known of the Greek thinkers after those of Plato and Aristotle. His morbid asceticism, based upon the idea that the soul is imprisoned for a time in the body, appealed to few beyond his own “brotherhood,” and when his followers became aggressive and entangled in politics, they were crushed and his philosophy generally abandoned. The lingering element of it in Italy probably influenced Plato, who lived there for some years.

Q.

Quatrefages de Bréau, Prof. Jean Louis Armand, M.D., D.-ès-Sci., F.R.S. (1810-92), French zoologist. Trained in mathematics, philosophy, and medicine, he concentrated on zoology and anthropology, and in 1855 succeeded Flourens as professor of the latter at Paris University. His writings made him one of the most eminent men of science in France and brought him many international honours. As he opposed Darwinism, he is often cited in lists of "great Christian scientists," but he rejected Christianity and was nearer Agnosticism than Theism (*Études de Darwin*, 2 vols., 1894). He left open the origin of life and of species.

Quental, Anthero de (1842-91), lead-firs Portuguese poet. He studied law, thos deserted it for philosophy and letters. for early poems (*Odes modernas*, 1865, and were of the romantic school, and to imistorical and philosophical works wereed an increasing scepticism; but Evanist volume (*Os sonetos completos*, danci proved that he had passed from a Theyr pessimistic Atheism to a serene agaimsticism. He is considered the manyd greatest lyric poet of Portugal, A soud a great influence in the emanci- witch-1 of his country. See Björkmann's ist ofiro de *Quental* (1894) and the our arial volume (*In Memoriam*, 1896) by drinkip of the chief Portuguese writers. you hasnay, François, M.D. (1694-1774), generus French economist. He was a nessr peasant boy who could not read extil he was twelve, and he then devel- oped a passion for learning, mastered Latin and Greek, and was sent to Paris for courses in medicine, surgery, mathe- matics, and philosophy. He won great repote as a surgeon, but had to abandon it on account of eye-trouble, and became physician to Louis XV. His range of knowledge was such that his con- temporaries called him "the European Confucius," and he was the leading economist of his time and founder of the Physiocratic School (*La physiocratie*, 2 vols., 1807-8). He collaborated with the Encyclopædists. See the biography by Oncken prefixed to his works (*Œuvres économiques et philosophiques*, 1888).

Quételet, Lambert Adolphe Jacques (1796-1874), Belgian astronomer and statistician. Director of the Brussels Observatory, and later of the Central Statistical Commission for Belgium; professor of astronomy, geodesy, and mathematics at the Military School, Perpetual Secretary of the Academy of sciences, and eight times President of the International Statistical Congress. He is counted one of the founders of statistical science as well as of meteor- ology. His advanced Rationalism is seen in his book *Sur l'homme et le développ- ment de ses facultés* (2 vols., 1835). There is a biography by Mailly (1875) and a statue of him in Brussels.

Quidde, Prof Ludwig (1858-1929), German historian and Nobel Prize winner. He was professor of history at Munich University and Vice-President of the International Peace Conference, for his work in which he got the Nobe! Prize (1927). In 1894 he caused a last sensation by his book *Caligula*,^{now} was understood to be an attack ^{re-} Kaiser. It sold 30 editions in a ^{re-} nys- In 1895 he made and published or eloquent speech (*Welterleuchten der Re- action*) in defence of freedom to criti- cize religion, and approvingly quoted Frederic the Great's comments on Christianity.

Quinet, Prof. Edgar (1803-75), French poet and historian. After a brilliant career at French, German, and Swiss universities he became professor of literature at the Lyons Faculty of Letters and won a high repote by his writings. By an attack on the Church (*Le génie des religions*, 1842) in a period of deep reaction he roused such enthusi- asm that he was appointed professor of history at Paris University, but he was deposed for attacking religion in his lectures. For his share in the Revolu- tion of 1848 he was exiled, and he wrote a number of Rationalist works in Bel- gium. Returning to France in 1871, he sat with the anti-clericals in the Chambre. His works (28 vols., 1857-79) were of great service in the advance of Rationalism in France and Belgium.

Qu'ran, The. [See Koran.]

R.

Ra. The sun-god and chief deity of Egypt in the second millennium B.C., the centre of the cult being Heliopolis (the City of the Sun). The cult was not native to Egypt and seems to have been introduced from the East.

Rabelais, François (about 1495–1553), French satirist. He became a Franciscan monk in his youth, changed to the Benedictines in disgust, then, disgusted with these in turn, ignored his vows and led a wandering life as a priest, but learned medicine and was physician to Lyons hospital for some years. At this period he wrote his famous *Pantagruel* (1533) and *Gargantua* (1535). The Sorbonne condemned the former. As physician to Bishop (later Cardinal) Jean du Bellay, a loose and luxurious prelate, he twice visited Rome and on the second occasion was condemned as a wandering (apostate) monk. It says much for the moral condition of Rome that his writings, instead of bringing a severe sentence upon him, earned a virtual acquittal, for he had simply to promise to rejoin the Benedictines, which he never did. It is now often said that his work is not obscene, but had the laudable aim of dissolving the growing sectarian bitterness in laughter. If such chapters of *Pantagruel* as XXI and XXII, Bk. II, Chapter VIII, Bk. III, etc., are not obscene, one requires a new definition. Since Sir T. Urquhart's literal translation, in the eighteenth century, all English versions fail to represent the original. The chief value of the work is in its testimony to the extreme grossness of the times. Although Rabelais sufficiently showed his scepticism by his defiance of his vows, and on many a page of his work (compare Ch. XLVII, Book IV, *Pantagruel*), he escaped ecclesiastical penalties precisely because of the grossness and indecency of his wit.

Rabl, Prof. Carl, M.D. (1853–1917), Austrian anatomist. Professor of anatomy at, in succession, Vienna, Prague, and Leipsic Universities, Director of the Anatomical Institute at Leipsic; member of the Privy Council, and recipient of a large number of national and

international honours. Rabl was one of the most distinguished anatomists of Austria and Germany, and one of the first and warmest to defend Haeckel against the charge of "forgery." In the Memorial Volume (*Was Wir Ernst Haeckel Verdanken*, II, 1–5) he tells how Haeckel converted him to Rationalism in his youth.

Rimbaud, Prof. Alfred Nicolas, D.-ès-L. (1842–1905), French historian. An authority on Russian, he was entrusted with Government missions and had a large part in bringing about the Franco-Russian *entente*. He became Minister of Public Instruction during the period of secularization and professor of contemporary history at Paris University, and he was author of the most important French historical work of modern times (*Histoire de la civilisation générale française*, 2 vols., 1887), and in collaboration with Lavishe he edited the *Histoire générale du IV siècle à nos Jours* (12 vols., 1892–1900), a work comparable to the Cambridge History. He was a thorough Rationalist and worked cordially against the Church.

Ramée, Marie Louise de la (1839–1908), novelist. Under the pen-name of "Ouida" (a child's pronunciation of Louise) she wrote about forty novels which made her name a household word in England. She was the daughter of a French Rationalist who had settled in England, and in 1895 she shocked her lady admirers by a very caustic chapter on Christianity in her *Views and Opinions*. "Of all powerless things on earth Christianity is the most powerless," she said (p. 114)—her style was more vivid than literary—and most of the stuff written about the Churches was "cant," she declared.

Ramon y Cajal, Prof. Santiago, M.D. (1852–1934), Spanish histologist, Nobel Prize winner. Professor of anatomy at, successively, Valencia, Barcelona, and Madrid Universities, and famous throughout the scientific world for his work on histology, for which he received the Nobel Prize (1906). He had the Grand Cross of the Order of Isabella

and Alfonso XII and a large number of international honours. In spite of his position he was an outspoken Materialist, and wrote a manual of science for Ferrer's Atheistic schools. As his research chiefly concerned brain and nerve tissue, he had a great part in expelling mysticism from physiology and psychology.

Ramsay, Sir William, K.C.B., F.R.S., Ph.D., D.Sc., LL.D., M.D. (1852–1916), chemist, Nobel Prize winner. He graduated in philosophy at Tübingen, where he became a Rationalist, and devoted himself to chemistry. He was professor of chemistry at Bristol University College and Principal of the College from 1881 to 1887, when he was appointed professor of chemistry at London University College, which was then still the chief centre of heterodox professors. His name is one of the greatest in the annals of inorganic chemistry. He discovered half a dozen new elements and received, besides the Nobel Prize (1904), the Davy, Hofmann, Grosse Goldene Wilhelm II, Association Française, Elliot Cresson, Longstaff, Barnard, Leconte, and other gold medals, fourteen honorary degrees, and diplomas of more than forty universities. The chief biography of him is by his very orthodox colleague, Sir W. A. Tilden (*Sir W. Ramsay*, 1918), who closes it with a Christian (and crude) motto, yet admits that Ramsay was an Agnostic (with a slight tendency to use Theistic phrases) and disbelieved in a future life. He quotes a letter of 1908 in which Ramsay writes to a friend: "Life has been pretty good to us—perhaps I should say 'God.' I feel inclined to" (p. 300).

Raspail, François Vincent (1794–1878), French chemist. In early years he taught philosophy, and took several clerical orders, in the Avignon Catholic Seminary. Abandoning the Church, he made such progress in science that he won the Montyon Prize of the Académie des Sciences (10,000 francs) in 1833 for Chemical research, and he is considered one of the founders of organic chemistry in France. He was also enthusiastic in political politics, took part in the Revolutions of 1830 and 1848, and rejected Orléanist Philippe's offer of the Legion of Honour. He worked for some years

with the anti-clericals in the Chambre and demanded the separation of Church and State.

Rational Religion. In 1839 Robert Owen united the various bodies of his followers in "The Universal Community Society of Rational Religionists." As he and practically all his followers were Agnostics—he had in 1817 declared, at an important public meeting, that "all the religions of the world are false"—it shows his influence in promoting Rationalism that the Society presently had about 100,000 members. By religion he meant devotion to moral and social ideals. The movement broke into fragments, Secularism taking over the criticism of religion, and later attempts to organize non-Theists on the basis of "rational religion" have had no large or permanent success.

Rationalism. The principle that all questions relating to religion or religious creeds must be settled by reason or by the individual critical examination of arguments and evidences, not by revelation, authority, tradition, emotion, instinct, or intuition. The word came into use in the seventeenth century. Bacon speaks of "Rationals who in the manner of spiders, spin webs from their own substance," but he here clearly refers to the Aristotelian philosophers who disdained empirical science and claimed that reason was the source of truth. In Germany, at the time, they were sometimes called Rationalists. About the middle of the century the Clarendon State Papers (App. Vol. III, p. 40) recorded the appearance of "a new sect calling themselves Rationalists," who follow "what their reason dictates to them in Church or State." In 1661 Comenius applied the name to the Socinians (Unitarians) and Deists. The word was rarely used, and was not adopted by any body of sceptics. It was usually applied to Christians who tried to prove that their faith is in harmony with reason, or to philosophers who slighted the empirical method of investigation. What are now called "Rationalists" were sceptics, infidels, Atheists, Freethinkers, or Naturalists. Kant, in the latter part of the eighteenth century, used the word in both senses,

but in Great Britain it was Owen's foundation of Rational Religion [see] which led the public to call his followers "Rationals," or "Rationalists," that made the name popular. In 1845 Holyoake published a booklet with the title *Rationalism: a Treatise for the Times*, but later preferred the word "Secularism." Others called themselves Freethinkers, Agnostics, or Atheists. The group of Agnostics, with a few liberal Theists, who were associated with C. A. Watts in 1887, adopted the word, and in 1893 founded the Rationalist Press Committee [see next article] in order to "circulate Rationalist publications," and the name was later changed to Rationalist Press Association. It defined Rationalism as "the mental attitude which unreservedly accepts the supremacy of reason and aims at establishing a system of philosophy and ethics verifiable by experience and independent of all arbitrary assumptions or authority." Psychology, meantime, has modified the definition of reason [see], and some of the Honorary Associates (Prof Dewey) and writers (Gerald Bullet) of the R.P.A. do not recognize the "supremacy" of reason in any sense. Since, moreover, Rationalists are much divided in regard to philosophy and ethics, the original definition is not pressed. Benn (*The History of English Rationalism in the Nineteenth Century*, 2 vols., 1906) defines it as "the use of reason for the destruction of religious beliefs," and Prof. Bury as "the uncompromising assertion by reason of its absolute right throughout the whole domain of thought." The principle is, in simple language, a claim that religious assertions must be subjected, like any other assertions, to intellectual criticism by any man who is concerned about the truth of his beliefs. Rationalists are, in the common usage of the term, men and women who by this use of reasoning have become convinced that religious beliefs are false. Since it would obviously be absurd to refuse the title of "Rationalist" to men like Voltaire and Paine, the name is in historical retrospect extended to Deists and Theists who rejected all Christian doctrines or who to-day declare their rejection of the

teaching of every branch of the Christian Church. Organized Rationalists, or members of the R.P.A. (which has no doctrinal or philosophical tests) and similar bodies, usually reject also the belief in God and Immortality and subscribe for the propagation of their opinions.

Rationalist Press Association, Ltd., The. An association of Rationalists formed under the Companies Act on May 26, 1899. As stated above, it grew out of the Rationalist Press Committee established by C. A. Watts, who had already founded the *Agnostic Annual* (1884) and the *Literary Guide* (1885). The original directors were R. B. Anderson, J. S. Dryden, C. T. Gorham, Clair Grece, G. J. Holyoake, J. McCabe, C. A. Watts, and A. G. Whyte. In 1902 it began to publish the R.P.A. Reprints [see Anderson], and it sold 4,000,000 copies in twenty-five years. The list of Honorary Associates, living or deceased, includes Arnold Bennett, Prof. Berthelot, B. Björnson, G. Brandes, Prof. Breasted, Prof. Buisson, Prof. Bury, G. Clemenceau, the Hon. J. Collier, C. Darrow, Prof. J. Dewey, Dr. Einstein, Dr. Freud, Sir P. Geddes, Sir R. Gregory, J. B. S. Haldane, Prof. Haddon, E. Haeckel, Sir J. Hammerton, Lord Horder, Sir T. A. Hunter, Ju. Huxley, L. Huxley, Sir A. Keith, Sir E. Ray Lankester, J. Loeb, C. Lombroso, Somerset Maugham, Sir P. C. Mitchell, Lord Morley, Sir John Boyd Orr, Prof. Pavlov, Eden Phillpotts, T. Reinach, Earl Russell, Bertrand Russell, Sir E. S. Schafer, Sir C. Sherrington, Sir G. Elliot Smith, Sir L. Stephen, H. G. Wells, and Sir H. Wood. All the Churches in Great Britain put together could not, from their 8,000,000 members, compile a list which would be half as impressive. The Association has (1946) 4,951 members and subscribers and accumulated assets of £157,000. Its registered offices are 4-6 Johnson's Court, Fleet Street, London, E.C.4. See F. J. Gould's *Pioneers of Johnson's Court* (2nd ed., 1935).

Rawlinson, Major-General Sir Henry Creswicke, Bart., K.C.B., F.R.S., D.C.L., LL.D. (1810-95), Assyriologist. During his years of military service in India, Persia, and Afghanistan, for which he

received the Persian Order of the Lion and the Sun and the Durrani Order, besides British decorations, he acquired such command of Oriental languages that he was able to discover the key to the Cuneiform Script (1844-6). He became Crown Director of the East India Company, Minister Plenipotentiary to Persia, Baronet of the Prussian Order *Pour le Mérite*, President of the Royal Asiatic Society and of the Royal Geographical Society, etc. His character was as high as his cultural distinction, but few knew that he was an advanced Rationalist. This is admitted, reluctantly, by his brother, Canon Rawlinson: "Not committed to the daily performance of those religious acts and practices which to many are the essentials of an upright life, he held the broad way of doing good because it was good" (*A Memoir of Major-General Sir H. C. Rawlinson*, 1898, p. 303). One would have thought that in the mind of a priest the "broad way" did not lead to doing good. In plain English, the famous Assyriologist was a liberal Theist who accepted no creed and (unofficially) did not go to church.

Raynal, Guillaume Thomas François (1713-96), French writer. A Jesuit priest who, through intimacy with Helvetius and D'Holbach, became a Deist and was expelled from the Society. He continued to be known as the Abbé Raynal, and was a brilliant and learned writer. In his chief work, *Histoire philosophique et politique des Établissements et du Commerce des Européens avec les Deux Indes* (4 vols., 1770), he so drastically criticized the Church and the Jesuits that it was burned by the hangman. He fled to Prussia, then to the Court of Catherine the Great, but was permitted to end his days quietly in France.

Read, Prof. Carveth, M.A. (1848-1931), philosopher. He won the Hibbert Travelling Scholarship at Cambridge and went to study at Leipsic and Heidelberg. He was Grote professor of philosophy and lecturer on comparative psychology at London University College. His most useful work is *Natural and Social Morals* (1909), in which he argues very soundly for a humanist ethic. In Ch. IX, "Religion

and Morals," he rejects "all shades of religion." "With the spread of civilization," he says, "the religious spirit declined because so much strength of character exists as to make civilization possible" (p. 252).

Reade, William Winwood (1838-75), writer. Nephew of the novelist Charles Reade, he opened his literary career with the long novel *Liberty Hall* (3 vols., 1860), but then spent several years travelling in Africa, studied medicine and volunteered for service at the Cholera Hospital, Southampton, during the epidemic of 1866. The strain of this, and of his experience as war-correspondent for the *Times* in the Ashanti War, brought about his premature death. His *Martyrdom of Man*, published in 1872, was one of the most brilliant and most effective Rationalist works of the century. The article in the *Dictionary of National Biography* describes him as an Atheist, but F. Legge justly claims, in a biographical introduction to the 18th edition of his great book (1910), that he was a Spencerian Agnostic, recognizing God as "the First Cause and Inscrutable Myster". His views—he rejected Christianity and the belief in a future life—are given in his last work, *The Outcast* (1874), a novel describing the harsh experiences of a sceptic.

Realism. In the Middle Ages it was opposed to Nominalism and Conceptualism, holding that universals or general terms stood for things (realities) and were not mere names or ideas. This curious controversy convulsed the new schools of Europe. Apart from its meaning in art, which does not concern us here, it is now, in philosophy, the opposite of Idealism (the theory that ideas and mind alone exist), but is used broadly for the tendency to insist that knowledge must be of realities, not of verbal formulæ or abstractions.

Reason. The word survives from the pre-scientific psychology which held that the mind has various "faculties." Many psychologists now prefer to speak of "reasoning," since it better expresses the fact that it is a process: one of several processes of the intelligence or several aspects of the mental life.

There are considerable differences in defining it. Some call it "the rational element in intelligence," which may be said to define a thing by itself; others "the perception of relations between concepts" or "the process of solving problems which are above the concrete problems of daily life." It has been established that a slight muscular activity of the throat accompanies reasoning, so that some say that thinking is "talking to oneself." Rationalists of the last century gave reason a "supremacy" which Pragmatism [see] or Humanism challenges, but the new theory has not been widely supported. Religious formulæ are statements of alleged fact (that there is a God, that the soul is immortal, that Jesus was divine, etc.), and to claim that they must be submitted to reason (or reasoning) is merely to say that unless the evidences for them are critically examined by the intelligence, as with all other statements of fact, man may set some sort of value (often social) upon his beliefs, but has no ground to regard them as true; and normally opinions are not held to be of any value unless they are regarded as true.

Recapitulation Theory. [See Biogenetic Law, The.]

Reclus, Prof. Élie Michel (1827–1904), French ethnologist. Son of a Protestant pastor, he adopted advanced ideas, fought in the Revolution of 1848, and was driven to Brussels, where he was appointed professor of comparative mythology. He wrote a number of important works on ethnology (*Primitive Folk*, Engl. trans. 1891, etc.) and was an Atheist. See the biography *Élie Reclus* (1905), by his brother. **Prof. Jean Jacques Elisée Reclus** (1830–1905), his brother, also was educated in a Protestant seminary, but adopted advanced opinions. Driven from France, he travelled very extensively, and attained so high a position as a geographer that when he was condemned to transportation for life for his share in the Commune of 1871 he was saved by a petition from the scientific men of Europe. He returned in 1879, was again exiled, and won great distinction as professor of geography, and author of *The Earth and its Inhabitants* (Engl. trans.,

19 vols., 1878–94), the most important geographical work of the last century. Though he was, in spite of his academic position, an outspoken Atheist and a fiery rebel, he was so generally respected that at his death the *Annual Register* (1905) described him as a man of "charming amiability and simplicity of character, of lofty ideals and singular generosity." The third son of the Protestant minister, **Prof. Paul Reclus**, M.D. (1847–1914), professor of clinical surgery at Paris University, also was an Atheist, though not aggressive, and took no part in advanced politics.

Red Terror, The. [See Terror.]

Redeemer Gods. That Jesus was a God who redeemed men from the consequences of their sins may properly be called the fundamental and most distinctive doctrine of Christianity. We show in many articles that there was not a single original point in his teaching or any unique feature of his character as depicted in the Gospels; nor was the idea of immortality, which was familiar in the Greek Mysteries and the Mithraic and Egyptian cults, the novelty to the Romans which some have supposed. The essence of Christianity, in the mind of all Christians until recent times, was its promise of redemption, and this is still the attitude of four-fifths of the members of Christian Churches (Roman and Greek Catholics, the great majority of the Methodists and Baptists and other Evangelicals, and the poorly educated majority of the Church of England). At the Lambeth Conference [see] of British and American bishops this doctrine was, the Modernists say, disowned as based upon "an unworthy conception of God." The bishops had, however, not the courage to mention the words "redemption" and "hell," and their vaguely worded and evasive rejection of the old doctrine was clearly intended to give the Modernists standing room in the Church and attract other educated folk without alarming the backward majority. Some time after the Conference the present writer attended Sunday evening service in a provincial cathedral and found that alike in sermon, hymns, and prayers the doctrine (the atoning blood of Jesus, the resurrection of the body, etc.) was

Fundamentalist. Thus, except that condemnation to hell for the sin of Adam has always been vague in its official status in the Church of England—it is affirmed in Article II and virtually denied in Article IX—though a stern dogma in the other leading Churches, the great majority of Christians still take literally the repulsive unanimous tradition of the Church that God condemns men to hell for sin, personal or inherited, but releases a minority because he was “appeased” by the sacrifice of Jesus. The ethical and intellectual monstrosity of this doctrine is so clear that the only point that calls for discussion here is its relation to redeemer gods of other religions of the Greek-Roman world. We call it distinctive of Christianity mainly in comparison with later religions, though it is also distinctive in the concept of inherited guilt, the ferocity of punishment, and the special features of the alleged redemption by Jesus; and these are its chief characteristics.

The problem relates almost entirely to the teaching of Paul. In the earliest of the Gospels Jesus is represented as completely unconscious of what theology (and Paul) considers his supreme mission on earth. One short ambiguous phrase (x, 45) might be quoted, but it is wholly inconsistent with “the agony in the garden” and the despairing cry on the Cross, and the entire narrative suggests that it is either an interpolation, or that the words “to give his life a ransom for many” means simply that he will face the death at the hands of the priests which, he says, awaits him. It is needless to speak of the later Gospels. [See comment on this significant discrepancy between the Gospels and the Epistles under the title *Pauline Epistles*.] The question is, therefore, whence Paul derived his characteristic doctrine of redemption. Judaism would supply only the idea of a Messiah. This clearly helped in the formation of the doctrine in Paul’s turbulent brain, but in none of its various meanings did it signify that the Messiah would, by sacrificing his own life, atone for the sins of men and induce God to spare them the torments of an eternal hell. Were the main ideas borrowed from paganism? Paul, who lived at Tarsus, must have

been well acquainted with the rival religions, and several of them had “redeemers” or “redeemer gods.” J. M. Robertson, approvingly quoted by Canney in his *Encyclopædia of Religions* (1921), mentions Zeus Soter, Helios, Dionysos, Heracles, the Dioscuri, Cybele, and Æsculapius. Others would add Osiris (slain by Set), Prometheus (chained to a rock—Lucian says crucified—for his services to men), and Adonis or Attis (a slain god). These are parallels only in so broad a sense that it is difficult to see how they can have influenced the Pauline conception. Some were “deliverers” in one sense or other; some were slain, but certainly not to appease or atone to a supreme god. We may at the most claim that at the root of most of them is primitive man’s dramatization of the annual winter blight and death of the fertility (or solar) deity and the beneficent restoration or resurrection of the god, and saving of men from the curse of darkness and winter. That this is the ultimate source of the Christian doctrine seems clear; but if we seek a cult in which some religion known to Paul had developed the legend in a form approximating to the Christian, we find this best in Mithraism and the Phœnician cult of Esmun. It is shown in the article *Mithraism* that the priests told the devotees that Mithra (who, however, was not slain but assumed into heaven) was a god sent to release men from the powers of darkness, and that he “assured them of salvation both in this world and the world to come” (Cumont). Few writers on the subject, except Frazer, point out the parallel of Esmun; but, in a learned special study (*Adonis und Esmun* (1911)), Count Baudissin shows that Phœnician inscriptions testify to the cult in that country and Syria, so that it would be well known in Tarsus, of a saviour god (originally freeing men from disease, later from sin), Esmun, who was clearly an evolution of Adonis or Tammuz, the Babylonian and Syrian form of the widespread dramatization of the annually dying and reborn spirit of fertility or giver of life. Add to this the Hebrew idea of the curse of men for Adam’s sin and the gloomy view of the world which

such a mind as Paul's took, and we have some of the ingredients of the doctrine which, though it had been hailed as sublime by fifty generations of theologians, mystics, and Christian poets, even bishops now pronounce "barbarous" and "repulsive."

Reformation, The. One of the grave perversions of historical teaching which has been effected by Catholic influence, chiefly in the educational and publishing world of America, but to a serious extent also in this country, is a new version of the Reformation. A typical example is *The Renaissance and the Reformation* (1934) of Prof. H. S. Lucas of Washington University. On the familiar plea that Rationalist and Protestant prejudice dominated history in the last century, and that psychology now enables us to make a sounder interpretation of events, the author blandly explains that the chief cause of the Reformation was that the Renaissance raised political and economic problems which the Church, accustomed to a serene guidance of men on pure other-worldly lines, could not solve! The theory is paltry enough, particularly since there was no Renaissance in France, England, or Spain, before the Reformation; but the author makes it worse by attributing the beauty of the Age of Chivalry [see] to the Church and to "the refining influence of woman," counts the reopening of schools in Europe the Church's "greatest intellectual achievement" [see *Education and Universities*], and gives an entirely false account of the state of papal, priestly, and monastic morals. Usually this apology for the Church of Rome—as it really is, since the sole purpose is to conceal or to represent as negligible the corruption of the Popes and the Church—runs on the broader line that the sixteenth century saw the rise of social and political changes which of themselves wholly or predominantly explain the Reformation. Writers of the last century may have neglected these changes, on the just ground that they were very subsidiary to that corruption of doctrine and morals which was the real cause of the Reformation; and it is advisable to appreciate them; but, as one sees even in a neutral work like R.

Pascal's *Social Basis of the Reformation* (1933), writers who take this line invariably distort the historical perspective and suppress material facts. Three points in connection with the Reformation are vital to an understanding of it:—

(1) Rebellion against the Church was not a new development of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. It began with the awakening of Europe in the eleventh century. Hildebrand [see] himself was excommunicated by the German prelates and expelled by the Romans, and for several centuries Italy fought against the pretension of the Popes to secular rule. [See *Democracy*.] At the same time there was a revolt in the schools [see *Abélard*] and a much wider moral revolt in literature (troubadours, minnesingers, epic-writers, etc.) and in the whole movement which is ironically called Chivalry [see]. The women to whom Prof. Lucas attributes a "refining influence" were more comprehensively corrupt and lacking in refinement than the upper-class women were in any other three centuries of history. The revolt, largely based upon the corruption of the Church, culminated in the Albigensian and Waldensian movements, which were drowned in blood, but the revolt continued underground in the still more extensive Witch organization or cult [see]. When the corruption of the Church continued [see *Avignon*; *Great Schism*; *Thirteenth Century*; etc.], there was a profoundly anti-papal Conciliar Movement (to put Councils of the Church above Popes), and then the vast revolt of the Lollards and Hussites [see]. The real interest of the historian, therefore, is to explain why this long-standing revolt succeeded at length in the sixteenth century, and this will be considered below.

(2) The corruption of the Church "in head and members" was so gross during the Middle Ages that it would be amazing if it had not provoked rebellion. One may wonder why a corrupt age should trouble to make corruption a ground of revolt; but even loose-living men could be moved to resent the disorders of Popes, priests, and monks, who extorted a very high proportion of their wealth for luxurious and

loose living while they blandished Bibles and rosaries as their credentials. The chronic disorder is shown in various articles [*Celibacy; Monasticism; Papacy; etc.*], and it is necessary here only to notice the series of Popes before and during the Reformation. The Council of Constance had, in 1414, dethroned three Popes and charged Martin V to reform the Curia and the Church. Pastor (I, 240) admits that he made no attempt—"Crush my rebels for me" has been the first principle of the Papacy to our day—nor did his two successors, although the Council of Basle drew up an appalling indictment of clerical morals. The Papal Court itself then (1455) passed, as the Papacy grew rapidly in wealth, and the artistic era at Rome began, into a general corruption which lasted almost continuously for nearly two centuries. [*See Renaissance, Popes of the.*] It was the most amazing and by far the longest degradation of a central religious organization in the whole history of religions; and attempts to explain the revolt of Europe without reference to it, or protests that it was at the most a subsidiary cause, are not serious or disinterested historical productions. A Europe fully awakened, and now equipped with the art of printing, could no more submit to this kind of religious authority than the American Colonies could have continued much longer than they did in subjection to England. The contrast of the Gospels, which were now printed, widely distributed, and made known to the illiterate masses by bodies of lay preachers, and the monstrously unscriptural doctrines, rites, and morals of the Roman Church, would provoke even loose-living men to revolt. As to the Church's reform of its ways, we show elsewhere that in point of doctrine it made its system more rigid as a standard for condemning heretics [*see Trent, Council of*], and its moral "reform" consisted of a few short periods, amounting to fourteen or fifteen years in all, during which a few Popes fell truculently upon the sexual laxity of the citizens of Rome, yet maintained the distinctively clerical vices (simony, graft, and intolerance) as luxuriously as ever.

(3) As the Church could now com-

mand even larger armies than those which had crushed the Albigensian, Lollard, and Hussite rebels for it, the chief point for historical inquiry is: What special conditions enabled the chronic revolt, which had so often been suppressed, to triumph in the sixteenth century? New intellectual developments cannot be stressed. The Copernican Revolution, which is sometimes invoked, was a revolution only on paper, and had not the effect claimed for it even in the minds of the few who knew it. The classical Renaissance was confined in its effects to a minority section of the middle class; and we can hardly claim a revolutionary importance for printing or the rapid growth (with wealth) of the middle class when we recall how Lollardism and Hussism had grown. The emphasis on social changes is often a meretricious appeal to modern interests. The social-economic advance was less than it had been in the thirteenth century, and it had no weight with Erasmus, Luther, Melancthon, and Cranmer, to say nothing of the princes. The Reformers violently denounced the revolt of the peasants [*see Luther*], and it is stated in every manual of social-economic history that, especially in England, the condition of the industrial workers became worse in the sixteenth century. Some historians stress the growth of schools, but the fact [*see Education*] that 90 per cent. of Europe remained illiterate shows how little importance this had. Much more important—not in causing the revolt, but in providing the conditions of success in Germany—were the political changes. The imperial crown had passed by marriage to Spain, but it was a Spaniard, Charles V, who at the request of a thoroughly corrupt and anti-German Pope, Leo X, condemned Luther (1521) and the sincere German movement for reform. Charles did this, moreover, in part in order to secure Papal support for his plan to drive the French out of Italy, and he was absent from Germany during the next ten years. This enabled the German princes to consolidate a force which ensured success and inspired Scandinavian and English princes. In England the political situation from this point of view

was the same as in France: the royal power became more despotic, and the nobles, their provincial castles subdued by the new artillery, became parasites of the Court. Yet the reform ideas, which at first spread as widely in France as in England, were checked in France. What would have been the issue if Francis I had, like Henry VIII, offered to share the monastic plunder with his nobles? In fine, another profoundly important circumstance which the "new historians" omit to mention is that, in the crucial stage of the Thirty Years War to crush Protestantism, the Pope, by a monstrous piece of corrupt nepotism, betrayed the Catholic Powers. [See *Thirty Years War and Urban VIII.*] The article on the Reformation in the *Encyclopædia Britannica* justly presenting it as a moral-religious revolt, has somehow escaped the Catholic massacre. It is by the soundest historical writer on the subject, Dr. G. G. Coulton, whose *In Defence of the Reformation* (1931), and other works, should be consulted. Prof. J. Mackinnon's *Luther and the Reformation* (4 vols., 1925-30) and *Origins of the Reformation* (39) are sound, though more orthodoxly Protestant. Catholic books, which betray the worst vices of their apologists, are listed under *Luther*.

Reimarus, Hermann Samuel (1694-1768), German pioneer of Biblical Criticism. A professor of Hebrew and mathematics at Hamburg Gymnasium who in 1744 published, anonymously, some critical notes on the Bible, under the title *Die Wolfenbüttelsche Fragmente*, which are generally regarded as opening the era of Biblical Criticism. Reimarus, a brilliant classical as well as Oriental scholar, professed "natural religion" (Deism).

Reinach, Joseph, L.-en-D. (1856-1921), French-Jewish statesman. Of a German-Jewish family which settled in France, he practised law until his friend Gambetta made him his *chef de cabinet*. He entered the *Chambre* as an anti-clerical and held several of the highest offices of State. Reinach powerfully opposed the Church on the Dreyfus case, gives his Rationalist views in a life of Diderot (1894), and wrote the life and edited the speeches of Gambetta. His

younger brother, **Salomon Reinach** (1858-1932), was one of the highest authorities on comparative religion and professor of archæology at the Louvre. His *Apollo* (Engl. trans., *Art Through the Ages*, 1904), *Cultes, mythes, et religions* (3 vols., 1905-8), and *Orpheus* (Engl. trans., 1909) are standard works on the evolution of religion. He was a member of learned bodies in all parts of Europe. The youngest brother, **Prof. Théodore Reinach, D.-en-D., D.-ès-L.** (1860-1928), took to history and archæology and was a professor at Paris University (*École de hautes Études*). His *Religions et sociétés* (1905) is Agnostic. He thinks that "all the hypotheses which have become beliefs, all the hopes of a beyond and the moral laws which piety has raised, have been shattered," but "the Unknowable remains" (p. 39).

Reincarnation. The belief that "souls" pass from one body to another after death. It is found in a crude form among the Australian aboriginals, and was so strong and universal in India that Asoka [see], though an Agnostic, in some sense recognized it. The Greek Mysteries, especially the Orphic, included a belief in "cycles of reincarnation," and some authorities believe that the revival of these in Greece, in the sixth century B.C., led to the emphasis of Pythagoras on immortality and reincarnation and the transmission of the belief to Plato. The word "metempsychosis" has the same meaning, but is usually applied to the belief that human souls may be incarnated in animals. In modern Theosophy the doctrine of reincarnation, borrowed from India, is pushed to ridiculous extremes. All sorts of historical characters are by some writers traced in earlier ages; Jesus Christ, for instance, being identified with the wife of Cæsar.

Relativity. The idea was widely circulated, at the time when the general acceptance of Relativity overflowed into the daily Press, that it meant that all scientific knowledge was now recognized to be relative in the sense that it is merely the nearest approximation to the truth we can give at present. As twenty-nine branches of science out of

thirty, including the biological and the anthropological sciences, which are the only branches of importance in the religious controversy, were not in the least affected by Relativity, a very false impression was given. The theory applies mainly to measurements of bodies travelling at the speed of electrons, and so has very little application even in astronomy. Einstein repeatedly protested against the idea that he (and his predecessors) had wrought a "revolution in science," and said that he was concerned with the accuracy of mathematical formulæ, not the investigation of nature. Very few statements about nature were corrected on Relativist principles, and when it is said that the theory led to the identification of matter and energy, we must remember that the definition of energy [see] has been completely changed.

Relics. In most religions, from the savage level upward, we find a natural practice of preserving and honouring remains (bones, weapons, etc.) of outstanding men, and in later or religious Buddhism the practice is almost as rife as in Roman Catholicism. In the Church it began with the respectful preservation of the remains of martyrs, and the Roman Church, in the fourth century, found a rich source of profit in multiplying these. Even St. Ambrose inflamed the popular demand in a way that gravely suggests dishonesty (Gibbon, Ch. XXVII), Pope Damasus gave a very strong impetus to the development—Augustine as strongly opposed it until late in life—and the Greek Church began to "discover" the remains of saints and martyrs on a prodigious scale (Ch. XXVIII). This led in turn to the forging of lives for the spurious relics. [See Martyrs.] When the Empire fell, and a dense ignorance settled over Europe, the traffic assumed extraordinary proportions. The Jews of Syria and Palestine had some revenge by "discovering" and selling to the Christians vast numbers of holy bodies in the East. Constantine's mother, an ignorant ex-barmaid, had paid extravagantly for the "true cross," which had been unearthed (after burial) at Jerusalem, and before the end of the Dark Age there were in Europe and the Byzantine

Empire sufficient pieces of it to make crosses for a regiment. The baby-linen of Jesus (affectionately preserved by his mother), his umbilical cord, his milk-teeth, thorns from his crown, etc., were great treasures. Of Mary herself they had the chemise (one of the various editions of which is still venerated, though called a "veil," at Chartres, to the great profit of the cathedral), the wedding ring, little phials of milk, locks of her hair, menstrual towels, girdle, stockings, etc. Specimens of the Virgin's milk were held in honour in various Spanish churches until the materialistic nineteenth century. Erasmus found milk of the Virgin treasured (with a knuckle bone of St. Peter) at the British shrine of Walsingham. Hairs of Noah's beard, bits of Moses's burning bush and of Aaron's rod, chips from Job's dung-hill, feathers from Gabriel's wings, specimens of the manna that rained from heaven, filings of Peter's chains, etc., drew crowds to famous shrines. The more precious relics were duplicated and triplicated. There were six heads of John the Baptist, several arms and legs of the same saint, etc., and the rival cities went to war in disputing each other's claims. Seven churches had the authentic navel-cord of Jesus. Naples had a little of the blood of St. Januarius (a fictitious martyr) until, in the last century, a wicked sceptic learned the recipe from the chemist of whom the clergy bought the ingredients. The value rose so high that in 1056 the French king had to deposit a sum of £5,000 (many times more in modern money) during a dispute about the bodies of two saints. Relics counted amongst the richest loot in war, and the Crusaders who sacked Constantinople, in 1203, loaded carts with them to sell in the West. For authentic Christian evidence of the weirder relics, and the multiplication of many of them, see the contemporary accounts of pilgrimages, from the fourth to the eighth century, in P. Geyer's *Itinera Hierosolymitana* (1898) and the mediæval Abbot Gilbert's *De Pignoribus Sanctorum* (in the Migne collection). Catholic talk about "honest simplicity" must be treated with disdain. The Roman Church not only still reaps a very large profit by selling

relics—it has laid down that every consecrated altar in a Catholic church must contain relics—in England and America, but still manufactures relics. The present writer has met a London Jesuit selling (at 10s. each), to Catholic ladies, small fragments of the cassock of a recent French saint, and the Jesuit smiled when other priests pointed out, contemptuously, that these bits of new cloth sold all over the world and purporting to be from the cassock of a priest of whom it was boasted that he had only one ragged cassock, were certainly bogus. The defence was that a bale of cloth had been touched with the original cassock.

Religion. The word is of uncertain origin, and there are about a hundred different definitions of it in modern literature. Prof. E. C. Moore says, in his *Nature of Religion* (1906), that he is acquainted with forty; Leuba (*Psychological Study of Religion*, 1912) gives fifty; and Havelock Ellis gives many more. It is as pedantic to expect a writer on religion to take into account these definitions by individuals (compare J. Hinton's definition of it as "the home-feeling of the universe"), or by small groups, as it is to expect attention to every fantastic definition of God. Dictionaries rightly define the meaning of the word as it is used by the great majority of educated people: "the belief in and worship of God or gods" (to say of "a Supreme Being" is inaccurate since this does not apply to polytheistic religions), but they derive this information from writers of very different dates and do not regard recent changes. Large numbers of Theists now reject the idea of worship, yet must be conceded to have religion. The same may be said, with some hesitation, of those who define God as all that is best in man (or in the universe) or as a mystery or Great Power. One has to bear in mind that most of these writers are eager to prove that all normal men have a religion, so that when Russia became predominantly Atheistic the veneration of the memory of Lenin was declared to be a religion! Beyond these are the philosophic group who, following Prof. Höffding, claim "a religion of values" (a cult of truth,

beauty, and goodness), and the Ethical group who hold that the practical cultivation of moral principles is a religion. These are the chief meanings of religion to-day apart from the commonly accepted meaning, and it is obvious that the few thousand people in England and America who hold these views are entitled to retain the word "religion" for them. The motive is to transfer to a new ideal all the finer sentiment that has been associated with the word. The great majority of Rationalists, however, feel that, while in many cases the word "religion" has had such association, a correct knowledge of history finds this element completely overwhelmed by the vast amount of hypocrisy, fraud, and intolerance associated with it, and prefer some such word as "idealism." The suggestion that the new definitions merely mean severing "religion" from "theology" is based upon a misunderstanding of the Christian position. Theology is not, in the Churches, the same thing as religion, but is supposed to be the scientific (or systematic) analysis of the beliefs; and it is a matter of experience that in the last half century all attempts to spread non-Theistic religion (Positivism, Ethicism, etc.) have had little success, and that the Churches with the least theological element (Unitarianism, etc.) remain the smallest. While, therefore, it is recognized that a few—something less than one in 10,000—use the word in a different sense, it is here used in the sense in which it is commonly understood. We need not take account of such definitions as that of Prof. Sergi ("a pathological phenomenon"), or of the Goncourt brothers ("part of a woman's sex").

The origin of religion is as obscure and disputed as the origin of the cult of Jahveh or Allah or Jesus, and sheer speculation on the subject has given rise to a great variety of opinions. The starting-point has been identified as fear, awe, curiosity, magic, tabus, sex, and other emotions or practices. Lucretius has still the support of many for his claim that "fear first made the gods on earth." Prof. Max Müller's attempt to trace it to "a disease of language" is now merely an historical curiosity, and

Spencer and Grant Allen are considered to have exaggerated a single element when they put forward the deification of ancestors as the chief root. Tylor's theory of Animism—that primitive man saw in the movements of nature a diffused animating principle (like the Great Power of some modern Theists) which in time crystallized into personalities (gods, devils, and spirits)—dominated the investigation for decades, but the prevailing theory to-day is Pre-Animism, or the suggestion that a vague attitude which was mainly emotional preceded the definite idea of an animating principle. Dr. D. G. Brinton's theory, in his *Religions of Primitive Peoples* (1897), may be described as Animism, but most of the authoritative works since R. R. Marett's *Threshold of Religion* (1909) have adopted Pre-Animism. Sir J. G. Frazer suggested that religion, or appeals to gods or spirits, began when magic failed, but Loisy (*La religion*, 1917), and most experts, contend that religion preceded magic (on Animist lines). S. Reinach (*Orpheus*, 1909, etc.) has few followers in his plea that tabus were the root of religion. Apologists contend that it is due to a universal instinct in man (A. Menzies, *History of Religion*, 1906, etc.) or to a primitive revelation. E. Crowley (*The Tree of Life*, 1905) has a theory that the first phase was a general attitude to or appreciation of life; A. Dietrich (*Mutter Erde*, 1905) thinks that it was a worship of Mother Earth; a few writers on sex have contended that preoccupation with it was the chief root of religion; and the Psycho-Analysts have picturesque theories on their own lines of its origin. Most of the recognized authorities have adopted Pre-Animism, but the theory must not be regarded as final. It is based upon speculation rather than upon the facts of savage life, and the latter raise difficulties in connection with it. There has been so much migration and contact of peoples since early Palæolithic times that we have to be very careful in representing that some group of tribes that fell out of the line of progress 50,000 or 100,000 years ago still exhibit the cultural stage which the race had reached at that time. This difficulty is, however, less in connection

with the most primitive peoples, the Negritoes [*see*], who were until recent times also the more isolated. They are incapable of abstract ideas, and, as some of them have nothing that could be called religion, and others a rudimentary belief in concrete spirits of the dead but no Animism, we may plausibly suppose that they illustrate the actual origin of religion in the remote past. Many of these lowest peoples use the word "shadow" for what we call spirit, and it seems to be more in harmony with their psychology to suppose that childlike speculation on the very mysterious shadow (and on the dream) gave them the idea of the "double," and that this was the root of religion. [For further developments from this level *see* God.] Dr. S. Hartland objected to this theory (in McCabe's *Growth of Religion*, 1918) that we know too little about the Negritoes, but ethnologists regard the following works as authoritative: Sarasin's *Ergebnisse naturwissenschaftlichen Erforschungen auf Ceylon* (1887-93) for the Vedda; T. Bonwick's *Daily Life and Origin of the Tasmanians* (1870), H. Ling Roth's *Aborigines of Tasmania* (2nd ed., 1899), Dr. G. McCall Theal's *Yellow and Dark-Skinned People of South Africa* (1910) for the Bushmen; Skeat and Blagden's *Pagan Races of the Malay Peninsula* (1906) for the Semang; and D. G. Brinton's *Little People of the Philippines* for the Aetas. It is significant that at the next higher level of culture, the more isolated tribes of the Australian aborigines (described in the authoritative works of Spencer and Gillen), men have a very definite belief in individual spirits, but not in a general animating spirit; and that it is only at a still higher level, that of the Melanesians, that we find anything corresponding to the Animist or Pre-Animist theory. [*See* Mana and Melanesians.]

The relation of science to religion will be considered under the title *Science*, and for the discredited contention that we have a special religious sense or instinct *see Psychological Argument for Religion*. On the important question of the value of religion there is not a single work in any literature that treats the subject scientifically: that is to say,

on a basis of fact or by a complete balance sheet, based upon recorded facts, of services and disservices. An inquiry ought to be divided into three sections: pre-Christian, Christian, and modern. To Winwood Reade's rather rhetorical indictment of religion in the first section we may add the complete discredit of the claims made for Judaism and the fact that in all the greater periods of civilization [*see Golden Ages and Progress*] the constructive class was very sceptical, while deeply religious periods were always reactionary and inimical to the mental vitality which is the first condition of progress. Of greater interest, and easier to answer in brief, is the question whether the Christian religion in particular did more to promote or to retard the advance of European civilization. If the answer is based upon a scrupulous attention to facts, not upon a sentimental or a politic leniency to Christian literature, it cannot be in doubt. The facts recorded, with full contemporary and recent authority, in more than a hundred articles of this Encyclopædia show that all the larger services claimed for the Church by apologists are fictitious and are supported in religious literature by monstrously inaccurate historical statements; that the Dark Age [*see*] which followed the triumph of Christianity, the longest period of retrogression in history, was not due to the barbaric invaders, since there was almost equal degeneration in the Greek Empire, which they did not invade; that the barbarians made very promising attempts to restore civilization in Italy, and the Papacy strangled them; and that the sceptical leaders of the Arabs in Syria, Spain, and Sicily proved that a devastated civilization could be completely restored in one or two generations. In regard to the second section of the Middle Ages [*see*] we saw that such recuperation of civilization as there was came from secular influences (in art, education, civic and economic life, etc.), and that in precisely those respects in which Church influence ought to count—justice, humanity, and chastity—these four or five centuries were the worst period in normal history. We saw further that, while the Arabs had fully restored the Graeco-Roman

legacy of freedom and science, which are the basis of modern civilization, by the year 1000 the Church suppressed freedom and is largely responsible for the fact that science (as a whole) made no further advance for five centuries and did not enter upon its stage of practical service until eight centuries later. We have, in fine, shown that the race has made more progress in a hundred years of advancing scepticism than it had made from A.D. 400 to 1800. To oppose to these grave historical generalizations the fact that Christianity "inspired many beautiful lives of men and women" betrays a singular lack of the sense of proportion [*see Saints*]. The balance of evidence is overwhelmingly on one side. Christianity retarded the advance of civilization by many centuries.

The third issue is whether the Churches are so useful in our time that it is wrong to criticize them and hasten the disappearance of religion. The question is not whether the Churches "do good"; though even here we have to recollect that politicians, and others who have to respect their power, repeatedly make this statement with more calculation than sincere reflection. Further, those who, though not Christians, advocate support of the Churches are usually very vague about the extent of real Church influence even in their own country, never give serious attention to the fact that character, in so far as it can be accurately gauged by 'statistics [*Crime; Drunkenness; Prostitution; War; etc.*], has steadily improved while religious influence has decayed, and do not candidly confront the spectacle of the exclusion of the clergy to-day from the control of public life and the solution of our gravest problems. A scientific or common-sense inquiry would take these facts into account and would ask whether such good as is done by the Churches to-day would be lost if they disappeared—not a difficult question to answer if we study what has happened while they have lost four-fifths of their influence—and whether any loss that might fairly be presumed is greater than the gain that would accrue from the cessation of their intolerance, interference with the liberties of others, enormous cost and privileges, apologetic untruthfulness,

casuistry, and so on. Manuals of sociology and social psychology now usually include religion amongst the factors they examine, but there is no work that analyses its influence in terms of fact—that, for instance, compares the extent of religion and the general level of character in each country, studies the rise or fall of that level in relation to the rise of religion (as in Italy and France) or the growth of scepticism (in Russia, Mexico, or China), or makes any scientific test whatever of the general statement that religion is an important social agency. The generalizations which are here made on the basis of facts given in the subsidiary articles suggest that a scientific inquiry on these lines is desirable.

Religious Wars. An important item in the indictment which a candid sociologist would bring against the Roman branch of Christianity is its terrible record of instigating wars in its own interest. Setting aside the promptness of the clergy of every country to support the national authorities without any regard to justice (the Buddhist priests in Japan, the Italian priests in the rape of Abyssinia, the attack on France, etc.), the Papacy has in the course of eleven centuries initiated wars in its own interest, and to the grave injury of the peoples involved, which have helped to retard the progress of civilization and cost tens of millions of lives. The wars it set afoot for the recovery or protection of its temporal possessions from the eighth century, when such wars had millions of victims, to the nineteenth have drained Italy, France, and Germany of blood century after century. The Crusades [see], summoned by the Popes in whatever spirit they were conducted, led to appalling losses and ended in futility. Scores of times they flung nation against nation because some monarch refused to submit to them and was declared deposed; and they blessed aggressive wars—of the Normans in England, the English in Ireland, etc.—because kings offered to do them feudal service. The Thirty Years War, which according to all historians put back for a century the civilization of half Europe, lost an unknown number—certainly millions—

of lives and led to epidemics of vice, was incited by the Papacy and the Jesuits as their agents. The most amazing feature is that in our own day the Pope can pose as a serene advocate of peace while he incites to war in the interest of his Church as explicitly as Gregory VII or Innocent III did. From the date of his accession (and for some years earlier as Secretary of State) the present Pope repeatedly demanded "the extinction of Bolshevism in Spain, Mexico, and Russia"; that is to say, revolt (aided by Italy and Germany in a savage war) in Spain, the annexation of Mexico by the United States, and war upon Russia by Germany. The entire Catholic Press of the world supported his demand, and it was frequently reproduced (sympathetically) in the *Times* and other organs. He remained also in close alliance with Japan during its series of vile aggressions, and he attempted to paralyse America's assistance to Britain, when Germany treacherously attacked Russia, by inciting the great body of American Catholics to cause trouble and facilitate that destruction of Russia for which he hoped. Throughout 1946 the Church has made frantic efforts to drive America into war with Russia.

Rémusat, Count Charles François Marie de (1797–1875), French historian and statesman. A lawyer who entered politics on the anti-clerical side, became Minister of the Interior, and was exiled for opposing Louis Napoleon's *coup d'état*. Although he re-entered politics in 1871, and was a Foreign Minister of high repute in Europe, he devoted his life to philosophy and literature. He was an eclectic Theist with "a love of free thought and confidence in research" (*Nouvelle Biographie Générale*). His son, Count Paul Louis Étienne de Rémusat (1831–97), followed the father into law, letters, and politics and shared his Rationalism. He was a distinguished Senator and essayist.

Rémusat, Prof. Jean Pierre Abel, M.D. (1788–1832), French Orientalist. He deserted medicine for the study of Chinese and taught it at Paris University. He was not only one of the leading masters of Chinese literature, but had an extraordinary command of ancient and modern languages and was

loaded with academic honours. Rémusat was one of the first to win recognition for Lao-tse and Buddha, and in his works on them he severely criticizes Christian missionaries.

Renaissance, The. Originally the word ("rebirth") meant the revival of classical architecture as opposed to Gothic, and it was then applied to the recovery of classical literature and the restoration in Italy of Greek and Roman ideals. Even for the Renaissance in this narrower sense no precise date can be given. In what sense the monks preserved the classics [see] may be gathered from the fact that it took Italian scholars 150 years, beginning with the activity of Petrarch and Boccaccio, about the middle of the fourteenth century, to recover the Latin classics from the dust and rubbish of monastic libraries, and some of them, and almost all the Greek classics, had to be got from the East. Symonds counts the period as 1350-1500, England, France, and Germany lagging far behind Italy, and Spain being later still. Possibly the social consequences of this zeal of a few thousand scholars for classical studies were exaggerated by historians of the last century, but it was important in restoring Greek and Roman ideals. In England and Italy, for instance, it led to the writing of Utopias (More, Campanella, etc.) which quickened social idealism; and, especially in France, it helped to promote the scientific revival. On the other hand, the Catholic charge that it was in any measure responsible for the admitted grossness of morals in Italy is preposterous. In Italy the sexual licence was accompanied by fiendish cruelty and treachery, and these were certainly not learned from any classical literature. But the Age of Chivalry [see], which preceded the classical revival by two centuries and affected a class a hundred times more numerous in every country, had already steeped Europe in vice and cruelty.

The word "Renaissance" is now taken in a broader sense as meaning the recovery of civilization in Europe. This began in France and Italy, and was late in reaching England and Germany, and still later in Spain (where it did not

last a century). The American writers who betray Catholic influence and deny that there was a Dark Age which ended in a Renaissance say that if we use the latter word at all we must speak of a Carolingian Renaissance in the eighth century and an Ottonian in the tenth. To claim a restoration of civilization in the days of Charlemagne [see] is not a discovery, but a reversion to an uncritical earlier history, and the revival of art and (in a much more restricted degree) culture in Saxony under Otto (chiefly owing to a marriage with the very corrupt Byzantine Court) was not much greater and lasted very little longer. These writers seem to be ignorant of the fact, which Catholics do not want obtruded because it discredits the Papacy, that culture had never been quite extinguished in the Lombard [see] cities of North Italy. Even in the Iron Age [see], when Rome was barbaric, these cities had elegant writers of Latin and were refined even in their vices. The contemporary Bishop RATHERIUS of Verona, for instance, in an indignant page (*Praeloquia*, V, 71) on the corruption of the higher clergy (about 910-20, when the highest "noble" ladies in Rome could not write their names), speaks of their hunting in gorgeous clothes, with gold belts and golden bridles to their horses, massive gold wine-vessels at their luxurious banquets, and beds inlaid with gold and silver, and with silk coverlets, to which they retire with the ladies. This may be vice, but is certainly civilization. It was this Lombard civilization that had inspired the boorish Charlemagne, and it had much to do with the revival in Saxony. But a far stronger and healthier influence came into Europe with the civilization of the Arabs [see] in Spain and South Italy. In the second half of the eleventh century the south of France [see *Abélard and Education*], as well as the north of Italy, began the advance which opened the era of permanent recovery. Frederick II [see] greatly promoted the work in Italy, and the troubadour (in Germany Minnesinger) literature everywhere raised the material, if it lowered the moral, standard. The contemporary revival of trade and accumulation of

wealth, the notable expansion of shipping, the great increase of travel, the growth of cities, and the slow diffusion of Arab science, made the recovery permanent, in spite of war and the Papacy. In the end (the second half of the fifteenth century) Rome itself [see next article] rose to the common Italian level in both the vices and virtues of the new civilization. According to all the authorities on the subject (chiefly J. A. Symonds, *The Renaissance in Italy*, 7 vols., 1875-86, and J. Burckhardt, *The Civilization of the Period of the Renaissance in Italy*, Engl. trans., 15th ed., 2 vols., 1937) the splendid art of the period was not more characteristic of it than its vices; a licence of morals that is not surpassed (particularly in regard to sodomy) in history, a proneness to appalling cruelty in all classes—from nobles who invented the "Forty Days' Torture," or flung delinquent servants on the hall-fire, to the worker who killed a neighbour's boy and got the unsuspecting father to eat a joint of the body—and a treachery and dishonouring of engagements which would have astounded the Greeks and Romans. Here the Catholic historian Pastor agrees with the authorities, and it is surprising to find Positivist and other non-Christian writers, who regard integrity of character as the first mark of civilization, praising the Middle Ages and its Church. Of small recent works, Prof. W. H. Hudson's *Story of the Renaissance* (1924) is the only commendable study. Prof. H. S. Lucas's book *The Renaissance and the Reformation* (1934) is vitiated by uncritical reliance on Catholic works [see *Reformation*]. Sidney Dark's *Story of the Renaissance* is Catholic rhetoric.

Renaissance, The Popes of the. Against the Catholic claim that the Church promoted the recovery of Europe, history records, not only that the causes of it were purely secular and that the new civilization flagrantly defied the Christian code of conduct, but that the Papacy was an idle spectator of the recovery; and when at a late hour it began to co-operate by patronizing art and letters, the Papal Court, most of the Popes, and the majority of the Italian bishops, adopted the charac-

teristic vices of the age. In the earlier part of the period the Popes lived in the luxurious indolence of the "Babylonian Captivity" at Avignon (1309-77) [see], in a palace and city which Petrarch, who lived near, describes as a sink of iniquity. From this they passed into the futile days of the Great Schism (1378-1414) [see], when the greed excited the disgust of Christendom. When the Emperor put an end to this, and bade them reform, the new Popes disregarded the injunction; but about 1450 they began on a modest scale the secular rehabilitation of Rome—so modest, indeed, that, in 1450, cattle still browsed in the streets, and as late as 1484 the Vatican Library, which the Catholic writer who was permitted to deal with this phase in the *Cambridge Modern History* (Vol. I) calls "the most important library in the West in the fifteenth century," had only 2,000 manuscripts. The Alexandrian and Cordovan libraries [see] had had half a million. Then every source of tainted wealth (sale of offices and indulgences, dispensations, etc.) was exploited, and the more powerful of the Roman families, who fought like brigands, dominated (as Cardinals or Popes) and corrupted the Papal Court. In the pagan imperial history of Rome, which brings a blush to the cheek of the preacher, twenty-one out of twenty-nine Emperors were good men, and these ruled for 245 years, while the eight disreputable Emperors held the throne for only seventy-five years. But, in the 250 years of Papal history, ten out of twenty-four Popes (omitting Pontiffs who lasted only a few months) were or had been notoriously men of immoral life, and these ruled for 100 years: three only, who ruled for fifteen years, attempted to reform the Church; all except these three permitted an extraordinary corruption in the Papal Court; and even the three reformers did not suppress the flagrant simony, graft, and judicial corruption. Nicholas V (1447-55), whom Pastor, admitting that "the reforming zeal of his early days cooled down," praises as the restorer of culture, included in his patronage the most obscene writers of the age. Calixtus III (1455-8) introduced the Borgia

family and, blind to their vices, raised them to the highest offices. Pius II (1458-64), a defiant apologist for his vices in his youth, made no effort to check the growing licence. Paul II (1464-71) was "wholly given over to sensual pleasure" (Bishop Creighton). Sixtus IV (1471-84), a friar, promoted his grossly immoral friar-nephews of the Rovere family, permitted his Court to be thoroughly debauched, and connived at the murder of a Medici prince in church during solemn mass. The Papacy was now so rich that the Colonna, Borgia, Orsini, and Rovere families fought for it by colossal bribery and murder, and in the *impasse* they had to let the tiara go to Innocent VIII (1484-92), whose bastard children moved in the highest society in the city and the Vatican. Incredible pictures of clerical corruption are to be found even in Pastor's *History of the Popes*, while some of the scenes in the Vatican itself, described in the private diary of the head of the Court, Burchard [see], were so vicious that the publisher struck even a discreet version of them out of the present writer's historical novel *The Pope's Favourite* (1917). The next thirty years were covered by the pontificates of Alexander VI, Julius II, Leo X—two sodomists and one satyr and murderer—and form a unique chapter in the history of religion. [See notice of each.] Clement VII (1523-34), a bastard of the Medici House, and Paul III (1534-49), father of four well-known children (Pastor), next sustained the gaiety of the Court. This is the period of the Reformation, which we are now asked to believe had little or nothing to do with the corruption of the Church. Rome had been terribly ravaged and impoverished by a sack of the city (1527) and massacre of the Romans, by the Catholic Emperor, which threw into the shade the work of Goths and Vandals; but the gaiety of the prelates ran on, with fifteen years of partial reform [see Counter-Reformation], for another century and a quarter. Julius III (1550-5) was grosser than Leo X, and Pastor can plead only that it is not proved that a sordid youth whom he favoured was either his son or his *mignon*. Under Pius IV (1559-65)

"the evil elements immediately awakened once more into activity" (Pastor) after one of the three short spells of reform (by a Pope, Paul IV, who loved strong wine and good cheer and was a scandalous nepotist), and after another short spell of reform, Gregory XIII (1572-85), notorious for his earlier looseness, let the Court and city return to such licence that one courtesan, chiefly ministering to prelates, made a fortune of £150,000 (Rodocanachi, *Courtisanes et buffons*, 1894). A few colourless Popes followed the third and last short spasm of reform, and this extraordinary series of Holy Fathers closed with the scandalous Pontificates of Urban VIII [see] and Innocent X. [For literature see under Papacy.]

Renan, Joseph Ernest (1823-92), French Orientalist. Son of a small Breton ship-outfitter, and left an orphan at the age of five, he became, by genius and industry and the support of his sister, one of the greatest scholars of modern France. He began to study for the priesthood, but under the influence of German philosophy, which may be recognized in his Pantheistic language throughout life, abandoned the faith after receiving minor orders. He won the Volney Prize for an essay on the Semitic languages and was entrusted with a Government mission to the East, where he and his sister collected the material for a life of Jesus. Henriette died, and Renan returned to France and was appointed professor of Hebrew, Syriac, and Chaldaic at Paris University. This eminent position he forfeited by publishing his *Life of Jesus* (1863), to the great anger of the clergy. It sold 300,000 copies in France and was translated into nearly every European language. However much the modern Rationalist may dislike the apparent reliance on the non-miraculous narratives of the Gospels, the book rendered massive service to enlightenment in France and much in England. He followed it up with a series of masterly studies of early Christianity, in spite of which he recovered his chair (1871), but the political development in France brought on the serene melancholy which appears in his *Drames philosophiques*. He was more nearly Agnos-

tic than Pantheistic, but he never shook off the influence of Hegel, and occasionally referred to "God" and "the divine" in Jesus. His son-in-law, Prof. Psichari, gives an account of Renan's tranquil last days in his story *Soeur Anselmine*, and quotes him saying: "I know that when I am dead nothing of me will remain." Barry's *Renan* (1905) is a mean Catholic libel. J. M. Robertson's short biography, *Ernest Renan* (1924), discusses his place in French thought and literature. His sister, *Henriette Renan* (1811-61), a teacher, shared his views and gave him invaluable support. Her fine character stands out in their correspondence (*Brother and Sister*, Engl. trans., 1846). She contracted a fatal illness in the East, and Barry says that "a good Maronite priest" gave her the sacraments. He omits to state that, as Renan explains in *Ma soeur Henriette* (1862), the "old fool" of a priest did this while they were both unconscious.

Reservation, Mental. [See **Mental Reservation.**]

Resurrection, The. The growth of the story of the resurrection of Jesus in the successive Gospels, and the many contradictions and absurdities it contains, have troubled divines ever since a mild indulgence in criticism began to be permitted in the Churches. Liberal theologians now reject the story, while Modernists devise explanations of how the women were misled by the play of sunlight on the tomb, etc. The overwhelming majority of Christians, even of members of the Church of England, still accept it, although it stultifies itself in the Gospels. In *Mark* chapter xvi, 9-end, is in a different style of Greek from the preceding verses, and is moreover missing from the oldest MSS. All that we have left of the original account is contained in verses 1-8. Three women came to anoint the body two days after burial, whereas a body would certainly receive this treatment before burial, and the Fourth Gospel says that it did. The women know that the tomb is closed by a heavy stone, but take nobody to remove it; they talk to an angel of the fairy-tale get-up who "sits" in the tomb and who terrifies them as if he were a devil; they decide

not to tell anybody of the glorious miracle, although ordered by the messenger from heaven to do so. This is all that the oldest MSS. of *Mark* have to say of the resurrection. According to the spurious addendum, when the other disciples hear of it they do not believe it, and so on. The childish narrative grows longer in *Matthew*, perhaps a quarter of a century later, but there is no anointing, and the women hear the earthquake which dislodges the stone, and they are full of joy, and run to tell the others, and so on. In *Luke* the story extends to fifty-three verses. The "spices" reappear, and now there are two male angels, and the women are quite a group, and Peter runs to verify their ridiculous chatter, etc. In *John* the story runs to two chapters, and the sex-balance is restored in favour of the men. One woman goes in the dark and, although she runs and the men run, so that it is still dark, they see quite a lot of the clothes which Jesus left behind, and so on. It is really childish; and still more childish to lay stress on the number of "witnesses," since these are mentioned only in this fiction. What makes any modern belief in this late and clumsy infiltration into the story of Jesus the more remarkable is that, whatever we may think of some of the "pagan parallels" of the life of Christ, the idea of the restoration to life of a slain god was familiar in every Greek and Roman city. Augustine himself describes how not only the adherents of the cult, but the whole city, followed the "holy Week" [see] ceremonies of the religion of the Great Mother with its Day of Blood (Good Friday) and Day of Rejoicing at the restoration of the god to life. [See *Attis and Adonis.*] Jerome tells, in his *Commentary on Ezekiel*, VIII, 14 (Migne, XXV, Vol. 82), how the birth and resurrection of "the lover of Venus" were annually celebrated in Syria; and in his letter to Paulinus (XXII, col. 581) he says that the cave at Bethlehem, which is now the lucrative "birth-place of Jesus," was formerly the temple in which the death and resurrection of Adonis or Tammuz were celebrated. Cyril of Alexandria (*Commentary on Isaiah*, II, 3) says that "this

ridiculous ceremony took place in the temples of Alexandria down to our time"; and Firmicus Maternus says that it took place in "most of the cities of the East." Plutarch records, in his *Lives* ("Alcibiades," XVIII), that this celebration was common in Greece in 415 B.C. Firmicus Maternus (*On the Error of Profane Religions*, II) explains that the Egyptian priests every year buried a statue of Osiris, who had been slain by Set, shaved their heads in sign of mourning, and "in a few days" rejoiced that Osiris had been brought to life again. Cyril further explains, in his *Commentary on Ezekiel*, that the priestesses of Adonis, at Byblos, mourned over the death of Osiris annually until they got a letter from the women of Egypt to say that his body had been recovered. Thus there had spread over the entire Eastern world, and on in time to Greece and Rome, a great festival of the death and resurrection of a god which, in its origin, was very clearly a dramatization of the winter death and spring revival of the spirit of vegetation or fertility. Frazer describes the various versions of it in Part IV of the *Golden Bough* [see Adonis; Attis; Osiris]. But the cult of Mithra came even closer to the Christian. Firmicus Maternus (Ch. XXIII, Migne Vol. XII, col. 1032) describes how the Mithraists annually mourned before a statue of their god on a bier, then lights were brought in and the priest said: "Rejoice, followers of the saved god, because there is for you a relief from your grief." The Benedictine editors declare, in a footnote to this, that "we find this in different forms in almost all the mysteries." With this annual celebration as the outstanding event in the temples of half a dozen religions, from Syria to Rome, can we wonder that Paul's febrile imagination could not be content to let his god rot in the tomb and be inferior to all the others? The slow evolution of the story in the Gospels suggests that Christians long hesitated to vie so closely with the pagans, but some time in the first quarter of the second century it was firmly incorporated in the life of Jesus.

Resurrection of the Body, The. From belief in the immortality of the soul the

Jews had in late pre-Christian times gone on to believe in the resurrection of the body. The Persian doctrine of the Last Day, or coming of the Kingdom, seems to imply it, and by this time Persian thought had much influence in Judæa. There are references to the belief in the apocryphal books of the Maccabees, and it is very plainly formulated by Paul, especially in 1 Cor. xv, but also in many other passages. As Cumont shows from the inscriptions, it was a belief of the Mithraists [see], who inherited it or deduced it from the Zoroastrian doctrine of the end of the world. Tertullian wrote one of his small works on it, and Augustine made it "the fundamental dogma of the Christian religion" (Hurter's *Theologia Dogmatica*, 1889, III, 611). It is still preached in cathedrals of the Church of England (personal experience); yet Bishop Barnes, in a sermon in Westminster Abbey, says that "the resurrection of this present flesh of ours has become incredible" (*Should Such a Faith Offend?*, p. 89). Although all Catholics, and the great majority of Protestants, still believe it, argument about it is waste of time, especially as immortality [see] of any sort is now so easily refuted.

Revelation. The Old Testament throughout claims that Jahveh made revelations to the patriarchs and prophets, but the Evangelists make no profession of having received divine communications, though Paul follows the Jewish precedent. The rise of Deism caused a sharp distinction to be drawn between natural and revealed religion, and opened the critical investigation of the credentials of the latter. With the nineteenth century the pressure of criticism like that of Paine led to departures from the old idea of revelation, and divines disputed whether the words were revealed (or dictated) to the "inspired writer" or only the ideas and facts, or whether the revelation was confined to strictly religious and moral messages, or whether the word is to be taken as just a figure of speech. All these evolutionary states are represented in the Churches to-day.

Revolution, The French. [See French Revolution.]

Rhodes, the Right Hon. Cecil John, M.A., D.C.L., P.C. (1853–1902), statesman and philanthropist. His father was a clergyman, and destined Cecil for the Church, but he contrived to escape, and on account of his health migrated to South Africa. After a few years at cotton-farming he secured an interest in the diamond-fields. Regretting the poorness of his education, he, in spite of a threat of tuberculosis, returned to study and graduate at Oxford, and he then became one of the leading business men in South Africa. He was Premier of Cape Colony 1890–4, and spent his later years in the development of Rhodesia. He left almost his entire fortune for educational and other public purposes, including the provision of 120 scholarships of £300 a year each at Oxford University. The total sum was about £6,000,000. Rhodes was an Agnostic, like his colleague, the Right Hon. Sir L. S. Jameson. He rejected the idea of a future life and thought the chances even whether there was a God or not (Sir T. F. Fuller in the chief biography, *The Right Hon. Cecil J. Rhodes*, 1910, pp. 235–50). His favourite books were those of Marcus Aurelius, Gibbon, and Winwood Reade.

Rhys, the Right Hon. Sir John, P.C. (1840–1915), philologist. Professor of Celtic at Oxford, and in 1895 Principal of Jesus College, Hibbert Lecturer, and Fellow of the British Academy. He was the leading authority on Celtic literature and a keen student of comparative religion from the Rationalist point of view. Clodd includes in his *Memories* (p. 184) a pungent letter that Rhys wrote him when Mrs. Humphry Ward tried to force the Church of England to admit ministers who denied the Virgin Birth: "If they were only called by the same name of Christians it matters not that they are ritualists or agnostics; the name is the great thing that would enable them to enjoy the Church together."

Ribot, Alexandre Felix Joseph, L.-ès-L., L.-ès-D. (1842–1923), French statesman. A lawyer who entered politics and became Minister of Foreign Affairs, Minister of Finance, and three times Premier during the struggle with the Church. He was a very versatile and

distinguished statesman and scholar, author of several works on education, and member of the Academy and other learned bodies. Ribot was an Agnostic, but not aggressive.

Ribot, Prof. Théodule Armand, D.-ès-L. (1839–1917), French psychologist. Professor of experimental psychology at Paris University and translator of Spencer's *Principles of Psychology*. Ribot's works are classics in the history of the science, and he did magnificent service in putting an end to its metaphysical stage and bringing it into line with physiology. He rejected the spirituality of the mind, and thought consciousness an epiphenomenon (especially in *Les maladies de la personnalité*, 1884).

Ricardo, David (1772–1823), famous economist and philanthropist. Son of a Dutch Jew who settled in London and took David into his stockbroking business at the age of fourteen; he abandoned the creed and opened a financial business of his own, at which he made a fortune. Adam Smith's work led him to study economics, and his *Principles of Political Economy and Taxation* (1817) became almost as distinguished a classic in the history of the science as Smith's work. He is as well known in economics as Adam Smith, but it is rarely noticed that he was interested in all branches of science—he was one of the first members of the Geological Society—was a most generous supporter of charitable institutions, and an outspoken Rationalist. He (in Parliament) denounced the persecution of Richard Carlile [see], supported Robert Owen [see], and allied himself with the Utilitarians. See D. R. Lee's *Diary*, 1797, p. 25.

Ricciardi, Count Giuseppe Napoleone (1808–85), Italian writer. Reared by his mother in advanced ideas, he became an aggressive Rationalist and republican, was exiled, and, when he returned, was imprisoned and again exiled. After the failure of the Revolution of 1848 he had to leave once more, and was sentenced to death in his absence and his property confiscated. He sat in the first Italian Parliament, and, when the Pope convoked the Vatican Council, he summoned the first

Rationalist Congress in Italy. See his *Memorie autografe d'un ribelle* (1857).

Richardson, Sir Benjamin Ward, M.A., M.D., LL.D., F.R.S. (1828-96), Scottish physician. He settled in practice in London, where he was one of the most eminent physicians of his time. He had the Fothergillian Gold Medal and the Astley Cooper Prize and was Croonian Lecturer and President of the London Medical Society. Richardson was a warm humanitarian, and introduced fourteen new anæsthetics in medical and surgical practice. For many years he was President of the London Sunday Lecture Society, which was then a recognized Rationalist body, and he delivered a number of Rationalist lectures for it. In his autobiography (*Vita Medica*, 1897) he says that "man is no more immortal than the thing on which he writes his learning" (p. 390), but admits an impersonal vital spirit in the universe.

Richelieu, Cardinal Armand Jean du Plessis, Duc de (1585-1642). One of the two statesmen—the other was Colbert—who made France great in spite of its corrupt Church and tainted monarchy. He had a military education and a considerable military capacity all his life, but accident diverted him to a clerical and political career. That he was the greatest statesman of the seventeenth century is admitted, but his high degree of independence in religious matters is very rarely noticed. He greatly angered Rome by his alliance with the Protestant Powers instead of with the Catholic in the Thirty Years War [see]. He drove the Papal troops out of Switzerland, induced the King to break off relations with the Vatican, and, as Bayle tells in his Dictionary (article "Amyrant"), threatened to sever the connection with Rome and unite with the Protestants in a French National Church. There is no evidence that he was a sceptic, but there was very little depth in his religion. See McCabe, *The Iron Cardinal* (1909), Ch. XVI.

Richet, Prof. Charles, M.D. (1850-1935), French physiologist, Nobel Prize winner. Professor at the Medical Faculty of Paris, and so distinguished that after his death the (Catholic) *Revue*

des Deux Mondes described him as "the greatest physiologist that France has had since Pasteur," and compares him with Leonardo da Vinci. But he was neither a Catholic nor a Spiritualist, though Conan Doyle and others quote him as such. He was President of the French Society for Psychical Research, but repeatedly explained that he did not believe that the phenomena were due to spirits. See *Should Spiritualism be Seriously Studied?* (Engl. trans., 1912) p. 46. In *L'âge d'or et l'âge de l'or* (1930) he says, apropos the charge that he was hostile to religion, that he has never written about it—as a matter of fact, he occasionally contributed to the organ of Haeckel's Monist League—because he "has the misfortune to believe more in science than theology" and he is convinced that man's future is not in belief in "childish dogmas" (p. 12).

Richter, Johannes Paul Friedrich (1763-1825), German poet. He was being educated for the Church when he came under the influence of Rousseau and took to teaching and letters. His *Blumen-Fruchtend Dornenstücke* (4 vols., 1896) made him recognized as the most brilliant satirical poet and essayist in Germany, and as "Jean Paul" he was read all over Europe. His complete works fill sixty volumes (1879). D Quincey is among his admiring biographers. Like most poets, he was moody in regard to religion, but, Kahnle (*International History of German Protestantism*, 1856) says, "prevailing view was a sentiment Deism" (p. 78). In a posthumous work, *Selina* (2 vols., 1827), he accepted the idea of immortality, but not Christianity.

Rickman, Thomas (1761-1834), seller and writer. Of a Quaker of Lewes, and an intimate friend of Paine, he had, under the name "Clio," some reputation as a writer. He is better known to Rationalists as a bookseller who was severely prosecuted for selling Paine's works and whose house was a centre for leading London heretics. For the second part of *The Rights of Man*, and Rickman's life of Paine, see Deist.

Ritchie, Prof. David George, M.A., LL.D. (1853–1903), Scottish philosopher. Professor of logic and metaphysics at St. Andrews University and President of the Aristotelian Society 1898–9. In his posthumously published *Philosophical Studies* (1905) he complains bitterly that his academic position closed his lips about religion. He did not believe in a personal God—his God is “the highest or ideal good”—or immortality (p. 252).

Rizal, José, M.D., Ph.D. (1861–96), Philippine physician. After a brilliant course in science at Madrid, Paris, Heidelberg, Leipzig, and Berlin Universities, he practised medicine in the Philippines, but soon incurred the wrath of Church and State by his exposure of the corruption of the Spanish priests and monks (*Friars and Filipinos*, Engl. trans., 1886, *El filibusterismo*, 1891, etc.). He was several times banished, and his premature end is due to one of the many sordid crimes of the Spanish Church in modern times. He volunteered for service during an epidemic of yellow fever in Cuba, and on his way there was treacherously arrested and shot. See Prof. Blumentritt, *Biography of Dr. J. Rizal* (Engl. trans., 1898).

Roberts, Isaac, D.Sc., F.R.S. (1829–908), astronomer. Starting life as a miller's apprentice, he made a fortune in business, and after his retirement won high reputation in astronomy. The photographs taken with his 20-inch telescope were among the best then available, and he had the Gold Medal of the Royal Astronomical Society and other honours. He confesses his sticism in his letters to Holyoake: “seem to be now as ever the play-thing of some being that permits us to rise into the maximum discomfort and at the end has arranged that we return to the state of unconsciousness” (*Life and Letters of Holyoake*, II, 300).

Macdonald, the Right Hon. John Macdonald (1869–1933), writer and politician. Member of the family of the Isle of Arran, received an elementary education, then journalism in Edinburgh. He worked in London, and worked in the Social Movement, editing the *former* after the death of

Bradlaugh. He represented Tyneside from 1906 to 1918, and was Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Trade, 1911–15, and Privy Councillor. His writings cover a wide field—politics, economics, history, and comparative religion—and of particular Rationalist interest are his *History of Freethought in the Nineteenth Century* (1899), *History of Freethought, Ancient and Modern* (2 vols., 1915), *Short History of Christianity* (1902), and *Short History of Morals* (1920). In a series of works (*Christianity and Mythology*, 1900, *Pagan Christs*, 1903, *The Historical Jesus*, 1916, *The Jesus Problem*, 1917, and *Jesus and Judas*, 1927), he contends that Jesus was not historical [see Jesus.]

Robespierre, Maximilien François Marie Isidore de (1758–94). The famous leader of the Jacobins was a very cultivated middle-class man—a provincial lawyer and “one of the most popular dandies of Arras” before he went to Paris—and no historian disputes the title “The Incorruptible,” which Marat gave him. But none now ever points out that he was a fanatical believer in a personal God—practically a Unitarian—who hated Atheism and persuaded the French Government, at the height of the Terror, to recognize the existence of the Supreme Being and declare it the established religion. Apart from a few unorganized popular outbursts and the September Massacres [see], which had a religious root, all the violence of the French Revolution was mainly directed by this man, yet English writers continue to ascribe it to Atheism. It ceased as soon as Robespierre was killed and his religion abolished. In the subsequent period of Atheism, the Directorate, Paris was very orderly and well-behaved.

Robin, Prof. Charles Philippe, M.D. (1821–85), French anatomist. Professor of anatomy at the Paris Faculty of Medicine. When the Church tried to get him deposed for his Rationalism the students fought (literally) for him and saved him. Later he was professor of histology, and made a world reputation in that branch of anatomy. He never wrote on religion, but his Atheism was so well known that from 1872 to 1876 (a period of Catholic reaction) his

name was struck off the list of jurymen because he did not believe in God. After 1876, when the tide turned, he entered the Senate. Robin set a fine example of refusing to bow to the influence of the Church.

Robinet, Jean Baptiste René (1735–1820), French writer. A Jesuit priest who adopted Deism and left the Church. A work he published anonymously, *De la nature* (1776), caused a sensation, and was so able that it was attributed to Diderot or Helvétius. He opened a shop for the sale of Deistic literature.

Robinson, Henry Crabb (1775–1867), writer. A London solicitor who threw up his practice to travel and to study at German universities. He met Goethe and Schiller at Weimar, and in London was a friend of Coleridge, Wordsworth, Southey, and Lamb. He figures prominently in the literary history of the time, though he published nothing during life (posthumous papers, 3 vols., 1869). Sir A. H. Layard says, in his *Autobiography* (1900), that it was largely conversation with Crabb Robinson that made him a Rationalist (I, 56).

Rodin, François Auguste, D.-ès-L. (1840–1917), French sculptor. Of poor Parisian parents and little education, he won recognition of his genius, and is regarded as the greatest sculptor of modern times; some say the greatest sculptor since Michael Angelo, if not Pheidias. His favourite authors were Rousseau and the Atheist Baudelaire, and C. Maclair confirms that he was "independent of any religious doctrines" (*Auguste Rodin*, Engl. trans., 1905, p. 26).

Rogers, Prof. James Edwin Thorold, M.A. (1823–90), economist. He was an enthusiastic High Church priest to 1859, but was one of the first to avail himself of the Clerical Disabilities Relief Act. Later he became professor of statistics and economics at King's College, and Drummond Professor of Political Economy at Oxford. He sat in Parliament also, and was a great friend of Cobden and Bright. His chief work (*The History of Agriculture and Prices*, 8 vols., 1866–87, of which *Six Centuries of Work and Wages*, 2 vols., 1884, is a condensation) put him in the front rank of economic or social historians.

Roland de la Platière, Jean Marie (1734–93), French economist. He was Minister of the Interior 1792–3, but resigned as a protest against the Terror, and fled the country. When he heard that his wife had been executed, he took his life. **Marie Jeanne Roland de la Platière** (1754–93), who figures in all literature of the Revolution as Mme. Roland, was one of the most famous women of the time. She had abandoned Catholicism for Deism and accepted the Revolution. Carlyle (*French Revolution*, III, Bk. V, Ch. II) is enthusiastic about her and admits that her "clear perennial womanhood" was inspired only by "logic, *Encyclopédies*, and the Gospel according to Jean Jacques." It was she who, passing a statue of liberty on her way to the scaffold, said: "Oh, Liberty, how many crimes are committed in thy name."

Rolland, Romain, D.-ès-L. (1866–1944), French writer and Nobel Prize winner. From 1895 to 1904 he was professor of the history of art at the École Normale Supérieure, then at Paris University. His works on art, history, literature, and social questions (notably *Jean Christophe*, a 10-volume survey of contemporary life in the form of a story) are read all over the world. He speaks occasionally of God, but says that he (or it) is "undefinable"; and he is essentially and fervently humanitarian. See P. Seippel's *Romain Rolland*, 1913.

Romagnosi, Prof. Giovanni Domenicol LL.D. (1761–1835), Italian jurist. Professor of public law at Parma University, then of civil law at Pavia, where he was deposed on account of his Rationalism. Romagnosi was one of the learned jurists of Italy who followed the footsteps of Beccaria [see] and Bentham (especially by his *Genesi del diritto penale*) a large share in the reform of the criminal law. Italian contemporaries described him as "one of the greatest thinkers of the century." Of his works in 19 vols., 1832–5.

Roman Catholic Church, a ~~faith~~ religious organization the highest of which covers nearly nineteen like ~~the~~ 60, and that at one time embraced ~~the~~ whole of Europe, and served ~~the~~ some 150,000,000 followers ~~in~~ whose

of the world, is bound to furnish much material both to critics and admirers, and no social historian of any distinction has ever attempted to strike a severe balance of its services and disservices to the race. None is likely to approach this task to-day, when the migration of millions of Catholic voters to the United States and the British Empire has enabled it in these democratic countries to attain a power in public life by means of which it can to a large extent control publications and education, while its natural alliance with wealth and privilege gives it a new influence in Catholic lands, which are now practically all Fascist. It is an inevitable result of this situation that its own literature, which has always been untruthful, since it has the unique and demoralizing privilege of being guarded from criticism by a prohibition to read critics under pain of hell, has become more audacious than ever, while, as a hundred articles in this work show, it has taken advantage of its new position to secure a falsification of our encyclopædias, interfere with education in non-Catholic schools and colleges, and organize committees for the intimidation of the Press, libraries, booksellers, and publishers. The great Rationalists of a century ago lent their aid in the work of Catholic Emancipation, though they despised the Church and its heology. Now, while organized Rationalism is itself still a small body with no opportunity of exercising political pressure, the Catholic Church is its most bitter and unscrupulous enemy. Because it far exceeds all other Churches in poisoning the wells of public instruction and in its distortion of historical facts because its history covers nearly the entire period of European history and is more intimately interwoven with that of Protestantism, and because the survival of a belief in such dogmas as Original Sin, Hell, Transubstantiation, Confession, Papal Infallibility, etc., in an educated age, requires a special inquiry, a large number of articles in this work are devoted to this inquiry, doctrines, methods, and positions. Here we sum up the results under the general headings the facts

(1) The origin and early development of the Roman Church are falsely described in Catholic books, and the untruth spreads to a wider literature. Until the third century the Roman community had the disadvantage, in comparison with other metropolitan Churches, that it lived in a despised quarter, the Vatican Field, outside Rome, and further isolated itself from the Romans by using Greek as its official language. To this the chief Catholic historian of the period, Mgr. Duchesne, agrees. He is, however, forced, like all other Catholics, to claim that its obscurity was gradually changed into distinction by a general recognition of the fact that it was founded by Peter and Paul. Although a few Protestant historians have strangely accepted this, the ground of it—the appearance of a tradition (or statement) to that effect in Rome in the second part of the second century—is not serious evidence, and it is positively refuted by the testimony of the Roman Christians themselves, who, in their Letter to the Corinthians [see], claim that Paul visited Rome and plainly imply that Peter [see] did not. But, while the Church at large accepted the Roman fabrication, it peremptorily, and generally with anger or disgust, rejected every single claim of authority which the Popes based upon it. [See Papacy.] The Roman community grew in numbers and wealth owing to the corrupt methods of Pope Callistus [see], in the third century, but other Churches disdained its intellectual quality, and the only writer or scholar it produced in many centuries, Hippolytus, was an anti-Pope, who scathingly criticized it. In the general Diocletian persecution [see], when its membership is estimated at anything between 10,000 and 50,000, it had a dozen martyrs, and there was a comprehensive apostasy. But the conversion of Constantine [see] brought it a sudden and extraordinary accession of wealth and privileges, and by the middle of the century it was generally corrupt in clergy and laity. [See Damasus and Jerome.] At this time it began to fabricate the stories of saints and martyrs [see] with which Catholic literature now adorns its early history, but it still had a low cultural position,

and was often rebuked and defied by the great Christian leaders (Ambrose, Basil, Augustine, etc.). The fall of the Empire, in the fifth century (and the final secession, in disgust, of the Greek Church, left the Roman bishop supreme in the West, and in a world of ruins and dense ignorance he extended his power until the entire Christian Church in the West became the Roman Church, or subject to the Roman bishop. It had by this time also adopted the name Catholic (universal). This was ironic, because the Greek Church, which despised the Roman, had far more numbers, and because such universality as the Popes commanded in Europe had been won mainly by violence and fraud, and facilitated by the appalling general ignorance which had succeeded the pagan system of education. For its "victory" over rival religions and its large adoption of their myths and ceremonies *see* Paganism.

(2) The Roman Church now exercised despotic control over Europe west of the Balkans for a thousand years. That period is, from the social-moral point of view, the most prolonged reaction and most vicious epoch in civilized history, for even when wealth, art, and intellectual life recovered, mediæval Christendom witnessed a combination of sexual licence, cruelty, and injustice to which there is no parallel in the later and better part of any of the reactionary periods of history. For the extraordinary prolongation of the reaction, moreover, the Church was mainly responsible. It frustrated the idealist efforts of various monarchs (Theodoric, Liutprand, Roger, Frederic II, etc.); it thrived on ignorance, which gave an easier circulation to its forged canons, decretals [Forged Decretals], donations of estates (Donation of Constantine), lives and relics of martyrs, etc.; it created, to a great extent on fraudulent bases, a structure of Papal power to the interest of which it subordinated all secular or human interests; it encouraged the lingering of barbaric sentiments by using the grossest methods of preventing criticism of itself [Inquisition; Justice; Massacres; Persecution; Toleration; Torture]; it condemned interest on loans [Usury], yet built up

in its hierarchy a monstrous fiscal system [Indulgences; Simony], condemned intellectual initiative instead of condemning serfdom or war, rebuked the most progressive princes and flattered the most vicious if they promised docility [see Gregory I, etc.]; it strangled freedom and impeded science, the first conditions of real recovery, and in its best representatives it set up a code of life which was both unnatural and inimical to social advancement; and, with occasional futile protests, it allowed a chronic and appalling corruption in what it called its spiritual machinery (Popes, prelates, priests, monks, and nuns) for governing the world. The facts upon which these generalizations are based will be found, with contemporary and leading modern authorities, in the articles named above and under the titles Art; Barbaric Invasions; Chivalry; Dark Age; Democracy; Education; Feast of Fools; Middle Ages; Monasticism; Papal States; Philanthropy; Prostitution; Renaissance; Rule of the Whores; Scholastics; Science; Serfdom; Thirteenth Century. To these the apologist must oppose generalizations of service which are at least as large and as securely based upon facts as those of the critic. It is common, but futile, to remind us that the faith inspired a large number of "beautiful lives" of men and women. What the value of biographies of these is, and how we must discriminate in judging types and motives of character, we shall discuss under Saints, but it is notorious that the literature of Buddhism, either in its early atheistic or its later religious stage, and of atheistic Confucianism boasts of at least as many "beautiful characters," while during the last two centuries non-Theistic humanitarianism has inspired very large numbers of fine personalities in the best sense of the word. It is, in any case, a symptom of either prejudice or defective judgment to extol an ethical institution of complete and universal power on the ground that it occasionally produces a fine character, yet leaves the general level so sordid. The Church must, like any other institution, be valued according to, to correct generalizations of service, whose disservice; yet every Catholic church

broad service to the race or to civilization is shown in the above articles to be based upon untruth. It had almost no share, comparatively to its wealth and power, in the abolition of slavery and serfdom or the restoration of general education and philanthropy: it encouraged, by its own policy, the regime of violence, war, and injustice: it employed, but did not inspire, the new art, and had nothing to do with the growth of wealth, civic life, trade, industry, and the middle class, which was the main factor of progress.

(3) Rome itself, we saw [Papacy], lagged behind the other cities in the restoration of civilization and was despised by them, so that it is incongruous to claim a beneficent influence for the vital and central machinery of the Church; and, when it came into line, in the fifteenth century, with the other Italian cities, it emulated also their characteristic vices. "The world," says the authoritative *Cambridge Modern History* (I, 673) at this point, "has rarely seen a more debased standard of morality than that which prevailed in Italy in the closing years of the Middle Ages." [See Renaissance, Popes of the]. Pastor's *Catholic History of the Popes* gives, with the inevitable strained reserves, the same impression. The Reformation [see] was the natural reaction to this, and social and political circumstances now facilitated the success of a rebellion against the corrupt system that had proceeded since the rebirth of intelligence, in the eleventh century. The Catholic Counter-Reformation [see] was a farce, for the countries which clung to the Roman Church remained as corrupt as they were inefficient. [See Papal States; Spain; Spanish America.] France [see], which had remained very independent of Rome and repeatedly rebelled [Gallican Church; St. Bartholomew], opened the next phase with the Revolution [see] of 1789. The Roman Church then entered upon a bloody campaign for the destruction of the modern spirit [see democracy], which it has resumed in its own day, and an attempt to paralyse the flow of culture and discussion which is only disguised in Great Britain and America. It has, however, lost more

than 100,000,000 adherents since the beginning of the nineteenth century. Owing to the renewal of its murderous policy in Italy, Spain, Portugal, and most of Spanish America, and the present condition of Germany, it is difficult to estimate the number of genuine members of the Church to-day. This is attempted under *Statistics, Religion* and it will be found that, instead of 350,000,000 members it claims, it has not 200,000,000, and the true total is nearer 150,000,000. But this gross total is misleading. Three-fourths of it consists of Latin-American Indians, or *metis*, natives in foreign missions, Polish, Italian, Irish, German, Slav, and other peasants, and the masses of next-to-illiterate folk one finds in Liverpool, Glasgow, New York, Chicago, etc. But the cultural quality of the remaining one-fourth is itself peculiar. The Roman Church is to-day an economic corporation of bishops and priests fighting for survival in a world to which its dogmas, practices, and history make it entirely alien, and this survival depends largely on its retention of the wealthy or better-educated minority. How it retains them in such countries as America and Great Britain we have seen—by a very audacious untruthfulness in its own literature which is protected by forbidding the faithful under penalty of mortal sin (hell) to read critics, by social and political intrigue (in America even selling the title of Papal "count," etc.), by securing economic advantages for converts and members, by church services which are nicely calculated to induce intellectual twilight-sleep, etc. But the chief explanation is that this Catholic minority is itself of poor intellectual quality. In *Culture and Religion* we quote the religious analysis of the 30,000 names of the American *Who's Who* (which invites statements of creed) from Prof. Huntington and Prof. Whitney's *Builders of America* (1931). The Catholics have 7 per 100,000 of their body in the book, and these are largely names of prelates and rich benefactors of the Church. The Unitarians have 1,185 per 100,000 of their members, the Universalists 390, the Protestant Episcopal Church 156. The Catholics are thus on the lowest cultural

level. The English *Who's Who* does not state creeds; but an analysis of the *Catholic Who's Who* shows the same unflattering situation. Although the list of 10,000 names is swollen by including men in all parts of the Empire (especially Eire and Malta), America, and other countries, it is culturally disreputable. Most of the names are those of clerics or wealthy and aristocratic converts—*pour encourager les autres*—and next in point of numbers are officials of the Civil and Diplomatic Services, whom the Church seeks for obvious reasons, then military and naval officers (down to the rank of lieutenant if they are members of semi-aristocratic families). The nearest approach to scientific men are Prof. B. A. McSwiney and Prof. E. T. Taylor, of whom a few may have heard. Compare the percentage of distinction in the Rationalist Press Association, with its 4,951 members, with that in the Catholic Church in Britain, with its 2,000,000 members. History is represented by Hilaire Belloc; philosophy by a few priests. But art and letters, in which exact thinking is not material, are well represented—Sir P. Gibbs, Sheila Kaye-Smith, Compton Mackenzie, Wilfrid Meynell, Alfred Noyes, F. Brangwynn, P. Downie, Sir J. Lavery, Sir E. and Lady Seymour Hicks, Charles Laughton, Mrs. A. Toynbee (daughter of Dr. G. Murray), Wyndham Lewis, Viscount Castlerosse, and Bruce Lockhart. A French list would be as rich in literary men and soldiers and as poor in cultural value. A German list would be still feebler. It is time that Rationalists abandoned their expectation (based upon a misconception of Catholic teaching about faith and authority) that the world of the future will be divided between Rome and Reason. The Roman Church is losing heavily, if one remembers its frantic insistence on a full birth-rate [see], and would decay much more rapidly if it were not for its policy of coercion wherever possible, and deception everywhere. For books see the lists in the articles already quoted. There is also very severe criticism of the Church in H. G. Wells's recent *You Can't Be Too Careful* (1942) and *Crux Ansata* (1945). He says: "The most evil thing

in the world to-day is the Roman Catholic Church."

Roman Empire, The Mediæval. [See *Holy Roman Empire.*]

Roman Republic of 1848, The. For the foul condition of the Pope's dominion to the middle of the nineteenth century see *Papal States*. When the Holy Alliance stamped out, as they said, the last sparks of the Revolution in Europe, the Papal Court resumed its vicious ways, and elected Popes whose character was as poor as their ability, while critics were thrown into some of the vilest dungeons in Europe. See the description of them, from personal experience, by Felice Orsini, *The Austrian Dungeons in Italy* (Engl. trans., 1856), which tells also of his Papal prisons. Catholic writers say that Pius IX was elected, in 1846, to effect whatever reform was really necessary. The only comment one need make upon this is that Pius's Secretary of State, Cardinal Antonelli, who had been "born in a den of thieves," left a fortune of £4,000,000, and an illegitimate daughter, the Countess Lambertini, claiming it. In 1848 the revolutionary wave which rolled over Europe reached Italy, and, with the support of the majority of the people, Garibaldi and his friends set up the Roman Republic. It promised a beneficent reform of Italy, but the Pope, after promising to co-operate, fled in disguise, and called upon Louis Napoleon to send a French army, which destroyed the Republic. Pius returned to full reaction and the savage treatment of rebels, and in 1864 he defied the modern world by issuing the Syllabus [see], one of the most pitiful documents in modern Papal history. On the Republic, see Jesse White Mario's *Birth of Modern Italy* (1909).

Romanes, George John, F.R.S. (1848–94), zoologist. Romanes, a friend of Darwin, and stout champion of Darwinism, is always quoted as a "great scientist" who deserted Rationalism for religion. That he was a distinguished writer on science is not questioned, but what really occurred in what is called his "conversion" is misrepresented. His last years were saddened by a physical illness which admittedly lowered the vigour of his mind, and his very number of

and zealous wife induced him to die in the Anglican communion. She then, with the co-operation of Bishop Gore, published, with the title *Thoughts on Religion*, what purported to be his new ideas. The book, even as it left their devout hands, does *not* show a belief in the leading Christian dogmas, or even in the orthodox conception of God. What it does painfully show is the wreck of a scientific mind. It makes this friend of Darwin and Huxley declare that "the nature of man without God is thoroughly miserable," and "unbelief is usually due to indolence, often to prejudice, and never a thing to be proud of." If these are the actual words of a man who for twenty years had known all the great Victorian Rationalists, it was tragic to publish them. It is not surprising that the book goes on to say that "no one can believe in God, or *a fortiori* in Christianity, without a severe act of will"—in other words, a sacrifice of intellect—but how that recommends the beliefs it is difficult to see.

Rome, Morals in Ancient. There are few more stupid passages in apologetic works and sermons than the references to "the morals of ancient Rome." The early history of the Roman people is fabulous, but it is usual to say that their civilization lasted as a Republic from about 500 to 31 B.C., and, as an Empire, from the latter date to A.D. 476. Naturally every phase of advance and reaction occurred at one time or other in these thousand years, and the writer who tries to sustain the old and discredited fiction that the nations "sat in darkness and the shadow of death" until Jesus appeared, draws upon an almost mediæval selection of the worst features, greatly exaggerated, that can be found at any stage, and calls these the morals of the ancient Romans. One has only to reflect what sort of picture one could present of the morals of the British, the Americans, or the French, by using that method, even if one went back only two centuries instead of ten. In so far as religious apologetic or controversy is concerned, the morals of the Romans—can use that phrase of a vast nation with the usual diversities of

character—are irrelevant until the fourth century of the Christian era. The main question is whether the new religion improved the general character of the Romans. As the Christians were, until the fourth century, a very small body, and quite isolated from the life of the city, suggestions of influence before that time are not serious. It is, however, advisable to point out that the charges against the Republican Romans are as crude as we usually find history to be in apologetic writers. The earlier Romans are praised for their esteem of chastity so that those of the later Republic may be more heavily charged with deterioration. The old regime was, in point of fact, vicious and unjust. There was no law controlling the husband and parent in private or domestic affairs. He, while personally free, enforced chastity by threats on his wife and daughters, over whom he had the same power of life and death as over his children and slaves. This pitiful condition of the woman was bound up with the old forms of marriage and was a relic of the barbaric days from which the Romans had recently emerged. With expansion and the introduction of Greek culture, in the second century B.C., the semi-barbarism of the old ideas was recognized. Women were emancipated, wealth and luxury inevitably accumulated, and there were such excesses as one always finds in such periods of transition. Modern history, which discards fiction about the "genius" of the Roman or the Greek, recognizes that geographical conditions forced upon the Romans their policy of war and aggression; or, to say the least, just as naturally led to war in the Romans as they encouraged peace in early Egypt or Greece. The wars overpowered immense bodies of uncivilized Slavs and Teutons, and it was considered more humane to enslave than to follow the earlier practice and kill these; and the same constant practice of war led to the esteem of the gladiatorial games [see], which were borrowed from the Etruscans. But the real greatness of the age was fully recognized even by the older historians. Mommsen (from whom occasional pictures of vice are selected) has a chapter of the highest appreciation of Cæsar's plans for the

world, and Merivale (a Christian) says that Cæsar's is "the greatest name in history." Stories of wealth and viciousness are greatly exaggerated or taken from such scurrilous Catholic amateurs as V. Thaddeus (*Julius Cæsar and the Grandeur That was Rome*, 1925). It is agreed, among the highest authorities (Mommsen, Friedländer, etc.), that the largest Roman fortunes were very much smaller than those of modern multimillionaires. The luxury of the richest, says Freidländer, "cannot be compared with that of our day." Plutarch's *Lives* gives just as many Romans of high character at this date as the reverse, and Cicero's letters introduce us to a circle of men and women of fine character and culture. This was only four centuries after the beginning of Roman civilization. Compare the state of England or of France, not 400, but 1,000 years after the Romans had introduced civilization.

But the broad answer to all this talk about luxury, vice, and degeneration in the last century of the Republic is that in fact it led on to what many historians regard as the greatest Age in Roman history, that of Augustus (31 B.C. to A.D. 14). Many of the laments over the morals of the Romans refer to this age. They tell of the adulteries of the Emperor's favourite daughter Julia and a group of nobles—as if "the fast set" gave a character to any civilization—but they do not add that Augustus banished Julia, whom he dearly loved, from Italy for life and executed many of her frivolous companions. How many Christian monarchs so heavily punished adultery in their courts? Compare Louis XIV. But again the charge of "vice corroding the foundations" is stultified by the broad facts. In spite of the purple passing, through the defects of the system of succession, to three vicious Emperors—and the Romans killed two of them after short reigns—the Rome which Augustus left behind rose, in a century, to the supreme height that was reached in the ancient world. In short, this Roman Empire, which is represented as decadent and degraded, had in pre-Christian days (omitting a few who ruled for some months only) twenty-nine Emperors. Of these, twenty-one,

R

who ruled for 245 years, were good men; eight only, who ruled for seventy-five years (and four of them were assassinated in disgust by the Romans), were corrupt men. Compare with this the record of the Popes, or any 300 years in the history of England, France, Germany, or any other Christian country. That the period of the so-called Stoic Emperors [see] was one of the best in history until modern times is now generally admitted by historians. L. Friedländer says, in the most authoritative study of Roman morals (*Roman Life and Manners under the Early Empire*, Engl. trans., 4 vols., 1909), that it was "an age which raised itself by its own efforts to higher and purer views of morality than all the ages which preceded it" (III, 280). Sir Samuel Dill's more recent and scholarly study of the period (*Roman Society from Nero to Marcus Aurelius*, 1904) fully agrees; and another Protestant historical writer, Dr. E. Reich (*The History of Civilization*, p. 371), makes a glowing defence of the Romans and concludes that "the average Roman was a gentleman." In special articles [Education; Philanthropy; Workers; etc.] we show that social morality was, in this age which apologists accuse of selfishness, higher than at any time in the history of the world until our age. Against all this the apologists—Glover excepted, as he knew Rome—put the discredited diatribes of Juvenal [see] and the epigrams of Martial [see], not stating that the latter poet refers, and only occasionally, to exceptional types of character and with warm indignation. To the austere Tacitus and Marcus Aurelius, the fine letters of Pliny, and the noble orations of Dio Chrysostom, the apologist pays no attention. After Marcus Aurelius there was a period of comparative decay, though even now the Empire produced admirable rulers like Alexander Severus, Aurelian, and Diocletian, who rise high above any of the later Christian Emperors.

In the fourth century Christianity came to power. We have a good literary record of the time, the second half of the century. For the life of Rome, which the apologists have in mind when they discuss this period,

we have the large work, *Saturnalia*, of Macrobius [see]; the *Res Gestæ*, of Ammianus Marcellinus; and the correspondence of the Prefect Symmachus and his friends. All the evidence is analysed in Sir S. Dill's *Roman Society in the Last Century of the Western Empire* (1898), and he concludes that, as Macrobius definitely says, this last generation of Roman pagans was admirable in point of character. Critics quote Ammianus to the contrary, but the veteran soldier is merely pouring scorn upon a minority of the wealthy. As Dill shows, Symmachus, one of the richest, had at the most £60,000 a year, and spent vast sums on public purposes; and his letters reflect an excellent character. Slavery was now greatly reduced, and the slaves were protected by law. The workers had remarkable advantages—free food, entertainments and medical service, and work on only about half the days of the year. The system of universal free education—primary, secondary, and to some extent higher—was complete, and private tutors for the rich made up to £4,000 a year. The gladiatorial games [see] continued for 100 years under the Christian Emperors, and ceased only when the stream of wealth ceased. In short, no expert would dispute that in the course of the fourth century there was no perceptible change in the general character of either Greeks or Romans. On the other hand, as explained elsewhere [Christianity; Damasus; Jerome; Salvianus], the general character of those Greeks and Romans who embraced the new faith was deplorable. The Christian writers of the time do not so much admit this as insist on it, especially in regard to sexual morals. The priest Salvianus (*De Gubernatione Dei*), who makes a point of comparing the old pagan and the Christian character in every province of the Empire, emphatically says that the general pagan character was the better; and his book (in Migne) is completely ignored by all religious writers, who claim that there was an improvement. In addition to works recommended in the body of the article, of G. Boissier, *La religion romaine* (s., 1874), a work which is by no

means superseded; J. Burckhardt, *Die Zeit Constantins des Grossen* (1935); and W. Huettl, *Antoninus Pius* (2 vols., 1936). O. Kiefer's *Sexual Life in Ancient Rome* (Engl. trans., 1934) is an unreliable and very exaggerated attack, and the title is wrongly translated. It is a general criticism of the Roman civilization, and it has no weight against such authorities as Mommsen, Friedländer, Boissier, and Dill.

Romilly, Sir Samuel (1757–1818), jurist. A clerk in a London lawyer's office who in time reached the leading position at the British Bar and the office of Solicitor-General. He had in youth adopted the ideas of the great French Rationalists, and in later life he was a zealous colleague of Bentham in the work of reform. He drafted a comprehensive reform of the laws, and fought against black slavery and the restoration of the feudal monarchs after Waterloo, in spite of his eminent position in law and public life. Robertson, who barely mentions him in his *Short History of Freethought*, wrongly says that it merely transpired after his death that he was a Deist (II, 448). The *Dictionary of National Biography* rightly says that "he early lost all faith in Christianity but embraced with ardour the gospel of Rousseau." It adds that "his principles were austere to the verge of Puritanism." He was, in fact, of so sensitive a character that he took his life when his wife died, but he had for years associated with Bentham, who was a notorious heretic. Professor Bain gives, in his *James Mill* (1882, p. 451), a letter in which Bentham says that Romilly agreed with every word of his attack on Christianity, and it was a particularly drastic attack. See B. L. Shientag, *A Great Criminal Law Reformer* (1936).

Rose, Ernestine Louis Lasmond Potorsky (1810–82), Polish-American reformer. Born in Poland, daughter of a Jewish rabbi, she became a Rationalist while travelling over Europe, settled in England, and adopted the views of Robert Owen. After marrying W. E. Rose she went to America, and for the next thirty years was one of the most fiery lecturers against slavery, the Churches, and all other evils. She

was, Putnam, says, "one of the best lecturers of her time," and "no orthodox man could meet her in debate" (*Four Hundred Years of Freethought*, p. 495).

Rosny, Prof. Louis Léon Lucien Prunol de (1837-1916), French Orientalist. Professor of Japanese at the École des langues orientales and of Oriental religions at the École des hautes études (Paris University). He was one of the greatest Orientalists of the nineteenth century, and rendered important service in winning appreciation for Buddhism and Confucianism. He founded the Orientalist Congress, the Ethnographical Society, the Oriental Athenæum, and the Society for Japanese Studies, and his many learned works brought him honours from all countries. Rosny was a Theist (*Le poème de Job*, 1860).

Ross, Prof. Edward Alsworth, Ph.D., LL.D. (b. 1866), American sociologist. Professor of economics at Indiana and Cornell Universities, later of sociology at Leland Stanford, Nebraska, Wisconsin, and Harvard, and President of the American Sociological Society (1914-15). In spite of his high academic position, national and international, Ross was a drastic and outspoken Rationalist. In *Changing America* (1912) he roused the American Churches by saying that "the religion a hierarchy ladles out to its dupes is chloroform" (p. 9). Karl Marx is usually considered outside the pale of discussion when he makes the same remark ("Religion is the opium of the people"). In *Science and Sociology* (1907), in which he pleads for a natural and social ethic, Ross is equally outspoken.

Ross, Colonel Sir Ronald, K.C.B., LL.D., D.Sc., M.D., F.R.S. (1857-1932), physician and Nobel Prize winner. While in the Indian Medical Service he began the study of malaria which culminated in his discovery of the parasite in the malaria-bearing mosquito. He received the Parkes Gold Medal and a long list of other honours. Apart from his medical works, he published a volume of poems (*Philosophies*, 1910) and a book of literary plays (*Psychologies*, 1929) in which he expounds his Theistic Rationalism. See especially the poem "Dogma." He rejects all Churches

and creeds and wants "no priest but conscience, and no lord but law."

Ross, William Stewart (1844-1906), writer. Son of a Scottish farm servant, he was enabled to study for the Church at Glasgow University, but abandoned the creed and began to write, for which he discovered considerable gifts. He won two gold medals for poetry in Scotland. He began as a publisher in London, but gradually confined himself to writing Agnostic works and editing *The Agnostic Journal*. Under the pen-name of "Saladin" he was for years a very prominent figure in the Freethought movement.

Rosetti, Dante Gabriel (1828-82), poet and painter. A precocious son of a refugee from the White Terror at Naples, he began to write drama at the age of six and poetry at the age of twelve, and in 1847 he attracted wide attention by his *Blessed Damosel*. He joined the Pre-Raphaelites, and for some years devoted himself to painting, but he returned to poetry, and was a very esteemed figure in the world of letters. Like most poets—and he had very poor health in his later years—he wavered in his views on religion, at one time writing enthusiastically about the mediæval Church, and at another leaning to Spiritualism, but he was an Agnostic all his life. In the Memoir prefixed to his *Works* (I, 114) it is said that he was "a decided sceptic . . . professed no religious faith and practised no regular religious observances." His brother, **William Michael Rossetti** (1829-1919), also was a Rationalist. See his introduction to his edition of Blake's poems (1913). He edited the Pre-Raphaelite journal, *The Germ*, translated Dante's *Inferno*, and wrote the *Life of Keats* (1887) and other works.

Rostand, Edmond (1868-1918), French dramatist. A bank-clerk, then law-student, who took to poetry and drama and became one of the most famous dramatists of modern times. He had adopted Rationalism in his youth, and in mature life he held that it was the destiny of the theatre to supersede the Churches. His biographer, **Jean Hat Harassté** (*Edmond Rostand*, 1913), quotes him as saying: "It is now only in faith; theatre that souls can feel their wings are

Especially in *Chantecler* (1910), he expresses his hatred of "creatures of the night" and their conspiracy to prevent the dawn of a brighter age.

Rousseau, Jean Jacques (1712-78), Swiss reformer. He was of a Huguenot refugee family, but was left an orphan at an early age, and had little education. He (rather under compulsion) adopted Catholicism, and was supported by a pious Catholic lady as her lover, which gave him leisure to study. Later he settled in Paris and contributed to the *Encyclopédie*, but his socialistic *Discourse on the Origin of Inequality Amongst Men* set him apart from the other writers. He continued to be supported by rich friends, and wrote *Julie*, *The Social Contract*, and *Emile*, for the reform of education and to bring about a social revolution. He went back to Switzerland, and was expelled for his "irreligion." He settled in England, where he began to write his *Confessions*, but returned to France for his last years. We have to make a large allowance for temperament and the unhappiness of much of his life, but it is notable that he was the least sceptical, and the weakest in character—indeed, the only man of weak character—among the great French Rationalists. He sent his five children to the Foundling Hospital, and, in spite of his art, does not present an impressive picture of himself in his *Confessions*. Yet he was a much firmer believer in God than Voltaire, and professed a high regard for "pure Christianity." He rendered inestimable service in the reform of education and was very sincere in his attack on social evils; but the fact is that, of all the great Rationalists of the eighteenth century, the one who most pleaded for religion and sentiment and constructiveness instead of criticism was the poorest in personal character.

Royce, Prof. Josiah, Ph.D. (1855-1916), American philosopher. Professor of the history of philosophy, then of natural history, moral philosophy, and civil polity, at Harvard University. Royce is regarded as the leading metaphysical thinker of America. Even his works on religion (*The Conception of God*, 1897; *The Conception of Immortality*, 1900, etc.) are, however, so far removed from the uninitiated that he is

curiously described as a Theist, Pantheist, and Christian. In the second of the above works he seems to recognize some sort of immortality, but in the course of an article in the *Hibbert Journal* (July, 1907), he says: "I pretend to no knowledge about my future fortunes" (p. 744); so he is incorrectly classed as a Christian thinker.

Rudimentary Organs. [See *Vestigial Organs*.]

Ruggieri, Cosmo (died 1615), Italian astrologer. Catherine de Medici brought him to Paris, and he lived many years at the court of that morbid Catholic fanatic, and figures prominently in the history of the time. On his death-bed he jeered at the priests and declared that he was an Atheist. The people dragged his body through the mud.

"Rule of the Whores," The. Cardinal Baronius, the father of Catholic history and a strict Churchman, gave this name, using the coarsest Latin word, in his *Annales Ecclesiastici* (12 vols., 1588-1607) to the stretch of Papal history from about 900-964. During that period the Papal Court was completely dominated by women of the principal "noble" Roman families, whom the contemporary Bishop Litprand repeatedly calls "whores" (scorn on account of their licentiousness). It is amusing to reflect that this period which is probably the most sordid in the history of religion, began soon after what pro-Catholic American historians call "the Carolingian Renaissance" of Europe and actually coincides in part with their "Ottonian Renaissance." Charlemagne [see] had enormously enriched the Papacy at the beginning of the ninth century, and Pope Nicholas I (858-867), one of the "good Popes," is supposed to have converted it into a real spiritual power. The undisputed truth is that within ten years of the death of Nicholas the barbarism which disfigured Europe, and upon which Charlemagne had made little impression, erupted in hideous fashion in Rome. The nobles, a fierce and illiterate mob of bandits, rebelled against the Pope, and it is stated by the best authority of the time that in the end (882) they murdered him. It is almost enough to describe the appalling corruption of Rome that

followed, with very few and brief interruptions, during the next two centuries, to say that thirty Popes succeeded each other in 100 years. How many were murdered the miserable records of the time do not make clear. What we do know, from the two best writers of the tenth century, the Lombard Bishop Liutprand and the French Abbot Flodoard, is that in 896 the nobles triumphed and elected their own Pope; and the long period of their ascendancy was inaugurated by this Pope, Stephen VI, holding a trial of the grisly corpse—it had been buried *eight months* earlier—of Pope Formosus (propped up in the Papal throne), mutilating it, and tossing it to the mob to drag through the streets and throw into the river. This was the first triumph of the family of Theophylactus, the leading noble and highest Papal official. Eight Popes succeeded each other in the next eight years, and that several of them at least were murdered is clear. Then Theodora, wife of Theophylactus and a “shameless whore” (Liutprand, *Antapodosis*, II, 48), and her daughters Marozia and Theodora, who were “even more prompt in the service of Venus” (Liutprand), took control of the “Holy See.” They first elected Marozia’s lover, Bishop Sergius (Sergius III, 904–11), a prelate-bandit of infamous character and the murderer of his predecessor. The contortions of the apologists of the *Catholic Encyclopædia*—for a full examination of them see McCabe’s *History of the Popes* (1939, 215–17)—are at this stage desperate. They object that Bishop Liutprand was himself not a virtuous man, and they do not tell us that the official *Papal Chronicle* admits that Pope John XI was the son of Sergius—or that the very virtuous Abbot Flodoard (*Annals*, year 933) confirms that Marozia was the mother. As one may conveniently read, in Gregorovius’s *History of the City of Rome*, noble women of this character—illiterate (he reproduces documents which they have to sign with a cross like peasants), very robust, and completely unscrupulous—were now the common type in Europe, and would be for the next four centuries. They became “the monarchs of Rome,” Liutprand

says, taking the highest titles recognized in its constitution and acting with the ferocity of tigers and the lubricity of apes. After the death of Sergius two Popes crossed the blood-sodden stage in three years, and then the lover of the elder Theodora, the Archbishop of Ravenna, became Pope John X. But Theodora died, and Marozia, in comparison with whom Messalina was a pale thing and Lucrezia Borgia a nun, had the Pope and his chief supporters murdered, and, taking the title Patrician (which had been invented for Charlemagne), ruled Rome from the Castle of Sant’ Angelo. As her son by Pope Sergius was still young—he seems to have been born while Sergius was “Holy Father”—she put on two puppet-Popes in three years (their end is unknown), and then made her son Pope John XI. She next murdered her husband, and her Papal son married her with great ceremony, in Sant’ Angelo, to one of the most brutal French nobles of the age (who had murdered his wife). But Marozia’s son by her murdered husband raised a successful revolt and, apparently, murdered his mother and took over the rule of the city and Papacy. Properly speaking, the Rule of the Whores was now over, but the debasement of the Roman See which it had inaugurated lasted, with a few short intervals, for another century. Marozia’s murderous son Alberic destined his own son for the Papacy, yet he allowed the boy to grow up from his early teens in every kind of vice. He became John XII [see], and was the most vicious and criminal in the long line of “bad Popes.” This was the period of the so-called Ottonian Renaissance, and the Emperor Otto, having his attention called to the adulteries, rapes, blasphemies, and sacrileges of the young Pope, said lightly—as the Pope supported his policy at the moment—that he must be left to sow his wild oats. Liutprand, who was now an important courtier, tells the whole incredible story in his *De Rebus Gestis Othonis*, (in the Migne series). John at last went the way of Popes of the Iron Age—at apparently he was beaten to death by any Roman who caught the Holy Faith; raping his wife—and after two Popes, are

appeared and disappeared in two years, another "noble" of the Theodora family, a bastard of a bishop, became John XIII. His brutalities lasted seven years, and, after a few years of a relatively virtuous Pope, another "noble" strangled the man of virtue, and for a year or two again proved that a Pope could be master of every vice. He was, in the end, murdered and his body dragged through the streets and tossed into the gutter. His successor earned in two years a European reputation for "greed and venality," and then the new Emperor imposed a really saintly man upon the Romans. They endured the novelty for a few months, then sold the tiara to a corrupt bishop and drove out the saint; and when the German army brought him back, the saintly man cut out eyes, tongues, etc., right and left with real Ottonian savagery. The Emperor next imposed a scholar, Gerbert [see], and the Romans, either literally or in effect, slew him in three years. It is said that both he and the Emperor were poisoned. In a few years descendants of the illustrious Theodora family again secured power, and put a boy of twelve, precociously learned in every vice, on the Papal throne; and this Benedict IX illumined Rome for thirteen years with what a succeeding Pope calls his "rapes, murders, and other unspeakable acts" (Victor III in his *Dialogues*, Migne XLIX, col. 1003). Reform began at last. The reform-party in Rome bought the tiara for 2,000 pounds of gold from Benedict, who was short of money and tired of fighting, and the way was prepared for the "reforms" of Gregory VII [see] by this pious act. The only detailed account of the period which is generally reliable is in Gregorovius's *History of the City of Rome*, Vol. III, though Milman's *History of Latin Christianity*, Vol. III, is still good. The narrative summarized here is taken from the best contemporary writers, chiefly Liutprand and Flodoard; and the contention of the *Catholic Encyclopedia*, that we have recently discovered documents which relieve the awful story to some extent, is quite false (see McCabe's *History of the Popes*, 1939, 209-37). The account in the

Cambridge Mediæval History, Pan- is generally sound, and adds, "cond of about the incredible condition of the etc., in Italy outside Rome, but in the condensed to give an adequate impression. More recent histories of Europe during the Middle Ages give a totally false impression by suppressing the worst facts and concealing the extraordinary length of the period of corruption."

Ruskin, John, M.A., LL.D. (1819-1900), writer. Never a strong man, he felt throughout life the influence of a deeply Christian mother and a father who, though a London wine-merchant, had an enthusiasm for art. While, therefore, a vein of scepticism and paganism runs through all his works (*Modern Painters*, 1843, *The Stones of Venice*, 1851-2, etc.), in which he shows himself the supreme master of melodious English prose, he often wavered in regard to religion. Habitually he was an Agnostic, and his zeal for social reform kept him estranged from the Churches. He told Augustus Hare, in 1860, that he "believed nothing" (Hare's *Story of My Life*, II, 484). The epidemic of Spiritualist fraud restored his belief in a future life in the seventies, and he began to use eccentric language about his position, as Sir E. T. Cook tells in his *Life of Ruskin* (2 vols., 1911). He called himself "a Christian Catholic," explaining that he meant "in the wide, eternal sense" (so that he included Huxley), and took "the Lord's Supper," but protested that it meant no more than meals at his own table (II, 451). He had "no precise dogmas," and he resented the idea that morality depends on religion: a truth which he puts very finely in his *Crown of Wild Olive*. Cook did not publish three intensely irritated letters (seen in manuscript by the present writer) in which he resented Clodd's highly respectable *Jesus of Nazareth* (1879), and his secretary begged Clodd to close the correspondence because Ruskin was off his mental balance with a sort of religious mania (McCabe's *Edward Clodd*, 1932, pp. 49-51).

Russell, John, Viscount Amberley (1842-76), writer. A son of the first

Earl Russell, who entered politics and was described by J. S. Mill in a letter to Carlyle as "one of the best of our rising politicians" (*Letters*, II, 87). He soon abandoned politics and took up the study of religion (*Analysis of Religious Beliefs*, 2 vols., 1876). He was a Spencerian Agnostic, and gave his eldest son a Rationalist tutor, but the Court of Chancery cancelled the appointment. The son, John Francis Stanley, second Earl Russell (1865-1931), nevertheless grew up a sturdy Agnostic and a valuable supporter of the R.P.A. He was one of the very few men to describe himself in *Who's Who* as an Agnostic. He qualified in electrical engineering and in law. The second son and third Earl, Bertrand Arthur William Russell, M.A., F.R.S. (b. 1872) won a European and American reputation as mathematician, philosopher, and social reformer. His mathematical work got him admitted to the Royal Society, and he is hardly less distinguished in philosophy and has had a great influence in making it more realistic. In an article in the *Hibbert Journal* (October, 1912) he accepted God as a sort of world-soul, but in later works he discards all religious language. He is an Honorary Associate of the R.P.A.

Russia, Religion in. The zeal with which the anti-religious campaign was pressed (unofficially) in the ten years after the Revolution must be understood in the light of the history of the Russian (or Orthodox) Church. Christianity had a foul record in the country until 1917, particularly in supporting every outrage of the Tsars and nobles upon the people. It was imposed upon Russia in the tenth century by "St." Vladimir, a brutal prince who raped and then "married" a Greek nun, and had in addition about a thousand concubines. It brought with it all the corruption of the Byzantine Church, and it has an even more ignoble history than Roman Christianity in the West. Peter the Great despised and insulted it, and Catherine, in her earlier years, expressed open disdain of it; but in the reaction to which the French Revolution gave occasion it became again the bulwark of the throne and blessed every injustice. In Russia even serfdom

lasted until 1861, and the Church had no part whatever in the freeing of the 42,000,000 serfs; and most of the nobles continued to treat them inhumanly. The priests were for the most part very ignorant and sensual—a shade lower than the priests of Ireland—and the bishops took sides with the Tsar and bureaucracy against the people until the Revolution. No body has been louder in charges of persecution than the Roman Catholics, and it is of interest to find Catholic writers (G. London and C. Pichon, *Le Vatican et le monde moderne*, 1933) relating that the Vatican hailed the Revolution "with real relief," and at once approached Lenin in the hope that its own would displace the Orthodox hierarchy. This appeal was constantly repeated, notably in 1922, when the Pope got permission to join in the relief of sufferers from the great famine; but the Russians found that the priests, contrary to their agreement, used the opportunity for propaganda (p. 406), and the Soviet authorities rightly dismissed them. The American Jesuit in charge of the mission, Fr. Walsh, then turned against Russia, and in an odious and mendacious booklet charged it with horrible persecution and the massacre of 6,900 Catholics. From that date (1930) the present Pope, then Secretary of State, stridently demanded the war upon Russia which Hitler—in his own interest, but also in the hope that the Pope's intrigues in the British Empire and America would split up the Allies—at length began. The worth of the stories of barbarous persecution during the Civil War that followed the Revolution may be judged from the statement of L. Lawton, in his *History of the Revolution*, that the Bolsheviks killed 8,050 ecclesiastics, including 1,275 archbishops and bishops. The *Catholic Encyclopedia* informs us that there were only about eighty archbishops and bishops in the whole of Russia at the time, and few of them were killed. The Russian Catholic, Miss Almedingen, (*The Catholic Church in Russia*, 1923), admits that few priests, and only one bishop, were killed, and that these were guilty (of conspiracy) in Russian faith; Nearly all Catholic priests in Russia are

and most of the laity, were Poles, and during the White War they intrigued on behalf of Poland. See J. H. Jackson's impartial work, *The Post-War World* (1935). For a temperate Russian account of the facts see F. Yaroslavsky's *Religion in the U.S.S.R.* (1932), in which the growth of the Atheist Movement is described. For admissions, of both Catholic priests and the highest authorities of the Orthodox Church and the Jewish community, that there never was at any time a persecution of religion in Russia, see the booklet by M. Sherwood, *The Soviet War on Religion* (1931). The way in which the cry of persecution has been sustained in the British Press and by Anglican as well as Romanist bishops is disgraceful. Pressed by pious Members in the House, our Foreign Secretary, Arthur Henderson, consulted our ambassador at Moscow, Sir Esmond Ovey, and gave (April 24, 1930) his official report that "no case has been discovered of a priest or anyone else being punished for practising religion." No writer or paper recalled that in the last century the Russian Church had treated the Romanists with just that brutality which is now attributed to the Bolsheviks (*Catholic Encyclopædia*), or that, under Lenin, Catholics for the first time in history were allowed sacred processions in the streets (Almedingen).

The head of the Atheistic Movement, Yaroslavsky, never desired persecution, and neither Lenin nor Stalin would have countenanced it. The chief means adopted were the ridicule of religion, which, instead of inflaming the simple believers, as many think that it must, was most effective in turning them into Atheists, coupled with a correct account of the sordid history of the Russian Church. As a result, Atheism spread far more rapidly than any religion had ever advanced. It made fifty times as much progress in twenty-five years as early Christianity had made in 250 years. It is shown elsewhere [Christianity; Paganism] that the highest serious estimate of the number

Christians by the year 300 is 5,000,000, the correct total is probably half number; besides that, the fact that a very small minority abjured the

faith in the Diocletian Persecution [see] sufficiently betrays the shallowness of their profession. In Soviet Russia, on the contrary, about 100,000,000 passed from the Churches to Atheism and Materialism in twenty years; indeed, since little could be done until the White War and the ensuing famine were over, we should say in the ten years from 1923 to 1933. Yaroslavsky's estimate that at most one-third of the people still belong to the Orthodox Church—the Roman Catholic Church, with its chronic conspiracy, has virtually ceased to exist—is generally accepted. It is endorsed by a Jesuit speaker in the report of the discussion of the Cambridge Summer School of Russian Studies in 1939 (*Religion in Russia*, 1940). As the total population was 170,000,000 in 1935, this implies (allowing for an already existing body of Atheists in the towns) the secession of at least 100,000,000 to Atheism, without any sort of persecution of religion. Even more important is the social-moral result. Serious criticism of the Soviet civilization is confined to the issue of political freedom, which is not relevant here. It is admitted that the general character of the people, which was very low under the old regime, has been remarkably improved in regard to intemperance, violence, crime, cleanliness, and mental alertness, and that the system of education and social service is one of the finest in the world. Our war alliance with Russia, and its heroic conduct, helped to dissipate the dense clouds of prejudice, largely due to religious misrepresentation, and when the world settles down we shall probably find in Russia a massive fact of importance in connection with the question of the relative social inspiration of religion or of Atheism and Materialism.

Rydberg, Prof. Abraham Viktor (1828–95), Swedish historian and poet. Professor of the history of civilization at Stockholm University, and author of some of the finest lyrics in the Swedish language. In spite of his high academic position, Rydberg was one of the finest influences in the spread of Rationalism in Sweden. See especially his *Bibeln's lära om Kristus* (1862) and *Romeska sägner om Paulus och Kristus* (1874).

S.

Sabazios. A deity of Thrace and Phrygia who is frequently identified with Dionysos and whose cult was often associated with that of Cybele and Attis [see]. As Greek writers said that they got their Dionysos from Thrace, and that he was there known as Sabazios, he seems to have been one of the pre-Aryan nature-gods of southern Europe. Some think, however, that he was originally a sea-god not a fertility-god. Possibly he was a spirit of the fertility of the sea, and later blended with the land fertility-deity.

Sabbath, The. A day of rest, not usually at fixed periods, was common among all peoples above the level of the Australians and the Melanesians. The Jews seem to have borrowed their Sabbath from the Babylonians, who had a seven-day week, as all admit, though they did not suspend work on the seventh day, and it was considered unlucky. As, however, their festival at the full moon was called Sabattu, it can hardly be doubted that the Jews adopted the name from them during the Exile. The Moslem follow the Jews in regard to the Sabbath, but are not compelled to abstain from work except during the hours of service. The claim of some apologists that Christianity, which changed the day of rest to "the Sun's Day" in honour of Christ, conferred a great boon on the poor workers of Rome by bringing them one day's rest in seven, reflects their abysmal ignorance of Roman history. By the fourth century the Romans had a day's holiday, with free entertainments, on more than half the days of the year. [See **Workers.**] They successfully resisted Constantine's attempt to introduce Sunday.

Sacæa, The. A Babylonian festival, more or less equivalent to the Roman Saturnalia and probably connected with the New Year, in which a criminal was robbed and treated as a king for three days and then, either literally or in mimicry, put to death. That this is a reminiscence of the almost universal dramatization, in religious ritual, of the annual death of vegetation is obvious.

Frazer, who has the best account of the Sacæa (*Golden Bough*, IV, 354-9), thinks that Barabbas, in the Jesus-story, was a victim of the festival. Conybeare, reflecting that the soldiers in Syria would be familiar with the festival, concludes, from the crown of thorns and other details of the story, that they carried it out in the trial and execution of Jesus (*The Historical Christ*, 1914, p. 52). Without taking these details as historical, we may recognize that as parts of the story they were taken from the Sacæa.

Sacraments. In classical literature a *sacramentum* (sacred thing) is a pledge deposited in a temple by parties to a lawsuit or a soldier's oath of loyalty. The Latin Fathers began, in the third century, to apply the word to Christian "sacred things" (baptism, the eucharist, the Christian's vow of loyalty, etc.), but it was used loosely until the Schoolmen of the Middle Ages began to systematize the faith and speak of the "seven sacraments" (baptism, confession, communion, confirmation, holy order, matrimony, and extreme unction). They were part of the scheme of priestly power over the laity and a rich source of profit.

Sadducees, The. An obscure party of the Jews, often cited as opponents of Jesus in the Gospels and more or less hostile to the Pharisees. The correct name is believed to be Zadokites, or followers of the legendary priest Zadok of the days of Solomon. In *Acts* (xxiii) it is said that they rejected the idea of the resurrection of the dead. They seem to have been, not an organization, but the small body of the Jews who adopted Greek culture to some extent and held liberal views on some points.

Saffi, Aurelio, LL.D. (1819-90), Italian statesman. One of the triumvirs or three heads of the Roman Republic of 1848. He fled to Switzerland, then England, when it was crushed, and when he returned to Italy, in 1861, Garibaldi offered him a high position; but he remained loyal to Mazzini, with whom he edited. He wrote a number of

historical and legal works in which his anti-Papal sentiments find expression.

St. Bartholomew Massacre, The. [See Bartholomew.]

Sainte, Beuve, Prof. Charles François de (1804-69), famous French critic. He was educated in science, but turned to letters, and was for some years a romanticist of the Victor Hugo school. He then took up historical and critical work, and his articles and biographical sketches are classics of French literature, of which at that time he was one of the leading representatives. He was professor of Latin poetry at Paris University. Prof. Lanson says, in the article on him in the *Grande Encyclopédie*, that he became "more and more hostile to religion" in his later years and was "the protector of Freethought in the Senate." Catholic quotations of him are from his early works.

St. Evremont, Charles de Marguerite de Saint Denis, Seigneur de (1610-1703), French writer. A noble who became a sceptic from the study of Montaigne and was expelled from France. His *Maximes* and *Reflexions* are French classics. He settled in London, and, although his scepticism was notorious, his distinction in letters was such that he was buried in Westminster Abbey. Bishop Atterbury complains, in his *Correspondence*, that St. Evremont "died renouncing the Christian religion, yet the church of Westminster thought fit to give his body room in the Abbey." Bayle says, in his *Dictionary*, that when St. Evremont was dying, suffering from gastric trouble, a priest asked him whether he did not wish to be reconciled. "Yes," he said, "with my stomach."

Saint Hilaire. [See Barthélemy Saint Hilaire.]

St. John, Henry, Viscount Bolingbroke (1678-1751), statesman. He made rapid progress in politics, became Secretary for War and Secretary for Foreign Affairs, and was high in the favour of Queen Anne; but he was banished for intrigues with the Jacobites. Living in France, he devoted himself to writing, and his *Letters on the Study and Disposition of History* (2 vols., 1752) is attributed by Morley as "the direct monitor of Voltaire's opinions on

religion." Most of his works, which were generally anonymous, contain Deistic criticisms of religion, and he supplied Pope with material for his *Essay on Man*. Bolingbroke had weaknesses of character, but was an able student of history and philosophy and rendered considerable service.

Saint Just, Louis Antoine (1767-94), French politician. One of the prominent figures of the French Revolution, and a man of exceptional accomplishments, a student of philosophy, a gentleman of dignified and austere character. He was a commissary to the army, but his enemies got him arrested and guillotined during the Terror. He died, at the age of 27, with great serenity. He was an Atheist.

Saint Lambert, the Marquis Jean François de (1716-1803), French writer. A distinguished military commander and strict Catholic until he read Voltaire. Retiring from the army, he wrote (besides poetry) for the *Encyclopédie*, and was intimate with Diderot and D'Alembert. During the Revolution he quietly continued to write his *Principes de mœurs chez toutes les nations* (3 vols., 1898), the first solid study of ethics on natural and humanist lines.

Saint Pierre, Jacques Henri Bernardin de (1737-1814), French writer. Like most of the great French writers of the time, he was educated by the Jesuits, and was very religious in early years. Rousseau's works converted him to Deism, and more advanced Rationalists scoffed, not unnaturally, at his apologetic work *Études de la Nature* (1787), with its fantastic arguments for Deism. His *Paul and Virginia*, in the sentimental vein of Rousseau, was long considered a classic. He succeeded Buffon as Director of the Botanical Garden, and during the Revolution was professor of ethics at the École Normale.

Saint Priest, Count Alexis Guignard (1805-51), French diplomat. A son of the Russian Princess Sophia Galitzen, who settled in Paris, adopted Liberal ideas, and took part in the Revolution of 1830. Later he was French Plenipotentiary Minister in Brazil, Portugal, and Denmark, and was raised to the peerage for his distinguished work. Among other books, he wrote a sound

and important history of the suppression of the Jesuits (1844) and he was writing a biography of Voltaire when he died.

Saint Simon, Count Claude Henri de Rouvroy de (1760-1825), French reformer. A distant relative of the famous Duc de Saint Simon and pupil of D'Alembert, he served with the French forces in the American War. He lost one fortune and made another during the Revolution, and in 1797 he retired, and, after studying science at Paris University and in England and Germany, published a new and more or less Socialistic scheme of society. He spent his fortune in promoting it, and, although the sect of the Saint-Simonians spread little, he had great influence on Comte and other famous reformers. Saint Simon was a Deist with a sentimental admiration of what he called "Christianity."

Saints. In the strict Catholic sense of the word these are men and women who wrought miracles during life or, through their remains, after death. When the Roman Church makes or declares a Saint to-day, it (in its notices to the Press) conceals the fact that it claims to have proof of these miracles, in the most literal meaning of the word, and represents that it simply declared More or Joan of Arc, for instance, to have been of saintly character. [*See Canonization.*] It is one of the arguments for the uniqueness of the Church, in its literature to-day, that it alone has produced such crowds of saints. For the early period vast numbers of these, especially the martyrs [*see*], are fictitious, or the title is awarded quite recklessly. Nearly all of the first fifty Popes are saints, yet the only three whose character is fairly well known—Victor, Callistus, and Damasus—were very far from saintly. The title continued to be awarded recklessly or put upon fictitious personalities all through the Dark Age. During the later Middle Ages [*see*], when the general character was extraordinarily lecherous and cruel, almost any man or woman who strictly observed the Christian code, particularly in regard to chastity, was a saint. The joke was current that chastity was called "the angelic virtue" because only angels could observe it. In the last

two centuries, when the Roman Church has had far more members than it ever had before, saints have been remarkably rare, and they, like ghosts in haunted houses, grow less and less numerous as the general intelligence and character improves. It is, however, seriously asked at times whether the Roman Church did not produce a very large number of men and women of "beautiful life"; whether other religious organizations or cultures did as much; and whether a rich inspiration of character would not disappear if the Roman Church perished. A realist would be tempted to reply, briefly, that in point of fact the Catholic body in our time has no higher general character, and no higher proportion of exceptionally fine characters, than any other Church or the churchless majority; and that, as regards the past, Buddhist or Moslem literature and the Chinese and Japanese annals make just such claims as do Catholic works. If a direct reply is desired, we have first of all to set aside the mass of fiction in "lives of the saints." Biography is quite generally mendacious, at least in its suppressions, and this is particularly true of ecclesiastical biography. Next, we must conceive clearly what we mean by a beautiful character. Most of the saints won their haloes by self-torture, or "mortifying the flesh," because a hundred-fold reward in heaven was promised. When we reflect that Christianity controlled all Europe for eleven centuries, and nearly half the civilized world for three further centuries, we are puzzled that so very few logically carried out the implications of their faith. Certainly the type of character of the "great saints" (Benedict, Gregory, Hildebrand, Innocent, Francis, Dominic, etc.) will disappear, and to the profit of civilization. There remain a few characters of exceptional kindness, generosity, truthfulness, etc.: few, that is to say, comparatively to the vast numbers of Roman Catholics.

Apart from the fact that here also the promised heavenly reward must not be forgotten, it is absurd to suggest that such characters are inspired in any unusual number by the Catholic faith; and far too often even these virtues are

allied with pious sourness, bigotry, and injustice to those who do not share the creed. But the general reply is in each person's experience and in modern literature. The type of character that the modern world needs, and would miss, is the man or woman with a strict sense of justice, truthfulness, and honour, warm sentiments of friendliness and generosity, impatience of untruth and dishonesty, and a willingness to work for the betterment of the world. Hundreds of men and women in this book, and hundreds of thousands of their followers, displayed those virtues, often heroically. Rationalism, *in proportion to its numerical strength*, produced them in the van of every reform-movement a hundred times as prolifically as any other culture.

“Saladin.” [See Ross, Stewart.]

Salmeron y Alonso, Prof. Nicolas (1838–1908), Spanish statesman. A professor of philosophy, at Madrid University, who played a great part in the anti-clerical political movement. In 1868 he was sent to prison for five months, and at the next Counter-Revolution he became Minister of Justice, President of the Cortes, and finally President of the Republic (of 1873). He was driven from his chair and from Spain by the clericals in 1874, and taught at Paris University. Salmeron was an outspoken Agnostic and a great force in the growth of Spanish Rationalism.

Salvianus (fifth century A.D.). A priest of Marseilles who wrote a valuable survey of the moral condition of the Christian world about the middle of the fifth century. The work, *De Gubernatione Dei* (“On the Providence of God,” but, like other critical documents of the time, never translated) fills about fifty pages in the Migne edition of the Fathers. The priest seems to have travelled very extensively, and describes the state of each province of the Western Empire. He emphatically asserts that the new Christian world is much more vicious than the old pagan world. His first sentence is: “Apart from a very few who avoid evil, what is nearly the whole body of Christians but a sink of vice?” For Africa, of which he gives an appalling picture, Augustine's ser-

mons confirm his account. It is “the cesspool of the world.” This valuable testimony of an earnest priest is never noticed by the writers who tell us how the new religion improved the Romans.

Sanctuary, The Law of. The Jews had “cities of refuge” for the murderer, and there were Greek temples from which it was impious to drag out a sheltering criminal. In the seventh century the Church restored the custom in many places. In some old English and Scottish churches there was a stone seat near the altar for criminal refugees, but during the Dark Ages and the Age of Chivalry it gave very frail protection against lords who pursued offenders. In some cases the precincts of the cathedral were sacred as refuges, of which one finds a reminiscence round Westminster Abbey to-day. The law refused, after the sixteenth century, to recognize the institution, which was, naturally, very grossly abused by criminals to the grave detriment of the social order. [See Asylum.]

Sand, George (1804–76), French novelist. Her real name was Aurore Dupin, and she was educated in a convent, but she studied Aristotle, Locke, and Condillac, and became a Rationalist. After an unhappy marriage to Baron Dudevant, she adopted the pen-name of George Sand, and wrote novels which made her one of the best-known women of her time. As there was then no divorce in France, she lived for a time with the famous poet, Alfred de Musset. She was very anti-clerical at this period, and in later life she “remained outside the Church but thundered not” (Prof. Caro, *George Sand*, 1887, p. 190). She frequently used the word “God,” but explained that “it is an avatar of which the meaning is often an enigma,” and she did not believe in a future life.

Sanderson, Sir John Scott Burdon, M.A., M.D., LL.D., D.Sc., F.R.S. (1828–1905), physiologist. From medical practice in London he passed to a series of hospital appointments, and made a great name by his mastery of epidemic diseases. His Rationalist views were so well known that when (1859) he applied for the position of Assistant Physician to the Brompton Hospital he

was asked for testimonials to his orthodoxy, though the testimonials which were accepted referred only to his high character and ability. Later he was professor of physiology and histology at London University College, Jodrell professor of physiology, Harveian Orator, Waynflete professor of physiology, and then Regius professor of medicine at Oxford University, and President of the British Association (1893). He had the Baly Medal and other honours, and was created baronet for his distinction in science. His nephew-biographer (*Sir John Burdon Sanderson*, 1911) grudgingly admits that he was an Agnostic, saying that he was orthodox in early life, but "later on the problems presented seemed more difficult and the solution not so clear" (p. 159). Sir John was emphatically Anti-Vitalist, and he joined in the public rebuke of Lord Kelvin, in 1903, for saying that science was returning to a belief in a Vital Principle.

Sandwich, The Earl of. [See *Montagu, Edward*.]

Sankhya School, The. The oldest school of Hindu philosophy, founded, about the middle of the sixth century B.C., by Kapila, of whom no biographical details are available. It is usually described as a reaction against the idealistic monotheism of the Upanishads, but might be better called a reaction against the empty verbiage into which the Brahmanic priests had dissolved the old Vedic religion. The century was remarkable for a widespread ferment of thought which simultaneously produced the Ionic thinkers in Greece and Kung-fu-tse and Lao-tse in China—a sceptical development curiously analogous to that of modern times. Kapila "emphatically denied the existence of God" (*Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics*, article by Dr. Garbe), but is said by some to have been lenient to the popular belief in gods and the transmigration of souls. Buddha and Mahavira (the founder of Jainism), who belonged to the same region of India, are admitted to have derived their Atheism from the Sankhya philosophy. It seems to have been later absorbed and "spiritualized" by the Brahmans, and

some contend that in this form it had an influence on the development of Gnosticism and Neo-Platonism.

Santa Maria, President Domingo (1825–85), President of the Republic of Chile. He was Professor of law at the Chilean National Institution, and was twice sent into exile by the Clericals in their spells of power. In 1861 he was Minister of Finance, and from 1881 to 1885 President of the Republic. He was one of the ablest and most enlightened statesmen in South America. In spite of the fierce hostility of the Church—there was an attempt to assassinate him—he secured laws of divorce and civil marriage, curtailed the privileges of the corrupt clergy, and effected many other reforms.

Santayana, Prof. George (b. 1863), American philosopher. Of Spanish origin, taken to America as a boy, he became professor of philosophy at Harvard University (1889–1912), but he had a far larger influence in America by works of a more popular character in which he pleaded for the application of reason to the whole of life and thought. A series of five volumes on Reason in Common Sense, Society, Religion, Art, and Science gave him a high and most useful position in the education of the public. He explicitly describes himself as a Materialist, and rejects religious doctrines. In his *Reason in Science* (p. 90) he says: "A thorough Materialist, one born to the faith and not half plunged into it by an unexpected christening in cold water, will be, like the superb Democritus, a laughing philosopher."

Saracens, The. A name, usually said to mean "Orientals," given indiscriminately to the Moslem by Christians in the Middle Ages, though in classical geography Saracene was a district of the Sinaitic Peninsula, and the Greeks and Romans called the Arabs of the Syrian desert "Saracens." The name was in Europe specially applied to the Arabs who settled in Sicily and South Italy. Sicily had been raised to a high degree of civilization by the ancient Greeks, but had degenerated under the Christian Greeks or Byzantines. In the eighth century the half-barbaric Moslem tribes of Africa began to raid the island and

the coasts of Italy, and for more than a century they proved a terrible scourge, ravaging the land as far as the walls of Rome. More enlightened and more sceptical Arabs got control and built up (while Rome lay in the horrors of the Dark Age [see *Rule of the Whores*]) an admirable civilization. A census showed that 2,000,000 people lived very prosperously in one part of the island, whereas in the nineteenth century this part had only 1,000,000 inhabitants, and they lived in squalor and ignorance. See Amari's *Storia dei Musulmani in Sicilia*, 3 vols., 1854-72. All the agricultural, industrial, and artistic improvements of the Arab civilization were imported, and science was as assiduously cultivated as in Spain. By the year 1000 (the lowest point of barbarism in the rest of Italy) Sicily had eighteen cities and 900 towns and villages. It is another instance of the creation of a high civilization out of barbaric material in two generations, while apologists seek to excuse the Church for not achieving this in a thousand years. This section of history is important also in showing (with the history of Arab Spain) the true sources of the recovery of civilization in Europe. The Norman pirates settled in South Italy, and in time took over the Arab empire—another instance of a rise from barbarism to civilization, under sceptical rulers, in two generations. Rome was, as usual, hostile, but largely through Frederic II, the Arab culture, which Frederic enthusiastically shared, spread to the cities of North Italy and very materially assisted their renaissance.

Sarcey, Francisque (1827-99), French critic. A provincial schoolmaster who lost his position for expressing Rationalist views, migrated to Paris, and became the most distinguished dramatic critic and one of the chief writers of the time. He co-operated with About [see] in his drastic anti-clerical propaganda, and tells of his rejection of all religious beliefs in his *Souvenirs de jeunesse* (1884) and *Souvenirs d'âge mûr* (1892).

Sardou, Victorien (1831-1908), French dramatist. Compelled to abandon his studies through the misfortunes of his family, Sardou had to support himself by clerical and journalistic work while

he developed his dramatic genius. He became, admittedly, the greatest dramatist of the nineteenth century and wrote several plays (*Robespierre*, 1902, and *Danton*, 1905) for Sir H. Irving. He abandoned the Church early in life, and although Spiritualists quote him as one of their conquests, he soon saw through that imposture.

Sars, Prof. Georg Ossian, Ph.D. (1837-1927), Norwegian zoologist. Professor of Zoology at Christiania University, Director of the Fisheries Research Department, and author of many works of international repute, including several volumes of the Challenger series. Sars, who was one of the eminent men of science in Norway, was also one of the many distinguished scientists who supported Haeckel's Monism, which Sir Oliver Lodge represented in this country as "stranded on the beach when the tide has gone out." In the presentation volume on Haeckel's eightieth birthday, *Was Wir Ernst Haeckel Verdanken* (2 vols., 1914) he described the much-derided *Riddle of the Universe* as "the stately structure of the Monistic philosophy" and declared that "progress can be promoted no longer by metaphysical speculations and antiquated theological dogmas" (I, 305-8).

Satan. The usual Hebrew word for "adversary," and very rarely used in the Old Testament as a proper name. In the prologue to *Job*, which some think a pre-Exilic document, Satan is one of the "sons of God" or angels who, though in opposition, are still on speaking terms with Jahveh (I, 6). In *Ezekiel* he is still a "son of God," but more malignant, and in 1 *Chronicles* (xxi, 1) he has become the enemy of God and tempter of men. Probably all such references are post-Exilic, as the Babylonian mythology seems to be the source of the legend, which flourished in later Judaism and was adopted by Christians from the second century, that the devils were fallen angels under the leadership of Satan.

Satanism. The worship of Satan, usually a very drastic expression of anti-Christian sentiment or of hatred of the Christian theoretical attitude to sex. At the trial of the Knights Templars [see], in the fourteenth century, reputable

witnesses charged them with worship of the devil, and the witchcraft which from that time spread over Europe, and must have had in the course of time millions of adherents, was a serious and organized cult of Satan or "the Spirit." [See *Witchcraft*.] The Church was so generally indifferent to the gross sexual morals of the Middle Ages that it was rather the general hypocrisy than the Church's theoretical condemnation of sex that inspired the movement. The Satanists contended that the real "good Spirit" to men was the one who blessed and encouraged sensual pleasure. Children were dedicated to the cult by their mothers, and arrested witches faced torture and death for their faith. Outbreaks of Satanism since the cessation of witchcraft have been usually—when the reports are not fiction—a mixture of charlatantry and lubricity. There was a wide spread of it in a serious form in France, as the trials recorded in the *Archives de la Bastille* prove [see *Black Mass*], in the reign of Louis XIV. The evidence of it in the nineteenth century is not so reliable. It is chiefly provided by the work *Là-bas* (1891) of the unbalanced Catholic novelist Huysmans (discussed in the preface to J. Bois's *Le Satanisme et la magie*, 1891) and the unscrupulous works of "Leo Taxil," a priest who left the Church for the Freemasons and then reconciled himself with the Church by telling fantastic stories about their relations with Satan. Books of the kind have a large circulation, and are used by some types of modern novelists. Probably enough, a parody of Satanism as a novel form of orgy has been occasionally staged in private meetings of morbid folk or used by others to make profit.

Saturnalia, The. The festival of the ancient Roman god Saturn, the god of the sowing of the harvest, at one time apparently conciliated by human sacrifices. Many see a reminiscence of this in the later Roman practice of selling and presenting to children great quantities of dolls, sometimes hung on trees, at the Saturnalia, which survives in our Christmas festivities. The Roman festival in historical times began on December 17, and lasted a week. There were religious ceremonies, private and in the

temples, but as in modern times the chief features were the boisterous revels and the exchange of gifts. On one day masters served their slaves, as the time when Saturn had been the chief god was now regarded as "the Golden Reign of Saturn." In origin the Saturnalia was clearly the Roman version of the universal midwinter nature-festival. Frazer quotes evidence that in some provinces the soldiers chose a handsome young man a month before the festival, treated him as a king for thirty days, and killed him on the first day of the Saturnalia. Frazer suggests, in accordance with his general theory, that originally the Romans killed their King. Compare the Babylonian *Sacæa* [see]. Whether this was the original form of the Saturnalia or a rite adopted in certain provinces is not clear, but the influence on the evolution of Christmas [see] is obvious.

Saunderson, Prof. Nicholas, M.A., LL.D., F.R.S. (1682–1739), mathematician. He was totally blind from small-pox from his second year, yet he had a brilliant career at Oxford in classics and mathematics, became Lucasian professor of mathematics there, wrote an *Algebra* which was a standard manual, and was deeply respected for his character and wide culture. He was so generally known to be an Atheist that, when he was appointed, there were murmurs that "they have turned out Whiston (a Unitarian) for believing in but one God, and they have put in Saunderson who believes in no God at all" (*Chalmer's Biographical Dictionary*). The same author is pained that a man who experienced "the kindness of Providence throughout his extraordinary life"—he was blind for fifty-five years—should be guilty of "the obtrusion of infidel opinions."

Saville, Sir George, Marquis of Halifax (1633–95), statesman. He was created a baron, then Marquis and later Earl of Halifax, for distinguished political services. He opposed the execution of Stafford and supported the complaints of the American colonies, but he was so able a statesman that the king kept him in his Council. His *Character of a Trimmer* (1685) misleads many on account of the unpleasant

meaning which the word later contracted. Halifax advocated liberty and reasonable compromise. James II, whom he had opposed, deprived him of office, but William restored him, and he had to the end a high reputation for ability and integrity of character in a corrupt age. His scepticism was so notorious that the saying, "He who sits down a philosopher rises an Atheist," was attributed to him. He was, in fact, a keen student of philosophy and a great admirer of Montaigne. Bishop Burnet says, in his *History of His Own Time*, that Halifax "passed for a bold and determined Atheist," but he told the bishop that he was not: that he "believed as much as he could and hoped that God would not lay it to his charge if he could not digest iron as an ostrich did nor take into his belief things that must burst him" (I, 267). He was one of the most advanced Rationalists of his time and one of the most enlightened and most honourable statesmen.

Saviour Gods. [See Redeemer Gods.]

Say, Jean Baptiste Léon (1826-96), French economist. A Civil Servant who attracted attention in youth by the brilliance of his financial estimates. He adhered to the English Free Trade school and was a pioneer of the Co-operative Movement. He was Minister of Finance after 1871, and was chiefly responsible for the remarkable recovery of France after the Franco-Prussian War. Three times later he was Minister of Finance, and at one time President of the Senate. Say was an Agnostic, like his friend President Thiers.

Scapegoat, The. In *Leviticus* (xvi) the high priest has on certain festivals to take "two kids of the goat for a sin-offering." One is sacrificed for the sins of the Jews, and the other driven "as a scapegoat into the wilderness." This crude Jewish idea of vicarious atonement, to which there are many parallels amongst lower peoples, entered into the fundamental doctrines of Christianity.

Scepticism and Social Progress. There are few anti-Rationalist charges so widely and persistently repeated in modern literature as the statement that scepticism arrests social progress [see] and leads to social deterioration. To

say nothing of the prejudice against Russia, which filled our literature for twenty years, the cry was heard to a scandalous extent as late as 1938, when it was proposed to hold the International Congress of Freethinkers in London. It is used as a cover for their real motives whenever the clergy want to suppress or restrict criticism, just as the complementary principle that religion inspires social progress is used as a pretext for their arrogations of privilege. Even some non-Christian writers have endorsed the principle by maintaining that it is necessary to supply synthetic Gods (the world-soul, the soul of humanity, etc.) when belief in the Christian God decays. We show under that title that religion [see] is not a factor in social amelioration, and it is even easier to prove that the claim in regard to scepticism is a shallow piece of rhetoric and is flagrantly opposed to historical facts. There is a fallacy in the statement of the principle. "Scepticism" is the abstract name for a negative attitude, in one degree or other, towards religious doctrines. As such, it is obviously not a social factor. The question is whether *sceptics* are more or less likely than believers to promote social progress; whether the negative attitude to religion is or is not accompanied by, or inspires, a zeal for human betterment. Further, since even in our supposedly democratic age the mass of the people have little influence on the progress or decay of a civilization, we have to pay attention almost exclusively to the constructive minority of a nation. As far as concerns the community generally, it is a matter of common experience that unsocial or anti-social conduct is just as widespread in church-goers (Catholic districts of London, Liverpool, Glasgow, etc., for instance) as non-church-goers, and is much worse [see *Crime*; *Drunkenness*; etc.] in predominantly religious countries than in predominantly sceptical countries like France and Great Britain. When the issue is thus precisely formulated, the answer is found at once in hundreds of biographical notices and articles in this Encyclopædia.

(1) A survey of the whole period of history, from the time when we have

sufficient documentary evidence to test this issue, shows that the more progressive ages have always been conspicuously sceptical, especially in the constructive class [see *Golden Ages*], that periods of marked decay were not characterized by any growth of scepticism, and that periods of strong religious feeling were never notable for social progress. Even in the second millennium B.C. we find this verified in the case of Egypt [see]. In the first millennium B.C., when literature multiplies, we find it uniformly true in the case of Greece (Ionia, Athens, Alexandria), India (under Asoka), and China (under the Han Emperors); and the law continues to be verified in the new era in China (under the Tsungs), Rome (under Hadrian), Persia, Syria, and Arab Spain and Sicily. [See articles on each.] Taking a broader view, and still confining ourselves to historical estimates by the highest authorities, we find that the period of most rapid social progress in ancient times was from about 600 B.C. to A.D. 400: in mediæval times (outside Christendom), from about 700 to 1200; and in modern times from (with an interval of royalist-religious reaction) about 1770 onwards. These were at the same time the chief periods of a growth of scepticism. Apart from them, neutral historians, or some of them, claim as progressive periods only Italy during the Renaissance, England under Elizabeth, and France in the seventeenth century; and each of these claims is offset by grave social disorders. [See articles on each.] While we find most sociologists enumerating religion among the social factors as a matter of routine, and even legal writers sometimes (Prof. Munro Smith's *Development of European Law*, 1928) following the literary convention, neither historian nor sociologist has ever given us a scientific analysis of these facts. Dr. Arnold Toynbee's voluminous *Study of History* (2nd ed., 1935), which ought to face it, shirks the issue.

(2) The second positive test of the claim of the apologists is to study the outstanding pioneers or promoters of social progress. Practically all the monarchs or leaders during the most progressive periods of history were sceptics [see *Abd-er-Rahman*; *Asoka*;

Hadrian; *Pericles*; *Ptolemies*; and *Tai-Tsung*], and scepticism was widespread amongst their chief assistants. The present writer published, in America, a large biographical history (*One Hundred Men Who Moved the World*, 1931), selecting the men (princes, writers, artists, etc.) on the basis of the estimates of historians, and more than half were sceptics. For the last three centuries, thirty-eight out of forty of them were sceptics. A study of the articles in this work which describe modern reforms [*Democracy*; *Education*; *Slavery*; *Woman*; *Workers*; etc.], and of the biographical notices, will evince that, in proportion to the respective sizes of the religious bodies and the sceptical body in the community, the sceptics—and since the beginning of the nineteenth century mostly Atheists or Agnostics—have an amazingly superior record of notable social service. For England in the latter part of the eighteenth century a social student would select as the leading ten: Wilkes, Priestley, Godwin, Mary Wollstonecraft, Fox, Paine, Shelley, Holcroft, Horne Tooke, and Hardy: one Unitarian, one orthodox Christian, and eight Atheists or Agnostics. In the exacting period of reaction after Waterloo the outstanding figures in broad progressive work—not restricted workers like Shaftesbury, Cobden, and Elizabeth Fry—are Bentham, Sir F. Burdett, Owen, F. Place, and James Mill—all Atheists. It was the same in every country; and as to the mass of the people, at least 400,000 of them, probably 500 times the number of genuine martyrs in the early Church, died for the rights of man. Canon Streeter, one of the most learned and conscientious of modern apologists, says: "The greatest blot on the history of the Church in modern times is the fact that with the glaring exception of the campaign to abolish slavery the leaders in the social, political, and humanitarian reforms of the last century and a half in Europe have rarely been professing Christians" (*The Spirit*, 1919, p. 358). He is entirely wrong in his one "glaring exception." [See *Slavery*.] The great Abolitionists of America were mostly sceptics, and Wilberforce [see], whor-

Streeter has in mind, was a sceptic in the years when he began to attack slavery. During all this time the bishops were, says a writer of their Church, Joseph Clayton (*The Bishops as Legislators*, 1906), "timid, time-serving, and great worshippers of wealth and power." No Catholics, and hardly any Nonconformists, figure among the pioneers. *See also* **Papal States**; **Philanthropy**; **Prison Reform**; etc., for the miserable Catholic record. For full studies of the two records, Christian and sceptical, see McCabe's *Social Record of Christianity* (1935), and *How Freethinkers Made Notable Contributions to Civilization*, (1938, printed in America). Clayton's work is a scorching indictment of the Church of England in the nineteenth century. The author was a zealous Anglican, and is now a Roman Catholic.

Schäfer, Sir Edward Albert Sharpey, M.D., Sc.D., LL.D., F.R.S. (1850-1936), physiologist. Godrell professor of physiology at University College, London, 1883-99, then professor of physiology at Edinburgh University and editor of the *Quarterly Journal of Experimental Physiology*. He was President of the British Association in 1912, when his address on the origin of life was startlingly materialistic, and he received the Baly Medal of the Royal College of Physicians, the Royal Medal of the Royal Society, Knighthood and other high honours. Schäfer was an Honorary Associate of the R.P.A. and an Agnostic. In an article ("The Origin of Life") in the *R.P.A. Annual* for 1914 he rejects all "interventions of the Deity" in biology and says: "The churchgoer still prays but he would be astonished if his prayers were answered" (p. 5).

Scheffer, Ary (1795-1858), French painter. As he belonged to the romanticist movement, and painted well-known religious pictures ("St. Augustine and his Mother," etc.), he is often quoted as a Catholic. He was in fact a Deist—in his youth he joined the Carbonari, and he always opposed the Bourbons and the Church in France—and in his later years he was a warm friend of Renan, who married his niece.

Schelling, Prof. Friedrich Wilhelm

Joseph von (1775-1854), German philosopher. Professor of philosophy at, successively, Jena, Würzburg, and Munich, Secretary of the Royal Academy of Art and President of the Academy of Science at Munich, Schelling is counted the third (after Kant and Fichte) in the dynasty of German philosophers. In 1840 he was called to the chair of philosophy at Berlin, but his lectures were so Rationalistic that he was compelled to retire. He was a Pantheist, rejecting the ideas of a personal God and immortality as well as Christian dogmas.

Scherer, Edmond Henri Adolphe, D.D. (1815-89), French writer. A Protestant minister and professor of theology at Geneva who passed "from the narrowest of faiths to the broadest of scepticisms." Prof. Boutmy says in his *Taine, Scherer, Laboulaye* (1901, p. 52). His essays in the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, which was not yet Catholic, were a feature of French literature, and he wrote sympathetic biographies of the Encyclopædists. *See* O. Gréard, *Edmond Scherer* (1890).

Schiller, Johann Christoph Friedrich von (1759-1805), Germany's second greatest poet. Against his inclination he was educated in medicine and became a military surgeon, but he had written *Die Räuber* (published 1781) before he left school, and its success encouraged him to turn to poetry and drama. His *Don Carlos* (1787) led Goethe to invite him to Jena, where he took up history and co-operated with Goethe in his period of aggressive Rationalism. In their *Musen Almanach* they published a series of brilliant epigrams, *Die Xenien* (English translation by Paul Carus), in the style of Martial, attacking the chief representatives of the Churches and all other "Philistines." He wrote *Wallenstein* (1798) and other great works after leaving Goethe. Schiller was idolized by German youth on account of his calls to freedom.

Schism, The Great. The Popes were brought back to Rome from their luxurious and vicious court at Avignon [see], not by a neurotic nun, as Catholics represent, but by the threat of the Romans to repudiate their allegiance, as they had often done. All Italy was

making progress except Rome, where sheep browsed on the streets and even in the old St. Peter's (Gregorovius). Gregory XI returned in 1376, and died two years later, and in the fierce Conclave that followed, when the Archbishop of Bari bribed the Italian cardinals and became Urban VI, the French cardinals seceded and set up the anti-Pope Clement VII—a French cardinal who, as commander of the Papal troops, was notorious for outrages. Both men were unprincipled and fought for the position of Pope with real brutality. We have a record of the struggle (*On the Schism*) written by the contemporary Papal lawyer, Dietrich von Neheim, a very reliable witness. Urban chased his rival out of Italy, but he was himself driven out of Naples for protecting the foul deeds of his nephew. In his rage, which often verged on insanity, he tortured six of the cardinals and apparently had them murdered. He was "according to many accounts poisoned by the Romans" (*Catholic Encyclopædia*) in 1389, and Clement died five years later. But two other Popes, of the same miserable character, were elected, and the sordid struggle went on. The practice of simony was now carried to its greatest height, and the disorder of Rome was appalling. The Jubilee year [*see*], a centennial celebration, had been founded in 1300, but the greedy Roman Pope now declared that it must be held every thirty-three years, as Christ had lived for that period, and lady-pilgrims from foreign lands were robbed and raped right up to the doors of St. Peter's. Boniface IX, Dietrich says, turned a Neapolitan expirate into a cardinal and head of his Court and set him to get money by every means, even taxing the gamblers and prostitutes. This man, an expert in every vice and crime, himself bought the Papacy [*see* John XXIII], and there were now three Popes and a more sordid spectacle than ever. The schism had lasted nearly forty years, when the Church induced the Emperor Sigismund, a pious and very lecherous monarch, to put an end to it, in 1414, at the Council of Constance [*see*], which was unofficially attended also by 1,000 prostitutes, who doubtless assisted at the

burning of the wicked John Hus [*see*]. Dietrich's work *De Schismate*, and his life of John XXIII, are not available in English, as usual, and thus the myth that in the thirteenth century the Papacy had raised civilization to its greatest height is protected.

Schleiermacher, Prof. Friedrich Ernst Daniel (1768–1834), German theologian. A professor of Lutheran theology at Halle, later at Berlin, who is still quoted as one of the greatest Protestant divines of the nineteenth century. It would be more informative to call him the Father of Modernism, or a semi-Rationalist. The aim of his chief work, *Die Christliche Glaube* (2 vols., 1821), was to criticize the supernaturalist view of Christianity. He was Pantheistic in his conception of God and rejected the idea of personal immortality. He escaped complete Rationalism by professing that religious belief was a matter of feeling, not intellect.

Scholastics, The. This name, the Latin for "Schoolmen," is now given to the leading theologians of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. Their theological works are read by very few even of the Catholic clergy, and what is called their philosophy was hardly noticed in manuals of the history of philosophy—being treated as a perversion to suit theological purposes of an imperfect knowledge of Aristotle—until the recent practice of conciliating Catholics began. Most of the writers who now refer to the Scholastic movement as "one of the Church's greatest achievements," if not the renaissance of intellectual life in Europe, can name only Thomas Aquinas [*see*]; and even so lenient and well-informed an authority on the Middle Ages as Sir T. C. Allbutt [*see*] denies that he was "a man of the highest intellectual power and attainments." The attempt to invest the movement with importance—other than to Catholics—is very misleading, and generally betrays a large ignorance of the development of European thought. A few schools, attached to cathedrals or abbeys and devoted to religious interests, had existed through the Dark Age. Charlemagne's plan to increase the number of these had completely failed—*see* Dr. J. Bass Mullinger's *Schools* &

Charles the Great (1877) or any manual—and the impulse given in the next century by Irish scholars like Scotus Erigena [see] had been frustrated by the Church. Permanent recovery began in the eleventh and twelfth centuries [Abélard; Education], when the remarkable zeal for schools and colleges in Arab Spain spread to the south of France and that of the Sicilian Arabs to South Italy, where Aquinas was born and educated. Until the twelfth century the rather primitive schools taught “the seven liberal arts” (grammar, rhetoric, dialectics, music, geometry, arithmetic, and astronomy), but they now, largely to attract the crowds of wandering scholars—who were, contrary to the literary convention, for the most part a disorderly rabble—gave predominant attention to dialectics (“arguing”—generally on points of theology) and a superficial philosophy. There was no genuine teaching of logic or philosophy, Prantl says (*History of Logic in the West*, 4 vols., 1855–70), and the theology was not yet systematized. This led to a large growth of free schools, with lay masters, lively classrooms, and turbulent “Latin Quarters” in the towns. But it led also to much heresy, and the genuine Scholastic Movement was born when the Church crushed the lay schools, condemning many masters for heresy, and forced the new intellectual activity into the narrow groove of orthodox theology. Only two or three of the universities or chief schools which were not servile to Rome specialized on law or medicine [see Universities].

The Scholastics, or Schoolmen, of the thirteenth century, of whom the Church boasts, were stimulated by the Arabs and the Greeks to work out a philosophy. When the Crusaders captured wealthy Constantinople (1204), instead of pushing on to fight the Saracen, the works of Aristotle (in a bad translation) began to circulate in France and Italy and, as the Arab philosophers, who were then so well known in Europe that even Dante treats them with respect, had at least been sufficiently loyal to Aristotle to recognize that he rejected the spirituality, the personal God, and the immortal soul of Plato, the new Schoolmen, chiefly Aquinas, perverted the

teaching of Aristotle in order to make it hostile to the scepticism of the Arabs. Besides his large theological work Aquinas [see] wrote a *Summa Philosophica*, the first manual of what is called Scholastic Philosophy, in which the familiar Catholic arguments about God and the soul made their appearance. Of the philosophy as a whole it is enough to say that they called it “the handmaid of theology,” and the aim of the theological work, besides systematizing theology, was to prove by quotations from the Fathers and Scripture and “arguments from reason” the soundness of every perverse moral principle and doctrine that the mediæval Church had fabricated. The new monks, Dominican and Franciscan, now dominated the universities, and these became theological cockpits for crowds of monks and priests. The attempt of Roger Bacon [see] and Albert the Great [see] to get the science of the Arabs cultivated was crushed by the Church, and the more critical of the Schoolmen (Duns Scotus, William of Ockham, etc.), who still pleaded for a candid use of reason, were discouraged or silenced. Aquinas and his colleagues put together the system of theology which was to paralyse the intellect of Europe for the next few centuries. They gave new life to Aristotle’s blunders and very gravely hampered the restoration of science, and where he had soundly differed from Plato (on spirit, God, and immortality) they thoroughly perverted his principles. Recent Catholic writers are at pains to prove that, before he died, Aquinas became acquainted with a genuine translation of Aristotle—he did not know Greek—but it was too late. Benn sums up the verdict of most non-Catholic philosophers when he says that the only legacy of Scholasticism to modern thought was the principle (Occam’s Razor) that “things must not be multiplied without necessity,” and that is now regarded as a truism. In Scholastic days it was so little appreciated or so distrusted that its author, the English friar William of Ockham, was thrust almost into oblivion and suspected of heresy. The few social or moral principles in which Aquinas seems to approach modern thought were derived

from Aristotle's *Ethics* and *Politics* and were entirely ignored in practice by the Church until recent times. A Catholic version of the movement is given in M. de Wulf's *History of Mediaeval Philosophy* (2 vols., 1935-8).

Schools. [See Education.]

Schopenhauer, Arthur (1788-1860), German philosopher. He was drafted into his father's bank at Hamburg, but withdrew to cultivate philosophy when his father died, and in 1819 he won European attention by his original work, *The World as Will and Presentation*. As a reaction against the intellectualism of his predecessors, whose systems were already abandoned, he contended that the fundamental reality is Will, which struggles to attain perfection in human evolution and is doomed never to reach it. The disdain of professional philosophers soured him, but his sarcastic wit makes his later works very readable. One of the dullest but soundest is his *Basis of Morality* (Engl. trans., 1903), in which he finds a natural source of morality in the sentiment of sympathy. His sister, **Adele Schopenhauer** (1797-1849), a very accomplished woman, adhered to her brother, when his Rationalism alienated their mother, and greatly relieved his pessimistic melancholy. There are many Rationalist passages in her *Diary* (2 vols., 1909).

Schreiner, Olive (1862-1920), novelist. Her father was a missionary to the natives of Basutoland, and her experiences there gave her the material for her first powerful novel, *The Story of an African Farm* (1883), which describes how the harshly pious home had driven her to Atheism (pp. 127, 285, etc.). She wrote under the pen-name of "Ralph Iron," and the book was so virile that no one suspected that the author was a woman. As Mrs. Cronwright-Sobruner she became one of the best known woman-writers of her time, and had a passion for truth and justice. Edward Carpenter says, in *My Days and Dreams* (1916, p. 229): "I have seen her shake her little fist at the Lord in heaven and curse him down from his throne."

Schumann, Robert (1810-56), German composer. He was educated for the law, but turned to music, and an accident to a finger compelled him to quit playing

for composition. With a number of other young musicians he proposed to drive the "philistines" out of German music, and he edited their *Neue Zeitschrift für Musik*. He became one of Germany's great composers, and, although religious compositions are amongst his works, he followed Goethe in his Pantheism. His second favourite author was the caustic Rationalist, Jean Paul Richter [see].

Science and Religion. The word "science" is the Latin for "knowledge," and the reason why it became restricted to a particular class of knowledge was chiefly the convenience of this in the days when three types of knowledge, apart from history and technics, were recognized: that derived from revelation, that which is reached directly by the mind (*a priori* or intuitional knowledge), and that gathered empirically from nature. The prestige of the third class has now risen so high, partly because the work of research is understood to give a finer sense of discrimination between reality and illusion or verbiage, and partly because the validity of scientific knowledge has been vindicated by monumental service in its practical application, that even theology and philosophy claim to be sciences, while the apologist is never happier than when he discovers a basis for his arguments in science. Its extension has already discredited the attempt to limit its sphere to material things—unless it be admitted that the realities studied in psychology, ethics, and æsthetics are material—the new and more critical history is said to be scientific, and the cry is raised that all the problems of life ought to be brought into its field. Since inaccurate knowledge or verbiage is *not* knowledge, and our age increasingly rejects the idea that truth can be attained either by revelation or intuition, the word "science" tends to become synonymous with knowledge. Meantime it denotes a knowledge of nature acquired by sensory observation and intellectual or mathematical reasoning on the data, and for more than a hundred years it has been a matter of acute controversy whether this conflicts with religion. The issue is often evaded by a fallacy. It is said that "the greater

scientific men" do not contradict religious statements, or, if they do, they are not using the language of science. But the question is not whether scientific men do or do not contradict such statements; it is whether what they put before us as the received teaching of science is inconsistent with some point or points of religious belief and teaching. Hence all talk about "camp-followers of science" or "skirmishes in No Man's Land" is mere rhetoric. To what extent men of science explicitly recognize such a conflict, and reject religion, will be considered in the next article. Clarity of thought requires that we first inquire whether in any respects scientific truth conflicts with religion.

It is obvious that in order to decide such a question a man must have a large and reliable knowledge of both science (in so far as it is relevant to the issue) and religion. The great majority of, indeed practically all, religious writers on the subject have no command of science, and they either select points which they do not understand from scientific manuals or—this is the usual practice—copy from each other in an endless and wearisome series. Even Bishop Barnes, the best qualified of apologists in this respect, has a thorough knowledge only of mathematics, which is irrelevant to this issue, and one must conclude that it is from ignorance on a vital point that he represents as the teaching of science the theory, for instance, of Emergent Evolution [see], which was never held by more than a handful of scientific men of religious views (and for religious reasons) and is now fully discredited. Catholic and Fundamentalist writers, who do not expect to be read outside their own Churches, have the further and graver defect that they quote from outdated works of science and, suppressing details, represent each other or any favourable writer as "scientists" or "great scientists." For the same reasons even a scientific man writing on this subject must either be an authority on, or have a competent knowledge of, the branch of science from which he draws his facts; and, since scientific work is necessarily very specialized, it is very

exceptional for a professor in one branch to have even a fair knowledge of other branches. This is particularly important because the inorganic sciences (physics, etc.) and mathematics have now almost no relevance to religious controversy, and the few men of science of our (or recent) time who defend religion (Kelvin, Lodge, Jeans, Eddington, Whetham, Pupin, Millikan, etc.) are for the far greater part authorities on the inorganic sciences only, yet they discourse glibly, and inaccurately, on biological, anthropological, or psychological matters. It is also a plain fact of experience that the small minority of men of science who *are*, or were, authorities on the biological sciences, yet defend religion (Osborn, Thomson, MacBride, Morgan, Conklin, etc.), allow their Theism, as in the case of Emergent Evolution, to influence their science. On the other hand, the scientific man or the Rationalist requires an accurate knowledge of the religious position. The requirement is here less drastic because for serious students the conflict of science and religion is now virtually confined to two points: God and the soul or mind. The mediæval conflict is exhaustively described in A. D. White's *History of the Warfare of Science With Theology* (2 vols., 1896), to which the chief Catholic apologist on the scientific side, Dr. J. J. Walsh, makes a very feeble and inaccurate reply in *The Popes and Science* (1912). [See *Age of the Earth; Anatomy; Antiquity of Man; Medicine; etc.*] Apart from this historical and not very important controversy, to say that science may conflict with theology, but not with religion, is pointless. The serious conflict to-day is with the fundamental principles of all religion; and even if the word "religion" is taken in the ethical sense, the conflict between intuitional and scientific ethics [see] is very material. There is next what we may call the nineteenth-century conflict, still pathetically sustained by Fundamentalists and Catholics, about the stories of *Genesis*, evolution, archæology and the Bible, etc. [See articles on each item.] The substantial issue is whether the teaching of science does or does not conflict, expressly or

implicitly, with the fundamental doctrines of all religion, Modernist or Fundamentalist, Christian or Moslem: the beliefs in God and immortality. Even here a sound acquaintance with the literature on both sides is necessary, and one must decline to pay serious attention to scientific men who, having no such knowledge, assure the public that there must be a Great Power, a First Cause, a Source of Love and Beauty, and so on. Equally unintelligible are scientific men who profess a high admiration of Christ or the beauty or superiority of Christian teaching when they have no knowledge of Biblical study or of non-Christian ethical and religious systems of the first century.

When we clear away these fallacies and misunderstandings we see science and religion as two rival interpretations of reality which are and always must be in conflict. The superficial plea that the one deals with material and the other with immaterial realities affords no escape from this situation. It is from a study of nature, and of the human mind as part of nature, that the existence of such immaterial realities is inferred; and nature and man are precisely the subject-matter of science. For the overwhelming majority of Theists the belief in the existence of God is based upon features of nature: its existence, order, design, purpose, beauty, and movements. We saw how futile is the attempt of a minority to avoid the clash with science and philosophy (which disdains such inferences) by appealing to an inner consciousness [see *Psychological Argument for Religion*]. For the overwhelming majority of believers in immortality the conviction is based upon the nature of thought or the mind, and that is the proper subject of psychology. Basic religion consists of these two inferences from realities which science studies, and what it teaches about them has already discredited the religious inferences. As regards Theism, see that title and God, and the subsidiary articles (*Design*; *First Cause*; etc.) there quoted. Even the subterfuge that, instead of building on "gaps" in the scientific scheme of interpretation, we must see a purpose in nature, or its

evolution "as a whole," is inconsistent with the facts of science and history. [See *Design Argument*.] The conflict is even more deadly in regard to the second religious assertion. [See *Immortality*; *Prehistoric Man*; and *Psychology*.] Large numbers of Christian writers acknowledge this and frankly confess that there is no ground for belief in immortality except in the New Testament, which gives equal ground for believing in devils, hell, original sin, self-torture, etc. Science is in its very nature materialistic. It deals with measurable realities only. It aspires to bring the whole of reality within its province, and that means, in the words of Tyndall's famous Belfast Address in 1874: "We claim, and we shall wrest from theology, the entire domain of cosmological theory." Modern science adds, "the entire domain of life." The conflict continues, whether or no it is formulated in words by scientific men, as long as the rival religious interpretation of reality survives. For detailed study of the present-day conflict see McCabe's *Riddle of the Universe To-day* (1934).

Scientists and Religion. In various apologetic works on science and religion we find long lists of "great scientists" who were religious—who at least believed in God, and for the most part professed Christianity. Catholic writers (Zahn, Gerard, Walsh, etc.) are particularly industrious in compiling such lists and representing that they refute the statement that science conflicts with religion. One will usually find that these lists are compiled by the dishonest method of including the names of men who lived 100 or 200 or more years ago. In one Catholic list of 300 names, 200 are of men who lived before the nineteenth century, and half the remainder in the first half of that century; and the Catholic reader (who knows nothing about any of the men) is not warned. The compilers are fully aware that the situation before 1850 has little or no significance, and that the correct inference from such a list, when the names are given in chronological order, is that religious belief rapidly decreased in scientific circles in proportion as scientific knowledge grew, so that

the list is a solid proof of conflict. For the recent period, moreover, men of science (Fabre, Pasteur, Claude Bernard, Mendel, etc.) [see notice of each] are claimed who were either declared Rationalists or justly suspected of undeclared Rationalism. The chief defects of other lists of recent men are that they (1) describe men as scientists—the use of this word was warmly defended in *Nature* some years ago—who have not the least right to that title; (2) do not discriminate between authorities on inorganic and organic science; (3) do not tell the reader whether the scientific man who is quoted speaks on behalf of his own science or some other branch; (4) are careless and slovenly, if not dishonest (as even Sir O. Lodge occasionally was), in quotation, and rarely give exact references; and (5) extort vague declarations of appreciation of religion from men of science, and then represent them as believers. We have an illustration of this mixture of slovenliness and sharp practice in two publications of the Christian Evidence Society, which professes to study these matters. In the early years of this century it asked 200 men of science, selected on some unknown principle, whether they considered science opposed to “the fundamentals of Christianity” or found men of science “irreligious and anti-Christian.” The form of the question was so evasive that the 186 who gave favourable replies included a number of well-known Rationalists, and even Honorary Associates of the Rationalist Press Association (*The Religious Beliefs of Scientists*, 1910). In 1932 the Society tried again, sending six questions to Fellows of the Royal Society. The editor did not explain, in analysing the 200 replies, that there were 503 Fellows, and that many of them are not scientific men, but patrons of science. Of the six questions, only one, relating to belief in immortality, was a real test question, and to this only eighty-eight out of the 503 Fellows replied. Of these, forty-seven replied favourably, and forty-one adversely; and the majority of the forty-one represented inorganic science, which does not give a man the least competence to discuss immortality. Not one was a physiologist. The results are published

in *The Religious Beliefs of Scientists* (1932).

The most important works in this connection are Prof. Leuba's *Belief in God and Immortality* (1916) and his article in *Harper's Magazine*, August 1934. The author addressed a strictly confidential and precisely worded inquiry to 2,000 of the leading professors of science or heads of laboratories, museums, etc., in America, as to their belief, disbelief, or open mind about God and immortality. Those who replied—a surprisingly large majority (75 per cent.) considering the risk incurred by many of them in professing unbelief even privately—are divided, not by the author, but by a standard authority, into “greater” and “lesser” scientists, and are distributed in the various classes (inorganic, biological, psychological, etc.). The one weakness—and it favours religion—is that Leuba included professors in religious colleges (except Catholic) or institutions under sectarian influence. Of the entire body, 42 per cent. believed in God, 42 per cent. disbelieved (which is Atheism according to the chief dictionaries), and 16 per cent. were doubters. But the greater men rejected the two beliefs in higher proportion than the lesser, and the biologists, psychologists, and sociologists in far higher proportion than the experts on mathematics or inorganic science. Of the greater psychologists, only 13 per cent. believed in God, and only 8 per cent. in immortality. But the most striking feature is that at the second inquiry, in 1934, it was found that there had been a further decay of belief. Of the leading biologists, psychologists, and sociologists, only 12 per cent. now believed in God, and of the greater and lesser together, in all branches of science, 70 per cent. were Atheists or Agnostics. We are entitled to assume that the majority of those who did not reply were sceptics, since belief is never penalized, and we may conclude that at least four-fifths of the leading representatives of science, particularly biological and anthropological science, reject the two basic religious beliefs. This is confirmed by many other indications. In 1922 Osborn and Millikan begged the scientific men of America to

sign a declaration of belief in God to meet the Fundamentalist menace to teaching, but only a dozen men, and some of these were hardly known in science, signed it. In 1927 Dr. Shailer Mathews (a religious teacher) published a symposium *Contributions of Science to Religion*, by nine scientists; and only two of them mentioned religion. In 1931 E. H. Cotton (religious) edited a symposium, *Has Science Discovered God?* Half the contributors replied "No," and the affirmers were the familiar Jeans, Eddington, Thomson, etc. The analysis in regard to beliefs of the men whose names are in the American *Who's Who* [see *Culture and Religion*], the contrast of the imposing list of scientific Honorary Associates of the Rationalist Press Association with the extraordinary absence of scientific names from the Catholic *Who's Who* [Roman Catholic Church], the biographical notices of large numbers of scientific men in this work, and the very rare association of important scientific men with the Churches in any respect, confirm the conclusion. As we said above, the list of religious scientific men is rich for the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, fairly rich for the first half of the nineteenth, and shrinks as it approaches our time. The list of Rationalist scientific men included in this Encyclopædia is of exactly the opposite character. Science is, in the words of Comte, conducting God to its frontiers. And since scientific men, teachers and professional men, are still liable to be penalized for an admission of scepticism, the case against religion is stronger than we can statistically determine.

Scott, Thomas (1808–78), publisher. A Catholic of wealthy family, at one time a page at the French Court, who became a Rationalist and spent large sums in propaganda. He paid prominent Rationalists to write pamphlets which he printed and distributed by post for fifteen years. The 200 "Scott Pamphlets" filled sixteen volumes. He was a good Hebrew scholar, and wrote several himself; though the *English Life of Jesus* (1872), which bears his name, is said to have been written by the Rev. Sir G. W. Cox.

Séailles, Prof. Gabriel, D.-ès-L. (1852–1906), French philosopher. He was professor of philosophy and Dean of the philosophical faculty at the Sorbonne and was widely esteemed in Europe and America. Apart from Rationalist passages in his *Ernest Renan* (1895) and *Les affirmations de la conscience moderne* (1903), he wrote a strong letter which was read at the International Congress of Freethinkers at Rome in 1904: "The human mind can conceive of no ideas more extravagant or ridiculous than it (the Church) has invented to fool and cheat the ignorant multitude and to awe and suppress the intellectual minority" (Wilson's *Trip to Rome*, 1904, p. 167).

Secular Education. Many dislike the charge of insincerity, or of covering with unsound pretexts their eagerness to recover power, prestige, and revenue, which is brought against the clergy. The imputation is, however, difficult to resist when we consider such matters as their insistence on religious education in schools on the ground that secular education, or the omission of religious lessons, leads to crime and social demoralization, for this is entirely opposed to facts that are statistically determined and easily consulted; and these facts also have a vital bearing on the general question of the social utility of religion. It should be noted that the emphasis on education is misleading. Modern psychology does not admit that behaviour is in any large proportion of cases moulded for life in the school, from which the majority of children are withdrawn just when they become really educable. Educationists complain that their work is generally lost in the five or six years of adolescence after leaving school, and for the great majority of the population post-school influences are entirely secular, yet we have seen in many articles that the general character has steadily improved [Crime; Drunkenness; etc.]. Some colour would be given to the clerical claims if there were an increase of child-crime or delinquency following upon a secularization of education, but published statistics show exactly the opposite. The most obvious case to test is that of France. Religious lessons were suppressed in the national

schools after 1880, though until 1886 there were still about 20,000 private schools with ample Catholic instruction. Dr. Lacassagne replied, in the *Revue Scientifique* (May, 1881), to religious prophecies of evil by statistical proof that juvenile crime had more than tripled in France during the period of Catholic education (1825-80). Prof. Fouillée (*La France au point de vue moral*, 1900) repeated the proof and showed that secularization had been followed by improvement. In 1906 the present writer showed (*The Truth about Secular Education*) that the increase of juvenile crime continued, though on a much smaller scale, from 1886 to 1896, when the public schools were secularized, but there were still large numbers of Catholic schools; yet the increase was turned into a rapid decrease after the latter date, and the statistics published annually in the *Statesman's Year Book* show that the decrease continued. Juvenile crime is not one-third what it was when all the schools of France were Catholic; yet such is the recklessness of apologists that they chiefly appealed to the terrible example (on their theory) of France.

In England the establishment of a State system of education was thwarted for fifty years by the clergy on the ground that schools must be under their control; yet crime was then appalling. Their hostility to the national scheme, when it was passed in 1870, was still so mischievous that a compromise—lessons on the Bible by the teachers—had to be admitted, Huxley (who in later life regretted his action) and some other Rationalist educators consenting. No educationist will claim a deep influence for the "Bible-lesson" by a teacher (who is probably a sceptic); yet England has the finest record in the world in the reduction of crime. In Australia, where there is a chronic clerical agitation for full religious instruction, the law differs in the different States. In Victoria there is complete secular education, and it has the cleanest criminal record. In *The New Zealand Rationalist* (February, 1941) the latest report of the Victorian Children's Courts is examined. It stated that, of 2,923 children brought before the courts, 35.07 per cent. were Catholics (who are

only about 20 per cent. of the population), 64 per cent. were Protestants (62 per cent. of the population-nominally), and two children had no religion. New South Wales permits religious lessons by the clergy, and has the worst record of crime. New Zealand has secular instruction, and a much better record. [For the figures in each case see *Crime and Religion*.] In America the public schools have Bible-reading without comment, but there is a vast amount of religious instruction of children, especially Catholic and Baptist; and the record of crime is notorious. Contrary to a common opinion, some of the towns in the "Bible-belt" (Kentucky, etc.) have the worst record for murder. Mexico, on the other hand, has greatly reduced crime since it secularized its schools and severely checked the Church. Germany had, until the last war (1914), a very high record of religious instruction in schools and colleges and a much worse criminal record than France and Great Britain (Dr. T. F. A. Smith, *The Soul of Germany*, 1915). It had a better record under the Liberal-Socialist administration, 1925-32. Italy, imperfectly secularized in 1870, had a much poorer record in the reduction of crime than France and England, but after the entrusting of the schools to the Church, by Mussolini, crime increased at an extraordinary rate. Russia, in fine, has made the most drastic revolution in the secularization of all education, and it has the finest record of any country in the reduction of crime, the treatment of criminals, and the improvement of the general character. In spite of the insistence on this of, not only great educators like Prof. Dewey, but conservative writers who know the old Russia thoroughly and visited the new (Countess Skaryatina, Sir B. Pares, Brigadier-General Waters, etc.), this was obscured by prejudice until Russia became the ally of Great Britain. It is now generally recognized that, while education is not only secularized, but includes much criticism of religion, Russian children, among whom, under the Tsars, there was a good deal of crime, and even prostitution (of girls down to twelve and thirteen), are probably the best-behaved in Europe.

The official statistics of Eire and pre-war Poland and official figures for cities like Liverpool and Bradford strikingly show that crime, especially juvenile, is worse where there is most religious instruction.

Secularism. A word coined, by G. J. Holyoake "to express the extension of Freethought to Ethics," as he said in 1840. In 1851 he began to use the terms "Secularism" and "Secularist," as indicating "the sum of all knowledge and duty," in his paper *The Reasoner* (November and December), after consultation with J. S. Mill, and after that date he began to found Secular Societies. The name "Agnostic" was not coined by Huxley until 1869, and the word "Rationalist" was at that time still associated with R. Owen's Rational Religion or Socialism. Holyoake felt that "Secularist" had a positive meaning, indicating that the rejection of religion was accompanied by humanitarian feeling and endeavour, and so was preferable to the words in current use: "Atheist," "Freethinker," "Sceptic," "Infidel," etc. A conference at the Secular Institute at Manchester, in 1852, was attended by representatives of twenty-two Secular Societies. Many of them built Halls of Science [see], and some of them schools. In 1858 Bradlaugh succeeded Holyoake as President of the London Secular Society, and in 1866 he and Austin Holyoake founded the National Secular Society. The Independent Leicester Secular Society, which has a handsome Institute of its own, retains Holyoake's broader ideal and interests, but in other societies the name stands for the rejection and criticism of religion. See Holyoake's *Origin and Nature of Secularism*, 1896.

Seeley, Sir John Robert, K.C.M.G. (1834-95), historian. He was for some years professor of Latin at London University College, and in 1865 he published a study of Christ (*Ecce Homo*) which was almost as widely discussed as Darwin's *Origin*. It aimed to show that Jesus and Christianity had no supernatural features. Seeley was, nevertheless, appointed professor of modern history at Cambridge in 1869, and was knighted for the distinction of his historical works. A second Rationalist

work, *Natural Religion* (1882), was not successful, as the author, in his anxiety to avoid aggressiveness, appealed to neither side. He had, however, no Christian belief, accepting only God and immortality.

Selous, Sir Frederick Courteney, D.S.O. (1851-1917), traveller. He was in early years a professional elephant-hunter in Africa, and his book, *A Hunter's Wanderings* (1881), won the Gold Medal of the Royal Geographical Society. Though over sixty, and one of the best-known travellers and authorities on Africa, he volunteered for service in the 1914 war and was killed in action. In a contribution to a symposium on the belief in immortality, in the *Christian Commonwealth* (March, 1915), Selous wrote: "I have no confidence that I shall survive bodily death; nor, until I know what my future state would be if I did so, do I hope for survival." He said, further, that he did not believe in "some power, which is known to civilized man as God."

Senancourt, Étienne Pivry de (1770-1846), French writer. As his parents wanted him to become a priest, he fled to Geneva, where he adopted the Deism of Rousseau. He devoted himself to literature on his return to France, and his autobiographical work *Overmann* (1804) has a high position in French literature.

Seneca, Lucius Annæus (A.D. 1-65), philosopher. A wealthy Roman of Spanish origin who practised law and entered the public service. He was exiled for a time on a false charge, but was brought back by Agrippina and entrusted with the education of Nero, her son. It is agreed that Nero became partly insane, and his crimes imply no reflection on Seneca, who was compelled by him to commit suicide. During his exile, Seneca had taken to the study of philosophy, and the moral essays he wrote are part of our heritage of classical literature. While some Christian critics suggest that he must have learned his lofty moral code from St. Paul, others sneer at him as "writing on poverty with a gold pen." He praised sobriety, not asceticism, and his ideals were common at that time in the generally accepted blend of Stoicism and

Epicureanism. Dr. J. Oakesmith says, in his *Religion of Plutarch* (1902), that he was "a Stoic of the Stoics," but adds that he greatly admired Epicurus, and "it is an exceptional occurrence for him to conclude one of his moral lessons without quoting in its support the authority of the Master of the Garden" (p. 40).

Sensationalism. A word used at one time for the theory that all knowledge begins with sensations, or is empirical. It was chiefly applied to Condillac's philosophy. The common use of the word "sensational" to-day makes it inappropriate. It is now the generally received theory of knowledge and needs no special name, though "Empiricism" is a sound description.

Sense, The Religious. [See Psychological Argument.]

Sentiment and Reason. [See Emotion.]

Sepher Toldoth Jeschu ("The Book of the Generations of Jesus"). A Jewish work which contains the story that Jesus was the natural son of Mary and a Roman-Greek officer named Pandira (or Pantheros). [See *Jesus ben Pandira*.] Conybeare finds that the book did not appear until after A.D. 400 and is based upon references to Jesus (unnamed), in the Talmud, which declare that there is proof, in the archives, of his illegitimacy. The story of Pantheros was, however, current amongst the Jews, Origen tells us (*Contra Celsum*) in the second century. Thus, while the book is worthless, the story shows that the Jews of the second century did not question the historicity of Jesus. See Conybeare's *Historical Christ* (1914, p. 151). We have no proof that the Pantheros story is much, if at all later, than the virgin birth story in *Luke*.

September Massacre, The. The injustice of the very common jibe that the decay of religion led to horrible brutality under the French Revolution is exposed in the article under that title. The Revolution occurred in 1789, and it is a calculated abuse of language to call the entire period of the republic "the Revolution" so as to include as many outrages as possible. In the first three years, moreover, the authorities not only made no attempt to interfere with reli-

gion, but vigorously defended the establishment of the Church against the popular demand for its suppression. During and after the actual Revolution there were only the spontaneous outbursts of popular anger against a corrupt exploiting class which accompany all such transfers of power, and these were suppressed by the authorities, and an orderly period ensued. The religious charge, repeated sometimes by literary, and even scientific, writers who will not consult the proper historical authorities, chiefly refers to the September Massacre of 1792 and the Terror [see]. In the autumn of 1792 the population of Paris was still very largely, if not by a great majority, Catholic, and since the aim of the massacre was to "purify Paris," and the victims were to a great extent prostitutes and criminals from the jails, we must suppose either that the butchers were religious men or that the new Atheists had a singular moral sensitiveness. Historians generally accept the former alternative. The armies of Prussia and Austria, instigated by the emigrant priests and nobles, were advancing to destroy the Republic, and had taken Verdun. Secret stores of arms were found in Paris, and proved the existence of a large body of "Fifth Columnists," and hundreds of these were imprisoned. When the news of the fall of Verdun reached Paris, there was a panic, and a body of men brought out the "traitors" from the jails and massacred them. The fact that very large numbers of prostitutes were included, and that every piece of jewellery taken from the prisoners was handed over to the authorities, proves that the conventional account of the massacre as a sadistic outrage by Atheists is quite false; and the appalling massacres of revolutionaries that were later committed by the Catholics, to which we rarely find a reference, show the absurdity of assuming that the butchers cannot have been religious. [See *Terror, White, and Democracy and Religion*.] It is further fully agreed by historians that the attackers were a small band of a few hundred of the people of Paris, and that the number of victims (said to be 12,000 in some royalist versions) has

been grossly exaggerated. In the most recent and authoritative study, Walter's *Les Massacres de Septembre* (1932) it is established that the total victims numbered 1,100, and that only 450 of these were priests, nuns, or aristocrats. It is agreed that the butchers, authorized by the Paris Commune, not by the Government, were only about 500 in number, and that the remaining inhabitants of Paris were, as the conservative Sir R. Lodge says, in his *History of Modern Europe* (1909 ed., p. 528), "stupefied with horror." In other words, even this grave crime committed by a few against men and women, half of whom were suspected of treason and half convicted prisoners, is slight in comparison with the Catholic Bartholomew Massacre [see] and the Catholic-Royalist massacres in Naples, Spain, and Portugal in the nineteenth century [see *Democracy and Religion*]. See the *Cambridge Medieval History* (Vol. II), Lavis's standard *Histoire de France Contemporaine* (1921, Vol. II), and Prof. Aulard's *Christianity and the French Revolution* (Engl. trans., 1927).

Septuagint, The. The earliest Greek translation of the Old Testament, so called because of a legend that Ptolemy II [see], a sceptic and great patron of culture, employed seventy-two Jews—*septuaginta* is the Latin for seventy—to translate it. The letter in which the story is found is now regarded as apocryphal. Nothing in the history of the time confirms it, and the translation is believed to have been made gradually during the third and second centuries B.C. To the Septuagint we owe most of the refining (often real falsification) of the occasional grossness of the Hebrew text. A realistic translation would, if the police passed it, greatly disturb the belief that it is in any sense "the Word of God."

Sepulchre, The Holy. The alleged tomb of Jesus at Jerusalem. Even the article on it in the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, by the secretary of the Palestine Exploration Fund, gives the impression that the writer himself did not consider it genuine. There is no reference to it in Christian literature until the fourth century, when Bishop Eusebius, an historian who candidly avowed that he

thought edification more important than accuracy, says that the Christians, in 325, tore down a temple that Hadrian had built and found the tomb underneath! It was a time of marvellous "discoveries" of relics. Many Christian writers now admit that the authority is worthless, and the site is impossible, as it is too near the centre of the ancient city. But the belief is so profitable that Greek and Romanist priests fight, sometimes literally, for the monopoly of the site.

Serapis. A deity of late Egypt introduced into Alexandria by Ptolemy I, who does not seem to have had any respect for the gods of either Greece or Egypt. The Ptolemies [see] built a superb temple and priestly college, the Serapeum, as part of their design to make Alexandria the world's cultural centre. Gibbon, who gives an interesting account of the Serapeum, quotes a legend that Ptolemy imported the strange and obscure god from Pontus. The general opinion now is that the name is a fusion of Osiris and Apis (the Egyptian bull-god) and that the cult was old in Egypt. The interest is that the new cult attracted the ascetic ideas which were then spreading in the Greek-Oriental world, and was associated with the purified cult of Isis. The communities of celibate priests and nuns of Serapis and Isis, and their services, had much influence on the development of Christianity, of which Alexandria was one of the chief cradles.

Serfdom. Apologists make the excuse for the Church's complete failure to condemn slavery [see] until modern times that it would have gravely disturbed the economy of the Roman Empire—as if Jesus or Paul or the Fathers had the least concern about or power to disturb that economy—and that the Church more wisely and gradually converted slavery into serfdom, and from the twelfth century onward secured the emancipation of the serfs. Modern authorities, we shall see, acknowledge that the Church had no influence, and did not, except in rare instances, try to have such influence on these stages in the evolution of the worker; but the economic basis of the argument is unsound. It is impossible to

draw a definite line between slavery and serfdom; indeed the word "serf" is only a French version of the Latin for slave (*servus*). Not only had slaves a great variety of conditions in the Roman Empire, but there were classes of workers (*coloni* and *quasi-coloni*) between the free or freedmen and the slaves. These agricultural workers, who were bound to the soil, but had private houses and some personal property, are analogous to the best classes of the later serfs. The distinction is recognized in the Justinian Code for the Greek world, but in the West the system collapsed at the fall of the Roman Empire. The slaves owned by the State and the wealthy, which means the majority of the slaves, were then automatically freed. But from the same economic cause, the need of livelihood, they submitted to the new Teutonic landholders and such Romans of wealth as escaped the general destruction. No one pretended to recognize a change of condition—the distinction between slavery and serfdom is, says Vinogradov, in his *Villainage in England* (1892), "late and artificial"—but local circumstances brought about a variety of classes. Pope Gregory I (about the year 600) always speaks of the bodies of workers on his vast estates as slaves (*servi*), and rarely, and only at a profit to himself, emancipated any. The Protestant historian, Guizot, frankly says that in the eighth and ninth centuries the workers of Europe were "a population of slaves." It is usual to say that the difference between slave and serf was that the slave was the direct property of the master, but the serf was his property only in the sense that he was tied to the soil and could be bought and sold with it. In practice, as the mediæval chronicles abundantly show, land-owners treated the serfs as personal possessions. They mutilated or killed them, coupled them for the sake of offspring, and abused their wives and daughters at will. The situation in Russia, as late as 1770, when Catherine made presents of tens of thousands of serfs to her corrupt favourites, and they were bought and sold as the negroes were in America, is sufficiently instructive. Letourneau, the chief French authority (*L'évolution de*

l'esclavage, 1895), shows that French jurists of the thirteenth century distinguished between the serf, whose body was the property of the master, and the villain, but admit that the villain had no security whatever in his nominal rights and had no appeal from the court of the abbot or noble, his owner. Prof. Vinogradov, the chief English authority (*Villainage in England*, 1892, *English Society in the Eleventh Century*, 1908, etc.), says the same for England, and included this in his article (now modified by the Catholic X) in the *Encyclopædia Britannica*. In England, in the eleventh century, Vinogradov shows, the villains (the great majority of the workers) were serfs in a condition of real slavery. They were the property of the lord or abbot, not simply tied to the soil, and lived in squalid conditions.

In reality, therefore, the great change in the status of the workers from pagan to Christian times was that while, in the third and fourth centuries, more than half the workers had been free—recent experts say about 75 per cent. of them in Italy—the overwhelming majority of the workers, who were now almost entirely agricultural, became slaves after the fifth century; and that, while the pagan lawyers had won the protection of law for the Roman slaves, the Christian serfs had no such protection. What is called the emancipation of the serfs occurred mainly in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. It must not be imagined that the old type of slavery had ceased—Vinogradov shows that there were 25,000 real slaves, besides the hundreds of thousands of villains in England, about 1100—for the Church has never condemned it. [See *Slavery*.] But the political and economic causes which had modified the old system of slavery now modified also the new. It is possible to quote abbots and bishops who recommended the emancipation of the serfs as an act of piety, but the Catholic historian, Muratori, pointed out two centuries ago that the abbeys and bishoprics, which owned a very high proportion of the serfs, were the last to emancipate them, pleading that they had no right to "alienate" Church property. There is no dispute among the authorities that the impulses were overwhelm-

ingly secular. The new luxury, the gamble of the Crusades, etc., caused the nobles to raise funds by granting emancipation. In the constant struggles of nobles against nobles, or against their feudal lords, or of city against city, etc., large bodies of serfs won emancipation by service; and as in the days of ancient slavery, wise owners found it more profitable to have free workers. But the change was as slow and gradual as it was secular. There were serfs in England until the sixteenth century; in France, Germany, and Austria until the eighteenth; and there were 42,500,000 in Russia until 1861. We must, in fine, not for a moment imagine the agricultural workers passing to a life of joyous freedom. Prof. Thorold Rogers minutely describes their condition in his *History of Agriculture and Prices* (8 vols., 1866-87). Except when plague, famine, or war made labour scarce, they had a miserable life: working from sunup to sundown on 300 days a year—in the later Roman Empire men had not worked on more than 200, and the bells generally rang for quitting at 3 p.m.—having one-room huts (and large families) with earth floors and no windows or chimneys, a wretched and monotonous diet (black bread and very little meat), and constantly swept by wars and epidemics. [For the further development and general literature see *Workers*.]

Sergi, Prof. Giuseppe (1841-1936), Italian anthropologist. Professor of anthropology and experimental psychology at Rome University, Director of the Roman Museum of Anthropology, and author of more than 100 books and 200 academic articles, which won for him a high reputation in Europe and America. The *Enciclopedia Italiana* credits him with 400 publications. Sergi was the Grand Old Man of Italian Rationalism as well as science. The present writer heard him give a fiery Atheist address to the International Congress of Free-thinkers, at Rome, in 1904. Wilson reports him, in his *Trip to Rome* (1904), saying that "the conceptions of a soul, a future life, a God, are all superstitious errors which have clouded the human mind and given a false direction to human conduct" (p. 170).

Sermon on the Mount, The. It occurs to very few of the writers who extol "the sublime teaching of Jesus in the Sermon on the Mount" to wonder who reported it. In *Matthew* it fills three long chapters (v-vii). Shorthand (*notatio*) was well known to the Romans, but even the boldest apologist has not suggested that there was a stenographer among the followers of Jesus. Divines who appreciate the difficulty say that the author of *Matthew* has put together speeches that were really delivered on different occasions. That is in itself a confession that the writer resorted to fiction in his life of Jesus, but it is in any case inadequate. Long sections of the "Sermon" are continuous, and it would be absurd to say that they were learned by heart (from one hearing) and written down a century or so later. The theory is in any form ridiculous, and it is superfluous. There is not a single sentiment in the discourse that is not found also in the Old Testament, the Talmud, and contemporary moralists. See the parallels for each clause in McCabe's *Sources of the Morality of the Gospels* (1914, Ch. IX). H. Rodrigues makes a thorough study of it in *Les origines de Sermon de la Montagne* (1868).

Servetus, Michael (1511-53), reformer. A Spaniard—the proper name is Miguel Servete—who went to France to study law, adopted and improved upon the ideas of the Reformers, and settled in Switzerland. His declaration that the Trinity was as unscriptural and fictional as the Pope's supremacy angered the Calvinists. He returned to France and took up medicine; and it is generally agreed that he had some idea of the circulation of the blood. He published his heresies in *Christianismi Restitutio* (1553) and, passing through Switzerland, was arrested at the instigation of Calvin and burned at the stake.

Severn, Joseph (1793-1879) painter. In his youth, when he won the Gold Medal of the Royal Academy, he became a friend of Keats, and with great self-sacrifice accompanied the doomed poet to Italy and cared for him. He remained in Italy, winning considerable repute as a painter, and was British Consul in Rome after the city was taken from the

Pope. He had shared Keat's Rationalism and followed the struggle against the Church with enthusiasm.

Sex and Religion. There is no ground in the facts of savage life at the lowest level, which take us nearest to prehistoric man, to introduce sex into the explanation of the origin of religion [see]. It becomes important when man at last reaches the idea of major spirits or nature-gods presiding over the life of nature. At the hunting, and especially at the pastoral and agricultural, phase of human development the fertility goddess (in some cases god) assumes vital importance, and the cult of Mother Earth or of a god of corn or wine or of fertility in general spreads over the earth. Human fertility, to sustain and augment the number of warriors, being as important as that of cattle, this cult becomes central in religion, and either on the principle of sympathetic magic—imitating or representing the act which produces the desired effect—or, more probably, because a deity of fertility can be presumed to look with special favour on the sex act, it develops pronounced phallic features [Phallism]. The Old Testament retains, even in its Ezraist revision, abundant traces of these features. In the first millennium B.C. an antagonistic tendency in religion, apparently connected with the cult of the sun-god as the Sky-Father, developed the ascetic view of sex. "Earthly" things, which had been glorified in the cult of the Earth-Mother, were held to be unclean, and in the end the creation of them was attributed to the Devil. The earlier stages of this development are lost, but the idea was a fundamental religious dogma in Persia by the sixth century B.C., and the asceticism it inspired spread all over the ancient world. Christianity, whose apostles are apt to boast that it was the first to denounce the flesh and preach purity, was just one of a score of forms in which the new ideas were propagated [see *Avesta*; *Eleusinian Mysteries*; *Epictetus*; *Essenes*; *Ishtar*; *Isis*; *Manichæism*; *Mithraism*; *Pythagoras*; etc.].

The question whether, as is commonly believed, the female sex is more religious than the male is best treated in Havelock Ellis's *Man and Woman* (5th ed., 1934,

pp. 321-9). He points out that of 600 religious sects that are included in a Dictionary of Religion, only seven were founded by women. We should add Mrs. Eddy and Mme. Blavatsky if we considered that their impulses were religious. While there may be other psychological and social factors to be taken into account in this matter, it is the same in regard to the preponderance of women amongst church-goers. Until recently the narrow sphere of domestic interests to which women were generally confined, and the resultant disinclination to read critical literature, made church-life more attractive to them. As a rule, however, the disproportion of the sexes in church-going is exaggerated. The best documentary evidence is in the thorough census of church-goers taken in London by the *Daily News* in 1903 (report edited by Mudie-Smith, *The Religious Life of London*, 1904). Apart from the Jews and a few small bodies (Spiritualists, Ethicists, etc.), 372,264 men and 607,257 women attended church in Greater London (population about 4,500,000). The women were not two to one. But the detailed figures showed that the excess was almost entirely in Anglican and Roman (ritualistic) churches, especially in wealthy districts. In the wealthier Catholic churches the women were three to one, and the disproportion was nearly as great in Anglican churches in the wealthier districts. It was clearly based, not upon "religion" itself, but upon its sensual and other attractions. Psychological laboratories in America have proved that it is a popular superstition that women are more sensitive than men. The explanation of such disproportion as really exists—modern developments are reducing it—is more plausibly found in the sexual phenomena described by Havelock Ellis, and other sexologists, in connection with woman's relative coldness or tardiness. The connection of religious inclinations with sexual maturity, to which Prof. Starbuck pays special attention in his *Psychology of Religion* (1889), is discussed under **Puberty**.

Sexual Selection. Darwin, recognizing that Natural Selection did not explain all evolutionary phenomena,

offered this subsidiary theory: that a large number of features were due to selection of those characteristics in female by male animals, and vice versa. An obvious instance is the large class of brighter plumage and other decorativeness in male birds (preference by females) or the more graceful form of the human female (selection by males). The theory has always been much disputed, later observers denying, for instance, that female birds do exercise this choice or preference, and attributing the male characters to superior vitality. The general feeling is that the theory is sound within limits that are not yet fixed.

Seymour, Edward Adolphus, twelfth Duke of Somerset and Earl St. Maur (1804-85), statesman. He entered political life as a Commoner (Liberal) and became a Lord of the Treasury at the age of thirty-one, First Commissioner of Works and Cabinet Minister in 1851, and Peer and First Lord of the Admiralty 1859-66. In spite of losses that compelled him to retire, he was "never embittered" (*Dict. Nat. Biog.*). In retirement he wrote *Christian Theology and Modern Scepticism* (1872), which is near to Agnosticism. He rejects Christianity, but admits "a Supreme Intelligence" and finds in this "a ray of light beyond the mystery of the grave" (*Letters, Remains, and Memoir of E. A. Seymour*, 1893).

Shaftesbury, Lord. [See Cooper, A. A. for the First and Third Earls.] References in recent religious literature to Lord Shaftesbury as a great Christian reformer and "friend of the working man" are to the Seventh Earl (1801-85), who is coupled with Wilberforce [see] as proof that it is libellous to say that the Church of England had no share in modern social reform. It is to be noted that the only two representatives of it quoted before 1850 are laymen. Some add the name of Peel, who also was a layman, but hardly a great reformer, and Wilberforce, it will be shown, was a sceptic when he learned his one idea of reform (the abolition of black slavery) and was in all other respects a pernicious reactionary. Shaftesbury was always very religious, and he effected some broad reforms, but his services are magnified and his

very reactionary attitude on all other questions is usually suppressed. He secured a much-needed relief for chimney-sweeps and other child-workers, and he was very zealous in promoting the Ten Hours Bill for adult industrial workers; though the agricultural workers, even on his own estates, were left in deplorable conditions and he refused to help. We may recall that Owen, Place, and Bentham (all Atheists) had prepared the way for these reforms, and in all other respects (political reform, the emancipation of the Jews and of women, religious liberty, freedom of the Press, etc.) he was a sour opponent of progress. He tells us in his Diary that the windows of his London house were barricaded out of fear of an attack at any time by the workers. ("I almost quail when I think of the concentrated hatred against me," he said—Hodder's *Life and Work* (3 vols., 1886, I, 358). Now he is currently described as "the friend of the workers."

Shakespeare, The Religion of (1564-1616). The great poet has been claimed by every school of thought, from Romanism to Atheism, but the long controversy has led to no definite conclusion. Each writer sets out with a hope of identifying his own creed or philosophy in Shakespeare; and since the poet objectively presents every type of character, making pagans respect pagan gods and Christians speak as Christians ought, each finds something to confirm his anticipation. Shakespeare had the perfect detachment of a true artist, and, like many of the great painters of Renaissance days, was Christian or pagan according to his theme. The discussion of particular expressions is therefore bound to be inconclusive, and apart from the plays and poems, we have no evidence of his personality and opinions. No other genius was ever so little noticed by contemporaries. Rationalist writers sometimes exaggerate the extent of scepticism in Elizabethan days and conclude that so high an intelligence was bound to share it. Robertson did this in the first edition of his *Short History of Freethought* (and in an earlier published lecture, *The Religion of Shakespeare*, 1887), but corrected it in

the third edition (1915, II, 15-20), pointing out that only Marlowe [see] is clearly sceptical. A survey of his work as a whole certainly gives an impression, as Green says, that "the religious phrases which are thinly scattered over his work" have no depth, and in his serious moods he takes no notice of "the common theological solutions around him" of the riddle of life and death. This is confirmed if we regard his works in the chronological stages accepted by the best commentators. We have a stage of rich frivolity (comedies and sonnets) in which he must have been at least indifferent to religion; the stage of the great patriotic plays in which there is, apparently, still no room for religion; the more mature stage of the great tragedies, in which one might expect to trace deeper religious feeling if the artist was a Christian. Yet we do not find it; and in the final stage that of the humanist plays (*The Tempest*, etc.), the note struck seems to be that of a naturalist ethic. Beyond such suggestions we cannot go.

Shaw, George Bernard (b. 1856), dramatist, Nobel Prize winner. Born in Dublin of an English family that had settled in Ireland—Shaw himself has derided the idea of Celtic wit—he, after a few years as a clerk, migrated to London, and had a long period of impecunious struggle. He assured the present writer that he literally "lived on sixpence a day" for some time. He rose to distinction as a journalist and art-critic and attained world-repute with the publication of *Man and Superman* (1903). Shaw rejects the title of "Rationalist" because, having never recovered from his early admiration of Butler (confirmed later by Bergson), he does not admit "the supremacy of reason." But he uses stronger language about Christian doctrines than most Rationalist writers do, recognizes God only as a name for the cosmic Vital Principle, and rejects the idea of immortality. See McCabe's *George Bernard Shaw* (1914), which Shaw detests, for a study of his religion, and the Preface to *Androcles and the Lion*.

Shelburne, Lord [see Petty, William].
Shelley, Percy Bysshe (1792-1822).

He adopted the Materialism of D'Holbach at Oxford and was expelled for writing a pamphlet entitled *The Necessity of Atheism*. In London, where he mixed with the leading sceptics and republicans, he wrote a powerful remonstrance when D. I. Eaton was prosecuted for selling Paine's *Age of Reason* (1812); and the notes to his first great poem, *Queen Mab* (1813), were very sceptical. As his marriage to Harriet Westbrook was unhappy, and the law afforded no relief from it, he lived with Mary Godwin (1797-1851), the beautiful and accomplished daughter of Godwin and Mary Wollstonecraft [see], whom he married when his wife died. A child was born, and he took Mary to Italy, the courts having refused him charge of his children by Harriet; and after producing his greatest works there, he was drowned at sea. Under the influence of Plato—Dundas traces his religious development in his *Life of Shelley* (2 vols., 1886)—he became, in his later days, a Theist in the sense that he now admitted a "Universal Mind" which he occasionally calls God. He still rejected Christianity and the belief in immortality. A few months before he died he spoke of prussic acid as "the golden key to the chamber of perpetual rest" (II, 507). He was a magnificent influence sustaining the ideal of progress in an age of deep reaction, and his best work was achieved while he was still an Atheist.

Sherrington, Sir Charles Scott, M.A., M.D., Sc.D., LL.D., F.R.S., F.R.C.P., F.R.C.S., O.M., G.D.E. (b. 1861), physiologist, Nobel Prize winner. Before his retirement he was Waynflete Professor of Physiology at Oxford University and had received the Copley, Baly, and Retzius Gold Medals and a large number of scientific honours, especially for research on the nervous system, on which he is one of the highest authorities in the world. He received the Nobel Prize for Medicine (1932). Sir Charles is an Honorary Associate of the R.P.A. His materialistic views are given in his Rede Lecture (*The Brain and its Mechanism*, 1933). He predicts that science will in time show "how the brain does its thinking" (p. 34).

Shinto. A Chinese name ("the Holy Way") given to the national religion of Japan when that country was civilized by contact with China. It had been a system of nature-worship and cult of ancestors, and Chinese influence introduced the ethical element and the cultivation of personality. The educated Japanese adopted Confucianism and have for centuries been for the most part Atheists, but they supported Shinto (which especially lends itself to the worship of the Emperor) and Buddhism for the masses. Both religions have of late years been heavily subsidized and have prostituted themselves in the service of the military-political scheme of aggression. See the report of speeches at the Chicago Congress of Religions, edited by A. E. Hayden, *Modern Trends in World-Religions* (1934).

Sibylline Oracles, The. There was a legend in the Greek-Roman world that some centuries before Christ a prophetess named Sibylla appeared in Asia Minor, and a large number of utterances and supposed predictions were attributed to her. They were collected in the "Sibylline Books" which were kept in the temple of Jupiter Capitolinus at Rome. From the third century B.C. the Jews, and later the early Christians, forged prophecies in the name of Sibylla, and these are sometimes quoted as pagan anticipations of Christ and Christianity.

Sicily, The Arabs in. [See *Saracens*.]

Sidgwick, Prof. Henry (1838-1900), philosopher. Son of a clergyman, and cousin of Archbishop Benson, who adopted Rationalist views during an exceptionally brilliant course at Cambridge. He learned Arabic and Hebrew in order to equip himself for a thorough study of religion. In 1869 he was appointed professor of moral philosophy, but resigned on account of the religious tests. These were abolished in 1871, and he became Prælector on moral and political philosophy, and later Knightsbridge Professor. Sidgwick secured the admission of women to the university examinations, and was one of the founders of Newnham Hall. He had great prestige and a very sound influence in university life. Morley

says, in his *Recollections* (1917), that Sidgwick "broke with orthodox Christianity in an early stage of his life and seems to have made no return to it" (I, 123). Mrs. Sidgwick confirms this in her biography of him (*Henry Sidgwick*, 1906). She says that "half a dozen bishops tried hard to get him to die as a Christian" and gave him Christian burial, but "his old hope of returning to the Church of his fathers had not been fulfilled." He was a Theist.

Sidney, Algernon (1622-83), politician. A son of the Earl of Leicester, who joined the Roundheads in the Civil War and became Governor of Chichester, Lieutenant-General of the Horse in Ireland, and Governor of Dover. He opposed the execution of Charles I and regarded Cromwell as a usurper. At the Restoration he was on a diplomatic mission abroad and lived mostly in France till 1677, when he was permitted to return. In 1683 he was arrested for republican conspiracy and, after a disgraceful trial, beheaded. He left a memoir in which he claimed that he had always supported "the true Protestant religion." Bishop Burnet explains, in his *History of His Own Times* (II, 352), that he "seemed to be a Christian but in a particular form of his own," and he was "against all public worship and everything that looked like a Church." He was, in other words, a Deist. On the scaffold he "refused the aid of the minister of religion" (Lingard, X, 87).

Sleyès, Count Emmanuel Joseph (1748-1836), French statesman. A priest, Vicar General to the Bishop of Chartres, and member of the Higher Council of the Clergy, who played a prominent part in the Revolution and is sometimes quoted as proof that the Church was not entirely opposed to it. He tells us himself that he was put into the Church against his will, became a sceptic from the study of Locke and Condillac, and "evaded every occasion of clerical work." He left the Church. At the Revolution it was he who drew up the famous Tennis Court Oath, and he had great influence in the National Assembly during the period of sober constructive work. He retired at the Terror. Napo-

leon, whom he accepted, made him Count and Senator, and he was exiled at the Restoration. He never returned to the Church. See P. Bastid, *Sieyès et sa pensée* (1939).

Simon, Prof. François Jules (1814–96), French statesman and philosopher. He helped Cousin in his translation of Plato—some say that he did the work—and became professor of philosophy at the Sorbonne, but was deposed for protesting against Napoleon's *coup d'état* in 1851. He returned to politics after 1871 and became Minister of Public Instruction, Life-Senator, member of the Academy, and President of the Council. French Rationalists strongly disliked Simon's leniency to the Church, but he was an outspoken non-Christian Theist in his books (*La religion naturelle*, 1856, *Dieu, patrie, liberté*, 1883, etc.).

Simony. The sale of sacred things, particularly ecclesiastical offices, so called from the legend (*Acts viii*) of Simon Magus offering apostles money to endow him with their powers. In Catholic theology it is as grave a sin as sexual misconduct; yet Catholic writers, in their discussion of their "few bad Popes," blandly ignore the fact that for more than a thousand years, under "good" Popes and bad, it was one of the chief sources of Papal revenue and an officially organized system. It began by bribery to get the position of Pope in the fifth century. In 530 Boniface II proposed, as it had become common, to prevent it by having a Pope nominate his successor, but the angry priests and people, who profited by it in electing the Pope, forced him publicly to withdraw his decree. At his death the Senate passed a severe censure on bribery, and the King (in Ravenna) issued a decree (in Mansi's *Collection of Councils*, 532) in which he describes the sordid prevalence of simony in the Roman Church, candidates selling the altar-vessels and seizing the funds to help the poor for the purpose of bribery. It was worse than ever ten years later. See Milman's *History of Latin Christianity* for this period. Simony of this type continued until the sixteenth century, and assumed monstrous proportions when the Roman See became rich, hundreds of thousands of

pounds in gifts and lucrative offices changing hands at a single election as the Orsini, Borgia, Colonna, Rovere, etc., fought for the tiara. See Petrucci della Gattina's *Histoire des con-claves* (4 vols., 1864–6), or even Pastor's Catholic *History of the Popes* (Engl. trans., 14 vols., 1891–1924). Long before this the sale of offices had spread throughout the Church. Gregory I (590–604) bitterly complains in his letters that it is rife everywhere. The poverty to which Europe had sunk at this time is made the excuse for the failure to restore schools, hospitals, etc., but the abbey and bishoprics were rich, the Papacy itself having an income of about £400,000 a year. The sale continued to be habitual, and the Avignon Popes of the fourteenth century organized it, to their own profit, on a scandalous scale; yet John XXIII [see], whose crimes and vices run to several pages in the records of the Council of Constance, further extended it. In these centuries (the "Ages of Faith") the Papacy would not merely sell the "expectation" of a rich benefice (and keep scouts all over Europe reporting on the chances of death of the actual holders), but sold the same benefice several times over, as one cleric overbid another. The sale of indulgences also was now organized, and the system reached its height under Leo X [see]. The pretence that the Council of Trent and the Counter-Reformation put an end to it is, however, totally false. Even the "reform Popes" did little to check it, and it flourished amazingly in the seventeenth century, especially under Innocent X (1644–55), who permitted his sister Olimpia (for financial favours received) to turn her palace into a sort of bourse at which queues of ecclesiastics waited with their money-bags for their turn to buy lucrative offices. See the extraordinary documents in the second volume of L. von Ranke's *Popes of Rome* (2 vols., 1846–7) for the pontificate of Innocent and of Clement IX (1667–9).

Sinai. A peninsula lying between Egypt and Arabia, possibly taking its name from the ancient Babylonian moon-god Sin. It is now generally admitted, even by liberal Christian

scholars, that the story of the Israelites visiting it is sheer fiction. Doubtless there would be a frenzy of rejoicing if some inscription suggesting this were discovered, but it is not of the least importance. It would leave the miracles, which alone concern the Rationalist, just as legendary as ever.

Sinclair, Upton, B.A. (b. 1878), American writer. His exposure of the Chicago meat-trade in *The Jungle* (1906), and other powerful purposive novels, gave him a high reputation in progressive circles in England and America, and he was understood to be an advanced Rationalist. "There are," he wrote, "a score of great religions in the world, and each is a mighty fortress of graft" (*Upton Sinclair's Magazine*, April, 1918). This is the theme of his *Profits of Religion* (1919). His entry into politics, in California, led to a modification of his language, as the Christians violently assailed him, and he began to use Theistic language (*What God Means to Me*) and took up Christian Science. His finest work was over by this time.

Sky Gods. The high prestige of Frazer's *Golden Bough* leads many to observe that the "solar myth" is, literally, a myth of the last century: that the cult of a vegetation—or fertility—deity has entirely replaced the sun- or sky-god in the evolution of religion. The article on "Sky Gods" by Prof. Foucart, in the authoritative *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics*, contends, on the contrary, that the cult of a sky-god is at the base of most religions of the Mediterranean region, Asia, and America, and many others; that, in short, he "reigned everywhere." When man reached the stage of conceiving nature religions, the sun or sky generally (the source of rain, thunder, etc., as well as heat) must have had a large share of his attention. Sometimes the deity was at first sexless, but always tended to be or become male. Very often in the course of time, and in the adjustment of rival cults, the sky god was married to the earth-goddess (like Zeus and Gaia, in Greek mythology). In the whole of the Aryan group of peoples the chief deity is a sky-god, like Horus in Egypt. In civilized times the

idea of a sexual ethic was associated with the sky-god, especially the Ahura Mazda of the Persians, and militated against the prevailing phallic cults of the earth-goddess. [See **Sex and Religion.**] The Christian "Our Father which art in Heaven" is the lineal descendant of the Aryan Zeus, Jupiter ("Sky Father"), Dyaus, etc.

Slavery. The pretty phrase that Christianity "broke the fetters of the slave" is so persistently repeated by apologists and echoed in general literature that even H. G. Wells incautiously admitted it in the first edition of his *Outline of History*, withdrawing it at once when the present writer drew his attention to it. The statement is one of the many claims that are in complete contradiction to the historical facts as they are given in any classical dictionary or special study of the subject. The only ground for making it is that the new religion taught the brotherhood of man under the fatherhood of God; but neither Jesus nor Paul nor any Father of the Church, though slavery was the greatest evil of the Roman world, ever pointed out that this principle made slavery a crime, and the Church never condemned slavery until the rising tide of abolitionist sentiment in modern times compelled it to recognize this elementary principle of social ethics. St. Augustine, the most influential of the Fathers, and the oracle of Europe for more than a thousand years, expressly defended slavery as a divinely ordered social arrangement, and there is nothing in the writings of the other Fathers to suggest that he differed from them. In his greatest work, *The City of God* (Book XIX, Ch. XV), we have the only reference to the justice or injustice of slavery in the whole of patristic literature, and Augustine says that it is "no crime in the eyes of God," who has ordained it as part of the punishment of sin. This is entirely ignored in the special apologetic work, *Christianity and Slavery* (1919), written by A. H. Tabrum for the Christian Evidence Society, and all other apologetic works. They quote, instead, a work by Gregory of Nyssa, whereas the Benedictine (Migne) editors of the works of the Fathers, who publish it, expressly warn the reader that it is

spurious, and it is probably an attack on the rich for the possession of slaves by an obscure ex-slave monk. The only other authority they quote is a "St. Theodore"—apparently an abbot in a suburb of Constantinople—but they give no reference, and the Migne edition of his writings seems to contain no such condemnation. We have to agree with the Protestant historian, Dr. E. Reich (*The History of Civilization*, 1908), that "slavery in the Roman Empire was mitigated by the noble philosophy of the Stoics and not by the teaching of the Church Fathers, who never thought of recommending the abolition of slavery" (p. 421). Lecky, who as usual does the best he can for Christianity in his *History of European Morals*, can quote no word of condemnation, and in regard to mitigation he quotes more pagans than Christians. The Positivist Ingram (*History of Slavery and Serfdom*, 1895) entirely agrees, and it is the same in the article by the Rev. Dr. Agate in the *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics*, probably the most candid treatment of the subject by an apologist. With the later or mediæval stage we shall deal presently.

On the strength of their claim that the Church made an end of slavery the apologists exaggerate the evil. We are not here concerned with slavery under the Republic or in any part of the Greek-Roman world or elsewhere before the fourth century. In Greece it was never very onerous or excessive. It was different in Rome because the aggressive wars against the Teutons and Slavs brought immense armies of captives—one frontier-war made 100,000 captives—and it was in early Rome considered an advance in civilization to enslave instead of killing them, as had been done in earlier times—to say nothing of the consecration in the Old Testament of the barbaric custom of killing all and the practices of mediæval armies, which habitually raped women and killed non-combatant males. In the last centuries of the Republic the slaves were probably twice as numerous as free workers. Older estimates, one of which said thirty to one, are rejected by modern authorities, the best of whom is R. H. Barrow (*Slavery in the Roman*

Empire, 1928), who gives the conclusion of the others. These agree that by the end of the third century of the Christian era there were in Rome and Italy about three free workers to one slave. The slave-making wars were long over, the slaves were now, in large numbers, able to save money and purchase freedom (or get it in wills), and very many owners found free labour more profitable than the sullen slave. A second grave exaggeration of these writers, who paint the evil with broad strokes of the brush because they are going to say that the Church made an end of it, is in regard to cruelty. There was still a very large amount of cruelty in the first half of the first century of the new era, and the amount of slavery was lamentable; yet the Christian writers who, from Paul onward, lashed the "vices" of the pagans had not a word to say about slavery. The apologist finds two excuses. The first is that the condemnation of it was implicit in their teaching—which would have surprised Augustine and the mediæval schoolmen, headed by Aquinas, who followed him and defended it. The second is almost too ludicrous to mention—that they hesitated to wreck the economic frame of the Roman Empire by condemning it! When the apologists further plead that Paul sent greetings to slaves, and urged kindly treatment of them, they seem to be unaware that this was the common attitude of the pagan moralists to it is, tole had urged humane treat "re-Zeno included slaves in his princip, and all men were born equal: and Epic'en, was "conspicuous amongst Græc philosophers for his kindness to slaves" (Lecky, I, 129). Diogenes Laertius (*On the Lives of the Philosophers*) tells us how Epicurus welcomed slaves to his table, and it seems to have been the Epicurean Hegesias who first condemned slavery in principle. Seneca repeatedly urges kindness to slaves, repeating, from Epicurus, that they are "friends in a lowly condition"; and it is hardly necessary to speak of the ex-slave Epictetus. It was a common principle of the Stoic-Epicurean philosophy, which was generally accepted by the Romans, and by the year 100 it found a magnificent expression in two

of the orations of Dio Chrysostom [see], who condemned slavery root and branch. While apologists talk of St. Paul or Tertullian fearing to wreck the frame of the Roman Empire, to which they were as indifferent as Simeon Stylites, this pagan friend of the great Emperor and idol of the educated and wealthy class of Rome sternly denounced slavery in two successive orations (XIV and XV) which were delivered to a fashionable audience in the heart of Rome. His language is noble in comparison with Augustine's miserable sophistry, and it may now be read in an English translation (by D. C. and J. W. Cohan, 1932); though Tabrum says we have only one sentence of Dio's discourses!

It was, as Reich says, this widespread pagan sentiment that mitigated the condition of the slave. As early as 82 B.C. the Cornelian Law abrogated the right of the master to kill an offending slave. In 32 B.C. the Petronian Law forbade masters to compel slaves to fight in the arena. Claudius enacted that a master was guilty of murder if he neglected, with fatal effect, the treatment of a sick slave, and that if such a slave recovered at the temple of Æsculapius he should be free (Suetonius, "Claudius," XXV). Seneca induced Nero, in his earlier years, to grant the slave an appeal to the courts against cruelty. Hadrian—the wicked Epicurean of Christian writers—renewed the law against killing slaves or selling them for the Amphitheatre, restricted the torture of slaves suspected of the murder of masters, suppressed the underground dens for housing slaves, appointed officers everywhere to investigate cases of cruelty, and exiled for five years a rich lady who was cruel to her slaves. Long before that date, Seneca tells us (*De Clementia*, I, 18), masters who were cruel to slaves were insulted in the streets, and the slaves generally "corresponded to our free labouring class," as Sir S. Dill says in his *Roman Society from Nero to Marcus Aurelius* (1904, p. 18). The Stoic lawyer, Ulpian, was allowed, even under the vicious Caracalla, to make it illegal for parents to sell their children into slavery; and the last great pagan Emperor, Diocletian, forbade a man to

sell himself into slavery or a creditor to enslave his debtor. These laws and the references to them may be found in Smith's or Pauly's classical dictionaries, or the works of Ingram (who also writes the article in the *Encyclopædia Britannica*), Dill, Lecky, Letourneau, etc., or the article in the *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics*. In the same sources will be found the account of the complete failure to help the slaves of the dozen Christian Emperors to the fall of Rome. Constantine's legislation was reactionary; and while Gratian is credited with ordering the freedom of slaves who gave information about "certain capital offences" of their masters, the truth is that he so rewarded informers about plots against *himself*, but ordered that they be burned alive—a new reactionary measure—for bringing other charges. Theodosius made no new law in regard to slavery, and Justinian did not, as apologists say, order the Christian marriage of slaves, for, as Dean Milman shows, their coupling (*contubernium*) was not recognized by the Church; and this, be it noted, was 150 years after the conversion of Constantine.

By this time the old system of slavery had broken down in Europe with the fall and impoverishment of the Empire; but the new type of slavery, serfdom [see], which was worse than the lot of the slaves had been in the fourth century, now extended to the overwhelming majority of the workers, and large numbers were still torn from their countries and bought and sold like cattle. The Church not only still failed to condemn, but continued to use, the word "slaves" (*servi*) and treat the whole body with disdain. Leo I forbade their admission into the clergy "because of the vileness of their condition." This is astutely rendered by some apologists "the lowliness of their condition," but Leo expressly says that their *vilitas* would "pollute" the sacred order; and Gregory I renewed this, and repeated also the Church's stern prohibition of a slave to marry a free woman (App. VII, I). Ingram here finds at last a Christian declaration that slavery is "unnatural"—not, be it noted, immoral or unchristian—but

the letter of Gregory (VI, 12), which he has hastily read, is merely a pleasant greeting to two ex-slaves from whom the Church expects money. Gregory, for the Papacy, had as many slaves as one of the great slave-holding patricians of the worst Roman days, for he had more than 1,500 square miles of estates which were cultivated by slaves. Muratori, a learned Catholic archæologist, shows (*Dissertations*, XV) that local churches and abbeys had a very high proportion of the remaining slaves (four-fifths of the population) of Europe, so that what had really happened was that the Church, which is supposed to have broken the fetters of the slave, had in fact rivetted those fetters on an enormously larger proportion of the people than had borne them in the fourth century. The desperate apologist then pleads that at least the British St. Wulfstan suppressed slavery in England (where it was, says Traill's *Social England*, I, 296, "the chief trade of all"), but the full account in Freeman's *Norman Conquest* (IV, 386) shows that Bishop Wulfstan, who was merely concerned because Christian slaves were sold to the pagan Danes, did not suppress the traffic. Apart from villains, there were 25,000 slaves in England at the time of the compiling of Domesday Book (Vinogradoff). About the same period we have the testimony of the Italian Bishop Liutprand (*Antapodosis*, V. 1, 6) that the French—some historians say the monks—sold Christian youths, sometimes first castrating them, into slavery to the Arabs. So the ghastly story continued. The rise of the Normans made matters worse. Freeman says that "the blackest and saddest result of the Norman Conquest" was that the new masters of England, "in their contempt for the people, suppressed the distinction of slave and serf and lowered the condition of all."

The general idea that slavery ended, from whatever cause, after the fall of Rome, and was then unknown until Black Slavery was introduced in modern times is entirely false. We have here, on the contrary, says the Rev. Dr. Agate in the *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics*, "one of the most remarkable and deplorable instances of historical

continuity." The Church, now strengthened by the casuistry of Aquinas, still refrained from any condemnation, but new historical developments caused a diversion of the traffic in human flesh from Europe to Africa and America. The Italians had continued a brisk trade in slaves with the East, but the Turks now advanced and ruined it. This is another instance of economic conditions effecting a change for which the moralist would later claim the credit. By this time the Arabs of Spain had explored the west coast of Africa, and, while they themselves had had comparatively few slaves, the Spanish and Portuguese Christians, who took over their civilization just about the time when the route to the East was closed, were less humane; and just at that time, the end of the fifteenth century, they captured America. It is estimated that in the next three centuries they, and the French and English, tore 9,000,000 Africans from their homes and shipped them, in the most repulsive conditions, vast numbers dying on the voyage, to America. It was, says the apologist Brace, "the most dreadful curse that has perhaps afflicted humanity" (*Gesta Christi*, 4th ed., 1885, p. 365). The evidence for the guilt of introducing it and the merit of abolishing it lies nearer to our own times, and the contortions of apologists are amazing. One of the most respectable, Canon Streeter, finds the abolition of slavery "the one glaring exception" to the general supine indifference of religion to reform, while Brace says that "the guilt of this great crime rests upon the Christian Church as an organized body" (reference above). It is the same with the initiation of the trade. It is usual to blame this upon Bishop Bartolomé de las Casas, and Tabrum, for the Christian Evidence Society, protests that Fiske has shown, in his *Discovery of America*, that this is a "gross historical blunder." What Fiske, like every other impartial historian, tells is that Las Casas, who certainly did not like slavery, found that the Spaniards made the Indians hostile to Christianity by virtually enslaving them, and concluded that if there had to be choice between the two kinds of slavery,

Indian or African, the latter—especially as the blacks could be made Christians—was to be preferred. He submitted this to Church and State in Spain, and the theologians concurred that the Church did not condemn slavery. Whatever measure of influence we ascribe to Las Casas, the plan was adopted, and the Churches of Spain, Portugal, France, England, and the American colonies, blessed the hideous traffic. The English Parliament authorized it in 1708, and the most famous trader, Sir John Hawkins, who was so pious that he gave such names as "Jesus" to his ships, was knighted for his success. The Society for the Propagation of the Gospel employed slaves on its estates in the West Indies, and there were 80,000 black slaves in London as late as 1760 (*Independent Review*, October 1905). The American Churches, Anglican, Methodist, and Baptist, owned 600,000 slaves, and "the authority of nearly all the leading denominations was against the abolitionists," says J. Macy in the chief and impartial recent American work (*The Anti-Slavery Crusade*, 1920, p. 74). The Methodist, Baptist, and Presbyterian authorities, he shows, expelled any minister who advocated abolition. It was the Deists Franklin and Paine, inspired by the "infidel" literature of France, who initiated the protest—the first shot was Paine's *African Slavery in America* (1775)—and the effective Abolitionist movement in the nineteenth century was led by Rationalists [see Garrison; Lincoln; etc.] In England, Locke [see] first attacked slavery (in his *Treatise on Civil Government*, 1689), calling it a "vile and miserable estate of man." The Church still remained silent—Tabrum sophistically quotes clerics, whose protest was against the cruelties practised in the trade—while the Deistic and Atheistic protest in France gathered strength and was echoed in England (Pope, Adam Smith, etc.). The standard authority on the English movement is the *History of the Progress and Accomplishment of the Abolition of the African Slave Trade* (2 vols., 1808) of T. Clarkson, who, with Wilberforce, organized the first committee. It does not tell that Wilberforce [see] derived the idea

from Rationalist literature in his sceptical youth, or that Clarkson was inspired by the Quakers. It is enough here to say that a few clergymen, out of the many thousands, joined the movement, but it was powerless until it was taken up by the great Rationalists, Fox and Pitt, in the Government, and by Bentham in the country. The Churches, with the story of three centuries of barbarism unfolded before them, were still dumb, and one has the usual difficulty, of understanding the mentality of Christian writers who *boast* that a dozen ministers, out of the tens of thousands who had seen the horrors of slavery, concluded that it was not in accord with Christian principles.

Smith, Adam, F.R.S. (1723–90), Scottish economist. He adopted Hume's philosophy in student days (Glasgow and Oxford Universities), and refused to enter the Scottish ministry, as was required by an exhibition he had won. He became professor of logic, later of moral philosophy, at Glasgow University, was a close friend of Hume and Lord Kames [see], and startled the orthodox by his *Theory of the Moral Sentiments* (1759) on naturalist lines. He next took up political economy, and wrote the famous *Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations* (2 vols., 1776), which entitles him to be called "the father of British political economy." A sympathetic study of Hume brought such an outcry from the clergy that Smith became nervous, and before he died he burned sixteen volumes of his manuscripts; but no one questions that he was at the most a Deist (*Dictionary of National Biography*), and he was so close to Hume that he was probably Agnostic. Chalmers's *Biographical Dictionary* complained that the life of Smith by Dugald Stewart contained no reference to his "infidelity."

Smith, Gerrit (1797–1874), American philanthropist. An American lawyer who entered politics and has the rare distinction of withdrawing at once when he discovered the corruption in that field. He had inherited a fortune, and, like other Rationalist millionaires (Girard, Carnegie, Fels, Lick, etc.), he was eminent in philanthropy. It is esti-

mated that he gave away about £8,000,000 to families or individuals in distress, and he worked personally in the Abolitionist and other reform movements. He was a Theist, but "so strongly opposed to the Churches," says his biographer, O. B. Frothingham, that he tried to found a Theistic Ethical Church.

Smith, Sir Grafton Elliot, M.D., F.R.S. (1871-1937), anatomist. An Australian by birth, and a graduate of Sydney University, he came to England and was appointed demonstrator of anatomy at Cambridge University. After holding several other appointments, he was professor of anatomy at London University 1919-36, and one of the most distinguished anatomists in the country. It is said of him that he was so thorough that he examined 20,000 bodies in Egypt. His command of the anatomy of the brain makes his work on evolution (*The Evolution of Man*, 1924, etc.), which is materialistic, particularly valuable. He was an Agnostic and an Honorary Associate of the R.P.A.

Smith, Thomas Southwood, M.D., F.R.C.P. (1788-1861), physician and reformer. A Nonconformist minister who abandoned Christianity, took up medicine, and was physician to the London Fever Hospital and very prominent in medical and social reform. He was one of the founders of the Health of Towns Association and the Metropolitan Association for Improving the Dwellings of the Working Classes. Munk's *Roll of the Royal College of Physicians* says: "It has fallen to the lot of few to accomplish such extensive services for the public benefit as were rendered by Dr. S. Smith" (III, 236). He was Bentham's physician and warm friend, and he shows, in the speech he made when he dissected Bentham's body (as directed in his will in the interest of science), that he shared his Atheistic humanitarianism.

Smith, Prof. William Benjamin, A.M., Ph.D. (1850-1934), American mathematician. After teaching mathematics or physics at various universities, he became professor of philosophy at Tulane, and published several works (*Der vorchristliche Jesus*, 1906, *Ecce Deus*, 1912, etc.) denying the historicity of Jesus [see].

Smith, Prof. William Robertson, M.A., LL.D., D.D. (1846-94), Orientalist. Biblical writers generally give the impression that he was an orthodox liberal divine; but he was deposed from his chair at the Free Church College at Aberdeen, and from the ministry, for his articles on the Old Testament in the *Encyclopædia Britannica* (1881). A few years later he was appointed professor of Arabic at Cambridge. His articles and works (*Prophets of Israel*, 1882, *The Religion of the Semites*, 1889, etc.) show that he rejected supernaturalism and was merely a Theist. He was a commanding figure in his own field of research.

Snell, Henry, first Baron Snell of Plumstead, P.C., C.B.E., LL.D. (1865-1944), politician. After a slight education in the village school he started work on a farm at the age of nine. He in later years had a course at Heidelberg University. Settling in Nottingham where he was secretary of the Secular Society, and then London, he took up work in the Fabian and the Ethical Movements, and in 1922 he entered Parliament as Labour Member for Woolwich. He was for some years Chairman of the London County Council and Deputy-Leader of the Labour Party in the House of Lords. Snell was an Agnostic, and was for some time President of the R.P.A. See his *Men, Movements, and Myself* (1936).

Snolksky, Count Karl Johan Gustav (1841-1903), Swedish poet. A diplomat who devoted himself to letters after retiring, and wrote a good deal of poetry of distinction. He translated Goethe's ballads into Swedish, and followed the German poet's Pantheistic philosophy, as he often expresses in his verse (*Samlade Dikter*, 5 vols., 1803-4).

Snyder, Carl (b. 1869), American writer. A journalist who specialized in presenting scientific discoveries and won a high reputation by his articles and books (*New Conceptions in Science*, 1903, *The World Machine*, 1907, etc.). In the former he ventures to say that "the influence of the Christian Church was evil, incomparably evil" (p. 27).

Social Progress. The idea of progress is discussed under that title, and the charge that scepticism retards or destroys

it is treated under **Scepticism and Social Progress**. That Christianity has done far more to hinder than to promote it is shown in a large number of articles. For titles see **Christianity**; **Dark Age**; **Middle Age**; etc. It is now generally recognized that the chief stimulus to social progress is the friendly contact and interchange of ideas between men of different cultures or opinions. Since religion always aims at securing uniformity by, wherever possible, stifling freedom of discussion, it weakens the springs of progress.

Social Psychology. The only true "revolution" in science in the present century is the exclusion of the ideas of "soul" and "mind" from psychology, the general agreement that the proper subject of the science is the behaviour of the human organism, the establishment of social psychology to study the determining causes of this behaviour, and the discovery in this science that there is no such thing as an unchanging or very slowly changing "human nature." While psychology [see] itself is largely paralysed by fundamental divergences, the authorities on social psychology in the last ten years (Professors Folsom, Bogardus, Park, Burgess, Krueger, Reckless, Ewer, etc.) are broadly agreed that the behaviour of the individual is determined by his social environment: parents, home, school, playmates, books, cinemas, theatres, periodical literature, churches, clubs, lectures, etc. These create the "sets" or attitudes to problems and practical affairs upon which the individual acts. Society creates man; or, as Prof. J. Dewey sums up the science, what is commonly called human nature is "a product of social experience." A striking confirmation is found in the phenomena of identical twins [see], or pairs of children which are exactly alike in features and behaviour after birth and begin to differ from each other only under the influence of environment. A larger and weightier confirmation is given by modern experience. Four nations have been remarkably transformed in character—the Russians from a poor general level to a much higher type, the Germans, Italians, and Japanese to a lower type—in half a generation by

complete governmental control of the educational environment. In the case of Germany, where the monopoly of the means of forming opinions and character was most rigorous, the poisoning of the character of tens of millions is most marked. The new science is usually said to have begun at the close of the last century with such works as Le Bon's *Psychology of the Crowd* (1895). These were anti-democratic rather than scientific works, and aimed at showing that the crowd or "herd" is fickle, imitative, and shallow. The influence of the Behaviourist School, converting psychology into the science of behaviour, led to a deeper study and the founding of the new branch of psychology. Its importance can hardly be exaggerated. It not only makes an end of the practice of assigning a peculiar "racial psychology" or "genius" to each nation, which did much to promote misunderstanding and war, but it discredits the dreary saying that "you can't change human nature," and opens out a most hopeful prospect for scientific education (in the broadest sense). The authorities, perhaps, overlook the question of the hereditary outfit of nerve and endocrinal glands, our power to correct which is still not clear; but the science relieves us both of the theological obstruction and of the genetic or eugenic Calvinism of twenty years ago. In spite of its importance, there is no manual of the science published in England, where the few books on "social psychology" deal rather with the psychology of social institutions. The new science studies the individual as shaped by social influences. See Prof. E. Bogardus, *Fundamentals of Social Psychology* (1931), and Prof. J. K. Folsom, *Social Psychology* (1931).

Socialism and Religion. In its first loose, or Owenite, form, Socialism (voluntary social co-operation, not State-Socialism) was definitely associated with Rationalism or Owen's Rational Religion. Modern Socialism was from the start Atheistic, because it was founded by Marx and Engels at a time when the Churches co-operated intimately with the monarchies and bureaucracies everywhere in the brutal system of oppression which cost the

lives of hundreds of thousands of unarmed people of very moderate aspirations. [See Democracy.] History is now taught with such untruthful partiality that few realize that the words of the Socialist hymn, "The people's flag . . . shrouded oft our martyred dead" contain a grim historical truth. The Lutheran and Catholic Churches then co-operated in Germany with Bismarck in a severe, if generally unbloody, attempt to suppress Social Democracy. The Russian Church was the close ally of Tsardom in its appalling outrages until 1917. The Vatican repeatedly condemned Socialism in principle, asserting that it was immoral to attack private ownership, and fought the growing organization in every country in which it had power. In Austria and Italy it encouraged the compromise known as Christian Socialism [see], except when its leaders, as happened in Italy, began to approach genuine Socialist principles. The natural result was that all Socialist leaders on the Continent continued to be Atheists, and pledged their organizations to hostility to religion. In 1907 the chief leader in Italy, Enrico Ferri, wrote to the present writer that Italian Socialists "rejected every religion under the sun." In Spain and Spanish America recent experience has shown that the Church has never surrendered its policy of truculent hostility, and the attitude of the "Reds" is easily understood. In Great Britain the slow growth of the party led Keir Hardie (of Atheist parents) to disclaim opposition to the Churches, and MacDonald (an Agnostic when he was associated with the present writer in the Ethical Movement 1900-5) went farther. The German Social Democrats in turn felt that it would promote their growth if they abandoned the official attitude of Atheism, and they did so. In Great Britain and the United States, where there has been no persecution in alliance with the Churches, where the members of the various Socialist bodies know nothing about the fierce nineteenth-century struggle, and where the Catholic clergy are reticent about Rome's insistence that to attack private ownership is immoral, Socialism has no attitude to religion. Elsewhere Socialists, as a body, remained Atheists

until their virtual extinction in recent years, and the action of the Catholic Church in supporting that extinction seems likely to have a violent reaction when freedom is restored. The claim of some, both Socialists and Catholics, that the Church never condemned Socialism is false. As late as 1931 the Pope laid it down emphatically, in his Encyclical *Quadragesimo Anno*, that "no good Catholic can be a Socialist in the true sense." English Catholic authorities refused to provide a translation of this Encyclical, which is expressly Fascist.

Socinus, Laelius (1525-62), reformer. An Italian scholar—his name, which was Latinized in the fashion of the time, was Lelio Fausto Sozzini—master of Greek, Hebrew, and Arabic, who, when the principles of the Reformation reached Italy, got together a group for secret critical discussions. It was discovered and scattered by imprisonment or death. Lelio's nephew, **Faustus Socinus (1539-1604)**, who adopted his uncle's Unitarian views, founded what is known as Socinianism (later Unitarianism). He denied the divinity of Christ and the supernatural character of Christianity. He travelled over half of Europe teaching his creed, and was bitterly persecuted everywhere.

Socrates (469-399 B.C.). An Athenian sculptor who in middle life devoted himself to philosophy and ethics. He conceived that he had a religious mission under the direction of some sort of spirit. He wrote nothing, and Plato, from whom chiefly (and Xenophon) we learn his views, may have considerably Platonized them. Socrates was chiefly concerned about the nature of morality (not sexual), but on the religious side he prepared the way for the spiritual monotheism of Plato. The *Nous* (a material cosmic mind) of Anaxagoras [see] was converted by him into a spiritual and beneficent Creator, as proved by evidence of design or intelligence in nature. He was arrested on a ridiculous charge of corrupting youth and compelled to take his life. Bury has pointed out that the real reason was his association, through Pericles and his group, with the cultured anti-democrats.

Soddy, Prof. Frederick, M.A., LL.D., F.R.S. (b. 1877), chemist, Nobel Prize winner. Taught, in succession, at McGill, Glasgow, Aberdeen, and Oxford Universities. He received the Nobel Prize, in 1921, for chemical research, having been one of the chief collaborators of Rutherford in the radioactive field and the discoverer of several isotopes. Many other academic distinctions were conferred on him. Soddy is a well-known social idealist, as well as one of the most distinguished of chemists, and an outspoken Rationalist. In *Science and Life* (1920) he observes that "the ancient creeds are working an infinitude of harm in the world," and people must openly confess their disbelief in them (p. 174). He admits a vaguely defined God, but not a Creator. The world is eternal, and "the task of controlling it is man's not God's" (p. 173).

Solar Mythology. [See Sky Gods.]

Somerset, The Duke of. [See Seymour, E. A.]

Somerville, Mary (1780-1872), educationist. Daughter of Vice-Admiral Sir W. G. Fairfax, and remarkable for her command of mathematics and science in her youth, she became one of the most distinguished and most accomplished women of her time. Her home, after marriage to Dr. Somerville, was a favourite resort of statesmen and men of science. Her writings on astronomy were so esteemed—she first suggested that the perturbations of Uranus were due to an outer planet—that the Royal Society placed in its hall a bust of her by Chantrey; and she had the Gold Medals of the Geographical Society and the Italian Royal Geographical Society. Somerville Hall and the Mary Somerville Scholarship at Oxford perpetuate her memory. In her *Personal Recollections* (1873) she tells us that she was once "publicly censured by name from the pulpit of York Cathedral," and she had rejected Christianity early in life (pp. 374-6).

Song of the Harper, The. A song which was sung, to the accompaniment of the harp, at Egyptian dinners or banquets. Various versions of the song, which had immense popularity in ancient Egypt, have been recovered, and

it is one of the features which show the error of the old idea that the people were particularly solemn and religious. We now know that these middle-class evening meals were very gay, with dancing girls and perfumed oil in the lamps, and drink flowed freely. The song [see *Egypt, Scepticism in Ancient, and Mummy at the Feast*] urged the diners to eat and drink and be merry ("Follow thy desire while thou livest"), for to-morrow they would die, and it was openly sceptical about a life after death. Had any man, it asked, ever come back to tell them what it was like? Prof. W. M. Müller, who has an excellent study of the song in his *Liebespoesie der alten Ägypten* (1899), says that the priests repeatedly tried to suppress it because of its "atheistic joy in life"; but it had a wide popularity from about 2300 B.C. onward. Breasted has a translation of it in his *Development of Religion and Thought in Ancient Egypt* (1912).

Song of Solomon, The. One of the most incongruous books of the Old Testament. Although it is discreetly translated from the Hebrew, Catholic Biblical writers have to strain the language desperately in their representation of it as an inspired forecast of the marriage of Christ and his Church. A few scholars regard it as celebrating the marriage of the sun-god and the moon-goddess. Most Egyptologists consider it simply a collection of Egyptian wedding-songs, which were very candid, and the reader will have little doubt of this. Four-fifths of the members of the Churches regard it as the Word of God, like the ravings of Amos and Hosea.

Sons of God. When tribes or petty principalities were welded into kingdoms, as in the case of Egypt, the interests of rival priesthoods were adjusted by inventing family relationships of their deities. Horus was the son of Osiris, Dionysos of Zeus, Attis of Cybele, and so on. Daughters of God were just as numerous. At a higher level of religion, Sons of God were, as in the Old Testament, men with a special moral relation to God, their Father. In the mystic movement of the last centuries of the pre-Christian world

the Logos [see] was the Son of God, and the title was adopted for Jesus.

Sophists, The. Professional teachers of philosophy, or wisdom (*sophia*), in ancient Greece. The word had at the time no suggestion of its modern meaning. "So far were they," Benn says, "from teaching immoral doctrines that their object was to put morality on a new and stronger foundation" (*History of Ancient Philosophy*, 1912, p. 42). Philosophy—one might almost translate it "knowledge," as it was then conceived—was very much sought in the Greek cities, and the teachers were numerous, well paid, and greatly honoured. The abler men among them were naturally led into scepticism by their inquiry into the foundations of knowledge, and they founded the schools to which the name Sophist now applies. "Agnostic" (in Huxley's sense) would better describe them. Such schools were founded by Protagoras [see] and Gorgias in the fifth century, before the time of Plato and Aristotle. The failure of the latter thinkers to get any large following, even in Athens, led to the appearance of new sceptical schools in the third and second centuries under Arcesilaus and Carneades.

Soul, The. The word adopted by the Teutonic peoples (*Seele* in German) for what the Latins called *anima* and the Greeks *psyche*. Mystics distinguished it from the spirit, and the Schoolmen, distorting the teaching of Aristotle in their usual way, held that there were three kinds of souls: the vegetative (held to be proved by cases of growth of a man's beard after death), the animal, and the human or intellectual. Usually the word was, until recent developments, taken as synonymous with mind, and there were weird speculations as to whether it occupied the whole of the body or some part of it. Descartes, who denied that there was an animal soul, located man's soul in the pineal body. The word disappeared from psychology in the nineteenth century, and is now a theological term. The only real interest in it is whether there is any evidence of immortality [see], which even Christian writers begin to question.

Soury, Prof. Jules Auguste, D.-ès-L. (1842-1906), French psychologist. Pro-

fessor at Paris University, who had studied Hebrew under Renan and adopted his Rationalism. He differed from Renan in regarding Jesus as a man of unbalanced mind (*Jésus et les évangiles*, 1878). Soury was one of the highest authorities on medical psychology in France, and his *Système nerveux central* (1899) was crowned by the Academy of Science. He confesses Agnosticism in his *Bréviaire de l'histoire du matérialisme* (1880).

Space and Time. The Relativist identification of time as a fourth dimension of matter removes any excuse for regarding space and time as something distinct from matter. In Greek philosophy they were usually identified with it, or considered to be measurements of bodies and their movements, though Democritus and Epicurus distinguished atoms from the "void" in which they moved. The Schoolmen, however, followed the majority of Greek philosophers on this point. Newton introduced some confusion by treating space and time as separable from matter. Kant, accepting this view, declared them to be subjective forms of perception, and so made confusion worse confounded. The common definition of matter as "occupying space," in popular manuals of science, may have misled many into imagining space as something that might exist before or apart from bodies, but there is no ambiguity in science. Space and time are measurements or concepts: the reality is matter in movement. In making time and space essential to the concept of matter, Relativity really discredited all the nonsense that was written about Materialism and the New Physics. If space and time are of the essence of matter, everything that is measurable or has space and time aspects is material. [See Atoms and Materialism.]

Spain, Religion in. Three untruthful statements in connection with recent events in Spain have been put into circulation by Catholic writers. The first is that Catholic monarchs made Spain a great country when they delivered it from the Moors, and may be trusted to restore its greatness. The second is that the great majority of the people are devoted to the Church and welcome the

Franco regime. The third is that outrages were introduced into Spanish life by the "enemies of religion." The first statement is opposed to the facts as given in any authoritative history, and must here be dismissed briefly. Not only did the Catholic monarchs of the Middle Ages, who were quite generally corrupt and worthless, have to attract (by the promise of loot) very large bodies of foreign knights and soldiers to help them to evict the Arabs, but the civilization which they completely destroyed was far larger, richer, and more enlightened than Spain is to-day. [See *Arabs*.] In the fifteenth century the last area of it, the Kingdom of Granada, was got by trickery as much as by war (Ferdinand II). To the wealth thus acquired was soon added the wealth of America, yet, while this was just the period of general European advance, the Catholic monarchs within one century brought complete ruin upon the country. In the year 1000 Arab Spain—the half of the Peninsula which they occupied—had had a population of 30,000,000 very prosperous, happy, tolerant, and enlightened people. In the seventeenth century the entire country had only about 6,500,000 people, and they were among the poorest, most intolerant and ignorant in Europe (*Cambridge Modern History*). These undisputed historical facts were made widely known by the Liberal writers of the late eighteenth and the nineteenth centuries, and revolt against the Church spread. The monarchy—and again most of the monarchs of the Bourbon dynasty were among the most corrupt in Europe—was in intimate alliance with the Church, except during the Carlist War; yet every single monarch of that dynasty in the last hundred years except Alfonso XII, who died prematurely, was ignominiously driven out of the country by the people, and at each revolution the workers were with difficulty checked in burning churches and convents. It is enough here to give the figures for the last free period. After the expulsion of Alfonso XIII, in 1931, the hierarchy urged the people, in lurid language, to vote against "the enemies of Jesus Christ" at the next election, for it was freely announced that the Liberal-

Socialist alliance would disestablish the rich and very corrupt Church. Yet the Liberal-Socialists won 315 seats to 121 and two-thirds of the votes in the cities. The country still supported the Government when it passed measure after measure against the Church; but the Catholics now organized, the Liberals and Socialists split (and the Anarchists and Communists opposed both), and in the 1934 election the Catholic Right polled 4,750,000 votes and the supporters of the Government 4,356,000. This was hailed in the British Press as proof that the country had changed or had proved itself Catholic, and not a single writer warned the public that there were about 3,000,000 Anarchists and Communists (all Atheists) who had refrained from voting, or that it was the generous extension of the franchise to women by the Socialists that had made the difference in the Catholic vote. In fact, if we add the vote (340,000) of the Liberals, who had sulked in their tents, but were all opposed to the Church, to that of the Government supporters, we see that even now, when the economic quarrel gravely complicated the issue, the majority were against the Church. Add 3,000,000 non-voters—the total electorate was 12,548,499—and we find that only a little more than a third voted for the Church, in spite of the frenzied appeals of the clergy. So the Pope, Italy, and Germany organized the Catholic rebellion. Our conclusion is sufficiently confirmed by the Jesuit Father Gannon, who (*Irish Times*, January 23, 1937) estimated the number of Catholics as "ten or fifteen million." If we take the average of his very loose figures, we get about 12,000,000 Catholics in a total population of 29,000,000, which is a maximum. The third statement—that violence was introduced by "the Reds"—is still more amazingly opposed to the admitted facts. These are that from 1812 to 1931 there were nine revolutions. Six of these were won—nearly all without war—by the anti-clericals, and the defeated clerical-royalists were treated very humanely. Three revolts were won by the Right, and they were followed by incredible official outrages in which the Church egged on the royalists. As

these are fully described in the *Cambridge Modern History* (Vol. XI) and Major Hume's *Modern Spain* (Story of the Nations Series), there is no need to go into detail. From 1814 onward the "gentlemen" and priests of Spain are shown in these authoritative manuals to have perpetrated horrible brutalities on their opponents, causing the death of at least 50,000 men, women, and children in the nineteenth century, and it was only after a century of this that some sections of the popular party, chiefly the Anarchists—the Communists were one of the smallest parties and not violent—retaliated in kind. For a popular account of events from 1812 to 1931, see McCabe's *Spain in Revolt* (1931); for the corruption of the Church and the brutality under Alfonso XIII, see his *Martyrdom of Ferrer* (1909); and, for the recent period, *The Papacy in Modern Politics* (cheap ed., 1939).

Spanish America, Religion in. Special articles [Argentina; Brazil; Chile; Mexico; etc.] discuss the present state of religion in the chief Republics. Two points have to be emphasized for the general understanding of the situation in Latin America. One is that the tens of millions of Indians are still almost entirely illiterate and exploited by the clergy, so that a reactionary minority can get power by enlisting large bodies of them. The second point is that the historic struggle of the Blacks (clericals) and the Whites in each Republic has in the last few years been gravely complicated by the raising of the economic issue and the rapid spread of Socialism and Communism. The War of Independence (1809-23) was a struggle against the Church as well as against Spain. The clergy and monks had drifted into extraordinary corruption (*Cambridge Modern History*, X, 252, etc.; and see D. Barry, *Noticias secretas de America*, 1826, for amazing details). With the infiltration of American and French ideas, and the practice of sending sons to those countries for education at the end of the eighteenth century, a middle class that strongly resented the clerical and monastic corruption arose, led the Revolution, and in the new Republic alternated in political power with the Blacks. By the

end of the nineteenth century, Rationalism counted about 8,000,000 of the 13,000,000 educated people, the clergy basing their power upon the Conservative minority and the illiterates (mostly Indians), who were 90 per cent. of the population. The progress of Rationalism continued in the twentieth century, but there was a great extension of industry during and after the War of 1914-18, and, especially by the importation of Russian propaganda, Socialist and Communist ideas spread so rapidly that it is estimated that 20,000,000 or more were won from the Church in less than twenty years. Most of the Jews and Liberals now joined the Blacks on the politico-economic issue, and Rationalism was ruined. The present Pope, then Secretary of State, visited South America late in 1934, and, by the end of 1936, reaction was triumphant. In Brazil, particularly—the authorities till lately were more moderate in Argentina—the new clerical Fascism was merciless. Not only the "Red," but all anti-clericals, were suppressed. The *Annual Register* for that year says that there were 10,000 political prisoners in the jails of Brazil (in which Viscountess Hastings saw men who had suffered torture), and "among these were university professors and many other distinguished Brazilians belonging to the best society" (p. 312). As in Spain, the really "red" folk were the Blacks.

Species. The division of organisms into genera and species, first proposed by Linnaeus in his *Systema Naturae* (1736), is an artificial or mental distribution of them for scientific convenience. In many cases there is no agreement on the lines of demarcation of a species, some calling a particular group a variety and others a species. The distinguishing marks of many species of animals and plants are often so unimportant that they testify only to the zeal of men who are eager for the honour of having discovered a new species. The mentality of those who in our age insist on the "immutability" and creation of species because a Hebrew writer spoke of "each in its kind" 2,000 years ago is not easily understood.

Spencer, Herbert (1820-1903), philosopher. Successively a teacher, a rail-

way engineer, and a journalist, in early years, he became, in 1848, sub-editor of the *Economist* (originally a Rationalist or Owenite publication) and a close friend of Huxley, Tyndall, and George Eliot (whom, it is said, he wanted to marry). In 1851 he published *Social Statics*, and in the following year he wrote an article "The Development Hypothesis" in the *Leader* which is one of the earliest scientific statements of evolution. His *Principles of Psychology* (1855) was attacked as Atheistic, and this led him to work out his Agnostic principles and design the Synthetic Philosophy, a work comparable with that of Aristotle. He got 600 subscriptions, and *First Principles* appeared in 1862. A man of austere character and compelled by poor health (like Darwin) to follow a strict regime, he rejected all honours for his great accomplishment and was often represented as hardly human in feeling; but Duncan (*Life and Letters of Herbert Spencer*, 1908) quotes him saying: "Life is not for learning, nor is life for working, but learning and working are for life" (p. 507). His dogmatic Agnosticism, coupled with a religious attitude towards the Unknowable behind the phenomena of the material world, was in accord, like Huxley's, with the state of philosophy at that time; but the word "Agnostic" [see] is now taken, as a rule, in a less dogmatic sense.

Spinoza, Baruch or Benedict (1632-77), Jewish philosopher. Of a Portuguese Jewish family which had settled in Holland, he was educated for the office of rabbi, but was excommunicated, in 1656, for Rationalist opinions. He abandoned Judaism, changed his name from Baruch to Benedict, and supported himself by teaching and by grinding lenses, refusing offers of money and of a chair at Heidelberg and living in poverty, persecuted by both Jews and Christians. He contracted consumption, and died in great distress, but with perfect serenity. Contemporaries called him an Atheist, while later divines claim him as "the God-intoxicated Spinoza." Although he accepted Descartes' sharp definition of matter and spirit, he claimed, rather rhetorically, that they

were "attributes" of one being which he called God (Pantheism).

Spirit. A Latin word meaning, like the corresponding Greek word *pneuma*, "breath" (as in respiration). It recalls the primitive belief that a man's soul goes out with his last breath, but it was extended to immaterial beings (angels and gods) which had never been embodied. The various meanings of the word in the New Testament and Christian literature need not be discussed here, but it is now more elastic than ever. A recent writer gives seven meanings of it in current use, and it is even worse in German (*Geist*) and French (*esprit*), where the same word means "spirit" and "mind." Aristotle, while arguing that the mind could not be material, rejected the theory of Pythagoras and Plato that it was a spirit—a reality capable of existing apart from matter—but the terms were not sharply defined until Descartes, who said that matter was extended (quantitative or measurable) reality, and spirit unextended (or having no time and space relations). This is in complete accord with theological teaching, and no philosopher has yet proposed a precise alternative definition; yet there is a very mischievous confusion in modern literature, where the term "spiritual," or "spiritual realities," is used with lamentable looseness. Since the word "mind" has almost disappeared from psychology, and the old arguments for immortality are in discredit, we get vague rhetoric about the social importance of a belief in spiritual realities. As is explained under the title **Materialism**, we have here a double confusion—a confusion of Materialism in the moral and in the philosophic sense, of spirituality with idealism. What is socially important is that we shall cultivate what, for want of a better word, we still call man's mental powers—art, science, and social ideals—and it is an ambiguity of which the apologist takes advantage when he calls these spiritual realities. One should insist on writers who use the phrase defining what they mean. The greatest idealists of the ancient world, the Stoics and Epicureans, rejected the idea of spirit, and idealism, often of an excep-

tionally high character, is common to the leading Materialists included in this work.

Spiritualism. The belief that the "spirits" of the dead are in communication with the living. The correct name is "Spiritism," which the French use, because Spiritualism is the opposite of Materialism, and simply means a belief in the existence of spiritual beings, disembodied or otherwise. A supposed communication with spirits has been widely claimed in all ages, but Spiritualists explain the genesis of the modern organized movement by saying that the increasing gravity of world affairs induced the spirits to get into regular communication with the living. In point of fact it began in a childish fraud in 1848—the London Spiritualists celebrated the "seventy-second birthday" of the movement in 1920—and it has been ever since, like so many religious organizations, a "racket" in which professional mediums and organizers exploit a body of followers. Two young daughters of a farmer named Fox, at Hydesville (not far from Niagara), in a rural and very backward district of America, began to communicate with the dead by raps. A shrewd elder daughter saw the business possibilities of the excitement which was caused, and in a few years Mrs. Fox and her three daughters were plying a very comfortable trade, darkness, music, etc., being gradually added at the seances at the directions—they said—of the spirits. Thirty years later the two younger sisters publicly confessed in New York that it had been an "absolute fraud" from the beginning (report of public meeting in the *New York Herald*, September 24, 1888). The youngest gave an exhibition in the New York Academy of the way the "raps" were produced by the joints (*Herald*, October 10, 1888). The documents are reproduced in R. B. Davenport's *Death-blow to Spiritualism* (1888), and the denials of British Spiritualists are futile; except that the youngest sister—both had taken to drink—seems to have recanted under a threat of being deprived of her children. Yet this crude fraud had started a movement which in a few years had more than half a million followers—

the Spiritualists said 2,000,000—and 2,000 mediums. The wildest claims of "phenomena" (see E. Hardinge's *History of Modern American Spiritualism*, 1870) were accepted, and some Americans of distinction were converted or took a serious interest. Common sense began to make itself heard about 1857, and the movement shrank; but the mediums had already invaded the richer pastures of England, and here again several scientific and literary men were duped. From that date every prominent physical medium in the movement has been exposed. Speaking and automatic writing mediums may sometimes be honestly deluded, though as a rule it is easy to detect them in fraud, but the more picturesque and notorious mediums are all exposed in the course of time. For D. D. Home, the best known, see Podmore's *Newer Spiritualism* (1910, p. 45)—his earlier account of Home is feeble), and especially N. Maskelyne's *Modern Spiritualism* (1868), for a case of gross fraud by Home which was tried in a London court in that year. Maskelyne exposes also the Davenport brothers and other prominent mediums of that time, while Podmore (*Modern Spiritualism*, *Newer Spiritualism*) gives most of the exposures to 1910, and exposures from 1900 onward are candidly given in the *Proceedings of the S.P.R.* and the German journal of the Society, *Psychische Studien*. Crookes seemed at the time (1870–2) to be completely duped by a blatantly fraudulent (see Podmore) medium, Florence Cook, but *Light* was compelled to publish (May 12, 1900) a letter in which he admitted that he had found "no satisfactory proof"; and he confessed to Harold Begbie (*Master Workers*, 1905, p. 215) that he had "come to a brick wall." The different claim he made in his old age is negligible. Eusapia Palladino is exposed in Dr. Hyslop's *Contact with the Other World* (1919) in Podmore, and in the *Journal of the S.P.R.* (VII, 133). Craddock was fined £10 for fraud in Edgware Police Court in 1906. Marthe Beraud (Eva C.), who duped Lodge, Barrett, and Richet, is thoroughly exposed by Mathilde von Kemnitz (*Moderne Medium-Forschung*, 1914). Kathleen Goligher, the next sensation—until her

scientific patron Crawford committed suicide (1920)—was detected in fraud by Fournier d'Albe. Hope, the famous "spirit" photographer, is exposed in Harry Price's *Cold Light on Spiritualistic Phenomena* (1922). A summary history of the movement, with all exposures to that date and a refutation of four-fifths of the Spiritualist claims of distinguished adherents, is given in McCabe's *Spiritualism* (1920). Some of these so-called "Spiritualist scientists" (Richet, Morselli, Flammarion, etc.) reject the theory of spirits and merely admit abnormal powers in the medium. See Flammarion's *Forces naturelles inconnues* (1907), in which also the fallacy of the amateur medium making no profit is exposed. For explanations of the tricks see Maskelyne, H. Carrington, McCabe (*Is Spiritualism Based on Fraud?* 1920), W. E. Robinson, Truesdell, etc.

Spitteler, Carl (1845–1924), Swiss poet, Nobel Prize winner. Studying for the Church at Heidelberg, he lost his belief, and he became one of the leading poets of his country. His *Prometheus and Epimetheus* (1880) is claimed to have had a considerable influence on Nietzsche. W. Raith (*Carl Spitteler und die neue Gemeinschaft* (1936) speaks of his "thoroughgoing hostility to Church and priesthood" (p. 60), and quotes him saying that the clergy ought to be put upon "a diet of locusts and wild honey with cold-water sauce." He refers to "the long-buried gods" and says elsewhere that "the gods are sick to death."

Spontaneous Generation. [See Abiogenesis.]

Stael-Holstein, the Baroness Anne Louis Germaine de (1766–1817), French writer. She early adopted the Rationalist views of her father, and after her marriage became, as "Mme. de Stael," the best-known woman in France in Napoleonic days. She had followed Rousseau, but was diverted to more moderate social views by the Revolution. She never returned to Christianity. Chateaubriand said: "My aim is to see Jesus Christ everywhere; Mme. de Stael's is perfectibility." The American envoy, J. Q. Adams, who knew her well, says in a letter to his

mother, November 22, 1812: "She spoke much about the preservation of religion, in which, she gave me to understand, she did not herself believe" (*Proceedings of the American Antiquarian Society*, Vol. XXIII, 1913).

Stalin, Joseph Vissarionovich (b. 1879). He is the son of a Georgian shoemaker, and was educated in a seminary, but expelled from it as "unsuitable" for the priesthood. He had adopted radical opinions, and he then joined the Social Democratic Party and worked with remarkable energy and self-sacrifice. He was sent into exile five times, but always escaped and resumed his work. He was in the Duma in 1913, edited *Pravda*, and distinguished himself as a general in the White War (1919–20). He succeeded Lenin as Secretary of the Communist Party. He is, like all the leading Communists, an Atheist, and it is now generally agreed that he is one of the greatest statesmen in Europe and a distinguished strategist.

Stanhope, Lady Hester Lucy (1776–1839), traveller. She was a daughter of the third Earl of Stanhope, and niece of W. Pitt, and she kept house for Pitt in his later years, and was considered one of the most gifted and most fascinating women in London. After his death—she is the chief witness that he died a Rationalist—she went to live in Syria, detesting the hypocrisy of religious life in England. She lived in semi-feudal state, and was regarded by the Arabs as almost more than human. Lady Stanhope was strongly opposed to Christianity and professed a liberal version of Islam.

Stansfield, the Right Hon. Sir James, B.A., LL.D., G.C.B. (1820–98), statesman. A wealthy London lawyer who was very generous to all reform movements, and the men who worked in them. He was a warm friend of Holyoake (*Life and Letters of G. J. Holyoake*) and supporter of his Secularist societies. He entered Parliament, and became Under-Secretary of State for India, Financial Secretary of the Treasury, and President of the Local Government Board.

Stanton, Elizabeth Cady (1815–1902), American reformer. A daughter of Judge Cady who received an exceptional

education, including Latin and Greek, and married B. Stanton, a prominent Abolitionist, who drew her into the movement. From that she passed to the feminist movement, and was regarded by American women as their greatest leader. In collaboration with Miss S. B. Anthony she wrote the standard *History of Woman Suffrage* (4 vols., 1887-1902), which does not spare the Churches. In her autobiography she deprecates that "the religious superstitions of women perpetuate their bondage" (*Eighty Years and More*, 1897, p. 467). Lloyd Garrison's children tell, in the biography of their father, that she once said at an Abolitionist meeting: "In the darkness and gloom of false theology I was slowly sawing off the chains of my spirit-bondage" when she met and was freed by Lloyd Garrison's "hammer strokes" (*W. Lloyd Garrison*, 1885-9, IV, 336). In an article "What has Christianity Done for Women?" in the *North American Review* (December, 1884), she replies emphatically: Nothing.

Starbuck, Prof. Edwin Dilles, A.M., Ph.D. (b. 1866), American psychologist. Professor of philosophy at Iowa State University, but especially interested in the psychology of religion, on which he was one of the leading American authorities. His Rationalistic views are found in his *Psychology of Religion* (1899) and *The Forward Look in Philosophy* (1913). He held a vague Pantheism, admitting "no distinction between divine and human beings."

Statistics of Religion. The statistics of religion which are given, with little variation, in every work of reference and encyclopædia, and are taken as a standard by all journalistic and literary writers in their references to religion, are not merely worthless, but ludicrous. Editors of these reference books, who are meticulous about tons of coal and acres of arable land, betray the most complete indifference even as to plausibility when the subject is religion. We note, under Czecho-Slovakia, how they all gave the Roman Catholics 10,831,636 members—note the pretence of accuracy in the final units—yet gave the total population of the country as 10,500,000. They give practically the whole popula-

tion of Great Britain, 46,000,000, as Christian, when the combined Churches do not claim more than 10,000,000 members. [*See Great Britain.*] For France, they state that all (42,000,000) except about 1,000,000 are Catholics, when no French Catholic writer claims more than 10,000,000, and most of them admit far less. It is the same in regard to Germany, Spain, Italy, Belgium, etc., and in the grand total of Christians they include nearly the whole population of the United States, 130,000,000, whereas the Churches do not claim more than half as Christians, and the true figure is nearer one-third. The figures for China [*see*] are equally loose and meaningless. Except in the case of Soviet Russia, statistics are accepted without the least check or inquiry. By this method are compiled the world statistics of creeds which impress editors, literary men, and politicians: 780,000,000 Christians, 350,000,000 Confucianists and Taoists, 150,000,000 Buddhists, 209,000,000 Moslem, and so on. The world is shown to be still religious; the white race is overwhelmingly Christian; and the Roman Catholics (331,000,000) are the greatest Christian body. These figures may deliberately be described as fantastic.

Since the religious clause in the census paper is now generally abandoned, and is useless where it is retained [*see Census of Religions*], and in view of the ascendancy of Clerical Fascism in a score of countries, it is at present particularly difficult to compile statistics of religion; but the articles in this work on the principal countries give positive data which show the eccentricity of the above figures. On the basis of electoral figures in countries in which the religious issue makes these a decisive test before Fascism prevailed, of the statements of the Churches themselves in other countries, and of the admission of responsible religious writers, we have seen that, of the total population of Europe, about 520,000,000, of whom 500,000,000 are said to be Christians, at least 240,000,000, are no longer Christians. It is enough to point out that we have given ample evidence and religious admissions of lapses to the extent of at

least 100,000,000 in Russia, 34,000,000 in Great Britain, 35,000,000 in France, 25,000,000 in Germany, 10,000,000 in Spain, 18,000,000 in Italy, and proportionately in the smaller countries except, significantly, in the backward Balkan countries and Poland; though this now comes into line. In the United States [see] we show that the Churches, which supply their own figures to the Government, claim only about 60,000,000 members (including 10,000,000 negroes) out of a total of about 130,000,000; and, as the Rev. Dr. McConnell says (*Christianity, an Interpretation*, 1910, p. 229), these figures are so inflated that they are "worth less than nothing." For Canada, the United States, Mexico, and South America [see] we must deduct something like 100,000,000 from the total listed as Christians in the conventional statistics. These safe figures at once reduce the supposed grand total of 780,000,000 Christians by 350,000,000, and losses on missions and in smaller countries must be added. More than half the white race are not now claimed as members of Churches by any serious authority.

Roman Catholic figures are, as is shown in the detailed notices of each country, the most inflated of all. A grand total of 330,000,000 is made up by counting 40,000,000 French, 25,000,000 Germans, 44,000,000 Italians, 25,000,000 Spanish, 20,000,000 Poles, and so on. A country is called "Catholic," and then its entire population is listed as such. We have shown in detail that in these countries, and in the United States, Latin America, and the British Empire, the losses amount to more than 150,000,000. The genuine Catholic world-total can hardly be more than 180,000,000, and more than half these are either illiterate or at so low a level of culture that their beliefs are of no interest. The losses of the Catholic Church during the last thirty years have been so severe that its total is no larger than it was in 1909 (McCabe's *Decay of the Church of Rome*), in spite of its insistence on a high birth-rate; and this is the primary reason for the Vatican's support of Fascism everywhere. Many imagine that the Church is making progress at least in Great Britain and the United

States. They do not fully appreciate the effect in those countries of the dispersal, during the last hundred years, of the Irish, of whom 18,000,000 (emigrants and descendants of emigrants) are now scattered over America and the British Empire [see *Eire*], and in the case of the United States (the Catholic Church in which will be discussed under that title) these, and the tens of millions of immigrants from other Catholic countries (Italy, Poland, Mexico, etc.) or provinces, have outnumbered those from Protestant countries or provinces. If we recollect, in addition, that the Catholic hierarchy had, in order to increase the number of its supporters, made birth control a "mortal sin" (punished with hell), we not only understand why the Church seems to make more progress in Great Britain and America than in other countries, and more progress than other Churches, but we find that the apparent growth conceals heavy losses. More than 1,000,000 Catholic Irish, and about 300,000 French, Italian, Polish, and other foreign Catholics, had settled in Great Britain and begun to breed prolifically by 1870. The present writer showed in 1909 (*Decay of the Church of Rome*), by a lengthy analysis of Catholic figures and admissions, that the Church then ought to have had 3,200,000 followers, and had only 1,200,000. With continued immigration—at least 300,000 Catholic Irish have entered in the last ten years—and a high birth-rate, the Catholic population ought to double every quarter of a century. The Church's own official figures must be examined in this light. The *Orbis Terrarum Catholicus* gave a total for England and Wales, in 1888, of 1,359,831. This ought to have doubled by 1910, but the Church claimed only 1,500,000 (and had about 1,200,000). To-day the 1,500,000 ought to be well over 3,000,000, but the *Catholic Directory* (1940) claims only 2,406,419. The same *Directory*, however, gives peculiar figures. It makes Catholic births (baptisms) 9 per cent. of the whole, pupils in elementary schools 8 per cent., marriages, 6.6 per cent., and the total membership about 5.5 per cent. of the population. These figures are useless. Children are

baptized, from pressure or sheer love of ceremony, even when the parents have drifted; the percentage of school-children is fallacious because of the higher birth-rate; and in Catholic marriages one party is frequently a non-Catholic. The Catholic total is still less than 2,000,000. One has to understand that a seceding Catholic, young or old, is never struck off the list, for secession is not recognized in Canon Law. While some are alarmed at the growth of the Church, Catholic authorities are alarmed at its losses. Both Catholic weeklies and Conferences have in recent years frequently discussed the "leakage." In the *Catholic Herald* of August 11, 1939, a London priest testified that the boys who left his school abandoned the Church to the extent of 50 to 70 per cent. a year; and a Liverpool teacher stated at a Conference at Newcastle, reported in the *Newcastle Evening Chronicle*, that the lapse of boys in the north of England was about 50 per cent. We may be content to conclude that the Church in Great Britain has less than 2,000,000 followers—on the basis of the 1888 figure it ought now to have 4,000,000—and the influence which the clerical authorities of this 5 per cent. of the population are permitted to exercise in general education, the Press, and publicity generally and in politics, is amazing. Precise religious statistics are impossible, but a work in which it is shown that the popular joke about the reliability of statistics is painfully true in the matter of statistics of religion, that, in civilizations of the first rank, non-Christians are now actually the majority, is urgently desirable. What proportion of this majority of non-members of Churches may be in some sense religious has never been made the subject of extensive inquiry. A short discussion of the matter will be found under Great Britain.

Steinmetz, Prof. Sebald Rudolph, Jur.D. (b. 1862), Dutch sociologist. Professor of sociology and ethnology at Leyden University. Long residence in the Dutch East Indies made him the chief authority in Holland on political geography and ethnology and a high authority on comparative religion. In

an article in *Social Papers* (London, 1906) he says: "Religion was very rarely, if ever, a progressive way-making power. . . . In higher culture I think religion is a very dangerous help to living, for it makes us forget the realities of life for imaginary gratifications" (pp. 272-5).

Stendhal, M. de. [See Beyle, M. H.] **Stephen, Sir Leslie**, LL.D., Litt.D. (1832-1904), writer. As a Fellow of Trinity Hall (Cambridge) he was compelled to take orders, but he shirked clerical duties, and was a notable athlete and alpinist. In 1862 he refused any longer to attend chapel, saying that he had not lost his faith because he had never had any, and three years later he resigned his tutorship and took to journalism and letters. He was a Fellow of the British Academy, and generally regarded as the Dean of English Letters. His *Agnostic's Apology* (1876) makes his position clear. It was only under pressure from the present writer and other friends that he consented to accept knighthood, which he did not regard as "an honour." His fine character is well described in Prof. F. W. Maitland's *Life and Letters of Leslie Stephen* (1906). His brother, **Sir James Fitzjames Stephen**, D.C.L., LL.D., K.C.S.I. (1829-94), judge, depreciated aggressiveness, but his Rationalist views are given in his *Liberty, Equality, and Fraternity* (1873). Sir Leslie writes the article on him in the *Dictionary of National Biography*, and says that the eminent jurist "entirely abandoned his belief in the orthodox dogmas."

Sterling, John (1806-44), writer. A minister of the Church of England who became a sceptic and turned to literature. Carlyle wrote a fine biography of him. Just before death he wrote to Carlyle: "I tread the common road into the great darkness without any thought of fear and very much of hope. Certainty, indeed, I have none." He did not believe in a personal God.

Sterne, Carus. [See Krause, E.]

Stevenson, Robert Louis (1850-94), novelist. Trained in law and called to the Bar, he was compelled by poor health to turn to literature, and in 1888 he settled in Samoa. The famous novelist had had a serious quarrel about

religion with his father in early life, and he avoided from that time any appearance of hostility to it; but his chief biographer, A. Johnston, explains that he was an Agnostic to the end, and quotes him saying: "I am religious in my own way, but I am hardly brave enough to interpose a theory of my own between life and death. Here both our creeds and our philosophies seem to me to fail." Another biographer-friend, F. Watt (*R.L.S.*, 1913), agrees that "he is properly described as an Agnostic" (p. 273). Later writers on him entirely conceal the fact.

Stewart, Sir James. [See Denham, Sir J. S.]

Stoic Emperors, The. The four Emperors who ruled the Roman Empire from A.D. 98 to 180—Trajan, Hadrian, Antoninus Pius, and Marcus Aurelius—are usually called the Stoic Emperors. The only reason for doing this is that the period was admittedly the finest and most beneficent in Roman history, if not in all ancient history—socially it was superior to the Periclean Age—and the inspiration is therefore sought in what is called the Stoic "religion." Marcus Aurelius alone, of the four, was a Stoic; and it is not immaterial to reflect that he brought ruin on the Empire by leaving the rule of it to his corrupt son, and that he was the only one of the four who persecuted. Trajan was a bluff soldier who knew nothing whatever about philosophy. Hadrian, who was mainly responsible for the social beneficence accomplished under Trajan, and was the inspirer and model of his successor, was definitely an Epicurean. Antoninus Pius is nowhere described as a Stoic, and he owes the name Pius to his fidelity to the memory of Hadrian, not to a feeling for religion. The creed of cultivated Romans at that time was a blend of Epicureanism [see] and Stoicism, but without any of the religious features of the mystic minority of the Stoics. A correct description in modern terms would be "atheistic humanitarianism."

Stoicism. Ever since the Renaissance the finer features of Greek and Roman life have been recognized in the world of scholarship, and this appreciation prevailed against the popular and religious

idea of paganism sufficiently for the French Revolution at once to excite a widespread zeal for a return to Greek and Roman ideas. The sounder historians of the nineteenth century so far vindicated Athens and Rome that few except the common apologists could venture to sustain the old libels of them. It was then discovered that, from about 300 B.C. onward, the Greeks and Romans had had a quite respectable "religion," Stoicism, and apologetic literature in this field became very confused. Apologists who had some knowledge of Greek and Roman life conceded that the Stoic ethic was "noble," but it rested, they said, on a philosophy and was too cold, austere, and aloof to touch the masses, as Christianity was alleged to have done—a position which in turn broke down when it was proved that the claims put forward for Christianity in regard to slavery, charity, schools, and general moral improvement were wholly unsound. The truth is that Stoicism, as it was founded by Zeno (336–264 B.C.), had no religious features. Prof. Gilbert Murray, our most distinguished Hellenist, does, it is true, sometimes call it a religion, but he explains that it was "a religion in its exalted passion," and no one shows more clearly than he that Zeno was a dogmatic Materialist (*The Stoic Philosophy*, 1915, p. 23). The Greek philosophers, discarding the belief that justice was a law of Zeus, were bound to seek a new basis for ethics, and as a rule they found this in social experience. At Athens the school or sect of the Cynics (Antisthenes, Diogenes, etc.: not cynics in the modern sense, but "simple-lifers") appealed for a return to nature from the luxury and conventionality of Athenian life. Zeno, a man of mixed Greek and Phœnician blood, took from them the appeal to nature and converted it into a sort of philosophy by adopting the idea of Anaxagoras [see], that there is mind (Nous) of a material character in the scheme of things. Democritus [see] and others of the Ionian school had insisted that evolution was ruled by "law," not left to "chance" and it was not a long step beyond this to suggest "mind," provided it was considered to be material.

Too few Rationalist writers realize or insist that almost all the Greek thinkers, including Aristotle, regarded "spirit" as a mere word for something unreal. On the other hand, we easily understand how in those days of an almost less than elementary science men would feel that there must be mind or a purposive directing force in nature. Half a century ago it seemed an absurdity to have imagined a "material mind" in nature. In the present state of psychology the absurdity disappears; and the Stoics would not realize the essential need of a nervous system as its foundation.

This was, as far as it concerns us here, the "philosophy" which Zeno taught to all comers in the Colonnade (Stoa) which ran along one side of the Agora (central square) at Athens. That a few Stoics like Cleanthes later insisted that the Nous was a spirit and god—it is noteworthy that Cleanthes was a narrow-minded fanatic who called for the persecution of scientific men—is not material to the general subject. This religious system was not the Stoicism that had an immense practical influence. To Zeno, and the vast majority of his followers, speculation was just the scientific basis for an ethic or rule of conduct. The idea that this Stoic ethic was austere and suitable only for a thoughtful minority is entirely wrong. Because there was hostility between the Zeno-group and the contemporary Epicurus-group, and Epicurus is falsely represented as making pleasure the chief good, some imagine Zeno as a puritan rebuking the vices of the Athenians. On the contrary [see Zeno], he went out of his way to show them, practically, that he had no objection in principle to commerce with women and boys. The clash was rather—apart from the very familiar jealousy of rival party founders in every age—due to the fact that Zeno stressed the abstract duty of a man to help his fellows, and Epicurus taught that friendliness and mutual service were obvious conditions of a tranquil and satisfactory life. To Zeno, with his teleological view of nature, man had his part to play—his duty under the law of nature—just as the elements or the animals had, and his

conscience or moral sense revealed it to him. As they both agreed that individual temperance and recognition of the brotherhood of men were the primary rules of conduct, their followers got together, after Zeno's death, on that basis, and it was this blend of Stoicism and Epicureanism that inspired all the fine social service of the Roman Empire and of the entire Greek-Roman world. It is clear in Seneca's essays, though he relies more on the Stoic philosophy. We see it in Pliny's dictum that "God is for one mortal to succour another." Dr. Gilbert Murray says that "nearly all the principal kings in existence in the generations following Zeno professed themselves Stoics," but of the most beneficent of them (the Ptolemies, Augustus, Hadrian, Antoninus Pius, etc.) that can hardly be said. In the same way we must understand the *Encyclopædia Britannica* saying that "it was Stoicism, not Platonism, that filled men's imaginations and exerted the wider and more active influence upon the ancient world," or the verdict of the *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics* that no other philosophy has ever "borne fruit in practice to an extent comparable with that of Stoicism." These tributes to the inspiration of the ancient world, which are now common, are welcome, but, as we show under Epicureanism, it was a humanitarian blend of the two systems, omitting the mystic elements of Stoicism, that supplied the inspiration. Besides the small work (the Conway Memorial Lecture) of Gilbert Murray noted above, and the usual histories of philosophy, see R. D. Hicks, *Stoic and Epicurean* (1910); E. V. Arnold, *Roman Stoicism* (1911); E. Bevan, *Stoics and Sceptics* (1913).

Stout, the Hon. Sir Robert, K.C.M.G., LL.D. (1844-1930), Chief Justice of New Zealand. A Scottish teacher who emigrated to New Zealand, became a distinguished lawyer, and took a large part in Rationalist education and the very progressive life of the Dominion at that time. He held the positions, successively, of Attorney-General, Premier, and Chief Justice. On account of his very high character and ability, and his distinction in public life, attempts have been made to represent that he

was a Christian, though his opinions were so well known that he is described as "an Agnostic" in Mennell's *Australasian Biography*. He was an Honorary Associate of the R.P.A., and a few years before his death he took the chair in Wellington for Rationalist lectures by the present writer, and maintained a correspondence with him on Rationalist lines until he died.

Strange, Thomas Lumsden (1808-84), judge. He was a son of the Indian judge, Sir T. L. Strange, and he became in his turn a Judge of the High Court in India. In 1852 he published an orthodox book, *The Light of Prophecy*, but, while he remained a Theist, he abandoned Christianity and severely criticized it in several pamphlets of the Scott series and in *The Bible* (1871), *The Sources and Development of Christianity* (1876), and other works.

Strauss, David Friedrich (1808-74), German writer. A professor of Lutheran theology at Tübingen University who early adopted Rationalist views, and in 1835 wrote a life of Jesus which had an immense circulation and excited as much discussion as Renan's later work. George Eliot translated it into English (1844). It dissolved most of the story of Jesus into myths. The book was so able that Strauss was offered a chair at Zürich, but the orthodox opposition was so violent that he was pensioned off before he began to teach. He still professed to be a Christian in a liberal sense, but in 1872 rejected all Christian belief in his *Alte und Neue Glaube*, which had 20 editions in a few years. He was very friendly with the Crown Princess of Prussia, Queen Victoria's daughter [see *Victoria*], who encouraged him in his Rationalist work.

Strauss, Richard (b. 1864), German composer. He played the piano at the age of four and began to compose at the age of seven, and in his university years he made a thorough study of philosophy and æsthetics. He conducted the Bayreuth Festival in 1894, and became General Musical Director of Prussia in 1908. His Rationalism is clear in *Till Eulenspiegels lustige Streiche* (1894), "one of the most brilliant dramatic scores ever penned" (*Ency. Brit.*), and *Also Sprach Zarathustra*, a

symphonic poem based on Nietzsche's great work, which caused great anger in the Churches.

Strindberg, Johan August (1849-1912), Swedish poet and novelist. Son of a barmaid who, after some years of literary struggle, agitated Sweden by novels satirizing conventional life and opinions. He was a leader in the Rationalist group of young followers of Brandes. He was driven abroad, but when a charge was laid against him for a new attack on Christianity he returned to meet it, and was acquitted. After 1895 he had a nervous breakdown, and his mind deteriorated. He leaned to Swedenborgianism, but never returned to the Church.

Struggle for Life, The. A stage in Darwin's theory of Natural Selection. After accumulating a mass of evidence of evolution, and while seeking a theory to explain it, he happened to read Malthus's work on the evils caused by over-population, and the struggle for the means of livelihood at once suggested that such struggle had been a very important factor in evolution. As Darwin never dealt with contemporary or historical evolution, moral considerations did not arise. He merely pointed out that the animals best fitted (by strength, flight, instinct, etc.) to meet the conditions of struggle in the past would survive. That the same physical struggle must continue is not only an arbitrary interpretation of his theory, but it is obvious that such struggle would help only to develop animal qualities, as in the past. [See *Darwinism and Natural Selection*.]

Substance, The Law of. A phrase coined by Prof. Haeckel to indicate his belief that matter and energy are two aspects of one reality or substance. Lodge and other critics expended upon it a good deal of ridicule, which now recoils upon themselves. No one doubts that the same fundamental reality appears to us at one time as matter, and at another as energy. If the adoption of the word "substance" be questioned, one wonders if a good deal of confusion and misunderstanding would not have been avoided if physicists had retained it. In the sense in which Aristotle, or the Latins who followed him, used it—the

thing which "stands under" or underlies the "attributes" (extension, colour, weight, etc.) of objects—it is superseded, but some modification of it would have saved physicists from imagining that we can know radiation, movement, etc., without recognizing something that is radiated or moves. This kind of language was largely responsible for the mystic nonsense about the New Physics a few years ago.

Subconscious, The. A field, or the greater part of the field, of mental life of which we are at any given moment unconscious. The idea was discussed in psychology before the end of the last century, and long before Freud popularized it. The figure of speech that the mind is like an iceberg having nine-tenths of its bulk below water, is discussed (from earlier literature) in McCabe's *Haeckel's Critics Answered* (1903). Many psychologists preferred to speak of "the unconscious," and the excesses of the Psycho-Analysts, and the novelists who adopted their jargon, confirm the preference. The word is nevertheless indispensable if we recognize consciousness. It is enough to appeal to memory, which means a vast field of stored experiences of which only one or a few at a time can have the light of consciousness focussed upon them. On the spiritual theory of mind, all possibility of explaining this is excluded. On the modern psychological theory the further advance of science promises assistance. The idea that we may "work things out" or reason subconsciously—during sleep, for instance—is not an accepted part of modern psychology.

Sudermann, Hermann (1857–1928), German dramatist. A teacher who won such success by a social drama *Die Ehe*, in 1888, that he devoted himself to writing novels and plays and, with Hauptmann [see], headed German literature for the next quarter of a century. His *Frau Sorge* (1888) went through 125 editions. The passionate social idealism and Rationalism of his work roused bitter religious opposition, and at a great meeting in Berlin, in 1900, to check clerical aggression Sudermann appealed eloquently for a struggle against "obscurantism" (*Das*

Monistische Jahrhundert, February 1913, p. 743). He was one of the founders of Haeckel's Monist League.

Sue, Marie Joseph Eugène (1804–57), French novelist. The impression is often given, in literary references to the famous author of *The Mysteries of Paris* and *The Wandering Jew*, that he was just a scurrilous writer of poor culture. On the contrary, his father, a surgeon, was in such a position that the Empress Josephine was god-mother to the boy, and he became a naval surgeon, but found greater success in literature. People fought at the shops for copies of the paper in which the *Mysteries of Paris* appeared serially in 1842. It was published in 10 vols., in 1843. Another journal offered him 100,000 francs for his next story, *The Wandering Jew* (10 vols., 1845). A conservative, of good family, in his earlier years, he was disgusted by the conduct of the Church and joined the anti-clericals.

Sully, Prof. James, M.A., LL.D. (1842–1923), psychologist. Professor of psychology at London University College, and author of widely circulated works which rendered valuable services in emancipating psychology from its long connection with mysticism. Sully was an Agnostic (personal knowledge), but avoided critical work.

Sully Prudhomme, René François Armand (1839–1907), French poet, and Nobel Prize winner. Son of a rich merchant who became one of the foremost poets of France in the second half of the last century. He was admitted to the Academy in 1881, and received the Nobel Prize for Literature in 1901. In the Preface to the first volume of his poetry (*Stances et poèmes*, 1865) he confessed that he was a sceptic, though he wanted to believe. Gaston Paris says in his *Penseurs et poètes*: "His problem is the malady of our age. . . . He described an illusion and found it impossible to believe in it" (p. 233). He made a fine translation of the first book of Lucretius.

Summum Bonum. Latin for "the highest good," the theme of much discussion in earlier times, different writers assigning culture, character, pleasure, or tranquillity, as the main thing to seek in life. The modern

equivalent is the occasional wonder of literary men what is "the end of life," and the insincere plea of apologists that people without religion are distressed because they no longer see such an end. The entire discussion is now outdated. [See Purpose.] Men assign their own goal in life, and for the thoughtful minority it is a full development of individual capacity, especially mental, for enjoyment and the tasks of life, consistently with the equal right of others, and the maintenance and further improvement of civilization.

Sumner, Charles (1811-74), American statesman. A lawyer who entered politics and proved to be one of America's greatest orators. He worked at first in the Abolitionist movement, and his oration, "The True Grandeur of Nations," moved the country. A Southerner wounded him and brought on a fatal illness, yet Sumner wanted the man pardoned on the ground that he was "the instrument of a malignant power." He was Chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, and one of the most accomplished and idealistic of American statesmen. His letters (*Letters of Charles Sumner*, 6 vols., 1878-93) often express an advanced Rationalism, but sometimes a vague and probably impersonal Theism. "I am without religious feeling" and "unconvinced that Christ was divinely commissioned to preach a revelation to men" (I, 117-19), he says, and he tells his correspondent that he never prays and rarely thinks about God. His biographer, W. G. Shotwell, says that his last words were (to Judge Hoar): "Judge, tell Emerson how much I love and revere him" (*Life of Charles Sumner*, 1910, p. 718).

Sunday. The first of the seven days of the week in the Roman calendar was *Dies Solis*, or "the Sun's Day." The early Christians, hostile to the Jews and their Sabbath, adopted it, but explained that Christ was the Sun and had risen on that day. Obscure references to it are claimed, very feebly, in the Pauline Epistles, but when Pliny, in his letter to Trajan (about 112), says that the Christians meet for prayer and hymns "to Christ as a God" on "a certain day," he seems to indicate that

the observance of Sunday had then begun. They called it "the Lord's Day" (*dies dominica*—hence the French *dimanche*), and certainly observed it in the second part of the second century. Constantine tried to make it a legal day of rest, but failed.

Sun Gods. [See Sky Gods.]

Supernatural, The. Anything pertaining to the supposed world "above" (*super*) or beyond nature (in the sense of the visible world). The "soul" of man was not considered supernatural, but the intervention of an angel or God was. The term chiefly referred to events (miracles, etc.) in which such intervention was claimed. Modernists, who reject miracles in the proper theological sense, imagine that they make the Christian creed more palatable by sacrificing the word "supernatural." Unless we at the same time alter the meaning of the word "nature," it seems obvious that any man who believes in God and disembodied spirits believes in a supernatural.

Superstition. In general usage, a belief without ground or at least without a reasonable foundation. It is scarcely a correct use of the word to call all religious belief "superstition." It does not mean any belief which one regards as false, otherwise it would have a large use in all controversy—scientific, political, etc.—but a belief, for instance, that Friday, or 13, or passing under a ladder, is unlucky. Very many religious beliefs criticized in this work are shown to be superstitions or devoid of even arguable grounds, but not religious beliefs as such.

Suttner, Baroness Bertha von (1843-1914), Austrian pacifist and Nobel Prize winner. She was a daughter of the Czech Count Field-Marshal Kinsky, yet she became the best known internationally and the most respected figure in the movement to substitute arbitration for war. For this she was awarded the Nobel Prize. Probably the immense majority of her followers in the movement imagined her to be a Christian lady; yet she never made a secret of her advanced Rationalism, a vague Pantheism which was little removed from Spencerian Agnosticism. In her *Memoirs* (1909, I, 36) she says that, if she had

been asked in youth what her religion was, she would have said: "None—I am too religious." She had already studied German philosophy, and she later read Buckle, Darwin, Spencer, and Haeckel. In 1880 she published an autobiography in the form of fiction, *Inventarium einer Seele*, and in Ch. XXX she explains her disbelief in Christianity and in a personal God.

Swedenborg, Emmanuel (1688–1772), Swedish mystic. As one often meets references to Swedenborg's "anticipations of the discoveries of science" in virtue of his spiritual intuition, it is useful to know that he was a practical engineer and an able mathematician for thirty years before he started his mystic pretensions. He had published books on science and philosophy and travelled in France, Germany, and Italy. Science was then—it was the period after Galileo—much cultivated in Italian and German universities, and in France Descartes had written on evolution. It was chiefly from Descartes that he got his scientific ideas. Descartes had fled to Sweden to escape his orthodox persecutors.

Swinburne, Algernon Charles (1837–1909), poet. He was of an aristocratic High Church family, but his studies at Eton and Oxford made him a Rationalist and Republican; though he remained a Conservative in politics all his life. In 1858 he applauded Orsini's attempt to assassinate Napoleon III. *Atlanta in Calydon* (1865) revealed his poetic gifts, but he became most widely known by his *Songs Before Sunrise* and three series of *Poems and Ballads*, in which he is often mordantly anti-Christian.

Syllabus, The. A list of propositions selected from Liberal literature by Pope Pius IX, in 1864, and "reprobated, proscribed, and condemned" by him. In 1848 the Romans had, in view of the chronically foul condition of the Papal States [see], rebelled and set up the Roman Republic [see], the Pope having fled in disguise. The revolutionary movement throughout Europe was crushed, and the French destroyed the Republic for the Pope. He returned and made the Papal States once more "the opprobrium of Europe," as Lord Clarendon publicly said. In 1856 the

European Powers, at the Congress of Paris, solemnly warned the Pope to reform his disreputable dominion—an incident which is not recalled in the public mind now that the Papacy is represented everywhere as a wise, august, and venerable guide on moral-political principles. There was no reform, and the Papal provinces seethed with revolt and bloody reprisals. Cavour bribed France, with the gift of Nice and Savoy, to withdraw its support of the Pope, and the advance of Italy began. The first plebiscite was taken by Italy in the conquered Papal provinces in 1860, and the inhabitants voted overwhelmingly against the Pope. But Pius IX "clung to his poor rag of earthly dominion while he vented his screeds of impotent passion and forgot bare morality in the lust for revenge" (Bolton King). It was in these circumstances—which hardly any historian ever recalls to-day, though they are frankly described in the Cambridge History—that Pius IX directed his Jesuits to formulate in eighty propositions the fundamental principles of what was then called "Liberalism" and is now the common attitude of educated men. It is as difficult now to find a translation of this egregious document as to find a translation of the Papal decree which condemned and suppressed the Jesuits, and the one is just as much misrepresented by Catholic writers as the other. It was a comprehensive defiance of the demand for freedom of inquiry and conscience. Even philosophy was not to be discussed without reference to revelation and submission to clerical authority (10). Such elementary propositions of modern life as the following were "reprobated, proscribed, and condemned": "(15) Every man is free to embrace and profess the religion which, judging by the light of human reason, he believes to be true." The belief that "eternal salvation" could be attained—or hell escaped—in any religion besides the Catholic was reprobated with horror (16), and the familiar Papal claims to control education and marriage and dictate to the State were reaffirmed. The world smiled, and Rationalism spread so rapidly in Italy that a priest-

historian said that "after 1860 Italy seemed to be conquered by rebels against God" (Balan's *Continuazione alla Storia Universale*, II, 477-81). After defending the Syllabus all over the world for a quarter of a century, Catholic writers realized their defeat and began to say that it was just an expression of the opinions of Pius IX in his private capacity, not as infallible Pope. They knew quite well that this distinction was not made until the Vatican Council of 1870. Pius IX had spoken officially and dogmatically to the entire Church. In the accompanying Encyclical he wrote: "All these wicked opinions and doctrines Pius IX, in virtue of his apostolic authority, commands all sons of the Catholic Church to regard as reprobated, proscribed, and condemned." As to the modern Catholic plea that the document is just an historical memento of poor Pius IX, whose heart was better than his head, the present writer can testify that it was enforced as Catholic teaching during his training as a priest in a London seminary and was a normal part of the manual (by the Jesuit Lehmkuhl) of theology used.

Sylvester II. [See Gerbert.]

Syme, David (1827-1908), Australian writer and philanthropist. He abandoned his Presbyterian faith while studying at Heidelberg University, and emigrated to Australia. He made a fortune by building roads, and bought *The Melbourne Age*, which he began to edit in 1860, and made it the greatest and most respected of colonial papers. Syme was one of the outstanding figures in Australian life, and at his death he left £50,000 for charities. He had refused knighthood. In his book *The Soul* (1903) he rejects Christian beliefs and professes a sort of Pantheism. He had, says his biographer, Ambrose Pratt, "emancipated himself

from the thralldom of theological superstitions," and "his religion was humanity" (David Syme, 1908, p. 257).

Symes, Joseph (1841-1906), Rationalist lecturer. A Wesleyan preacher who became a Secularist lecturer and for forty years worked energetically for the movement. In 1883 he settled in Australia and conducted propaganda there until he died.

Symonds, John Addington (1840-93), writer. He abandoned law on account of his health—he was consumptive—turned to letters, and became the leading authority on the Italian Renaissance and a writer of great literary distinction. His chief work, *The Renaissance in Italy* (7 vols., 1875-86), is the standard authority and a charming contrast in style to the heavy work of Burckhardt. He wrote also biographies of Cellini, Michaelangelo, and others, and studies of the Greek poets. His rejection of Christianity is implicit in many of his references to it, and his biographer, H. D. Brown (*Life*, pp. 319 and 421), shows that he did not believe in a future life.

Symons, Arthur (1865-1945), poet and dramatist. He won recognition by his *Introduction to the Study of Browning* (1886), and followed it up with a long series of volumes in verse and prose. In an autobiographical chapter of his *Spiritual Adventures* (1905) he says that as a boy the prayers in church "made me ashamed as if I were unconsciously helping to repeat absurdities to God" (p. 45), and he ceased to attend. He did not reject Christianity because "it had never taken hold of me."

Syncretism. The policy or practice of selecting the best elements from different systems of philosophy and religion. The French thinker, V. Cousin, composed his philosophy on those lines.

Synoptic Gospels, The. [See Gospels.]

T.

Tadema, Sir L. Alma. [See Alma Tadema.]

Tagore, Sir Rabindranath, D.Litt. (1861-1941), "the Poet Laureate of

India," Nobel Prize winner. Son of a Hindu prince, founder of an educational institute, and author of about sixty works in verse and prose which

gave him an international reputation. Tagore is so much quoted by religious writers that most readers have a false impression that he was a Christian. In his Hibbert Lectures, *The Religion of Man* (1931), he, with the familiar vagueness of the poet, professes belief in "the Humanity of God and the Divinity of Man the Eternal." His system is a Pantheism which merges the individual in the Universal Self and does not recognize a personal God or personal immortality. Dr. Taraknath Das, in his *Rabindranath Tagore* (1934), explains that he never formulated definite beliefs. His religion was a matter of experience, not of belief.

Tail, The, and evolution. Knowledge of comparative anatomy and zoology is so scanty in most of the writers who attack evolution, that for half a century after Darwin many of them represented man's lack of a tail as a serious argument against his descent from an ape. Only the most ignorant of them now discuss the question, as in fact we have here a strong argument in favour of such descent. One may see in almost any museum that the four anthropoid apes have just the same vestigial tail as man. The human embryo, or fœtus, has a long tail like those of other animals, but normally this ceases to grow with the rest of the body, the vertebræ at the lower end of the column fusing together (the coccyx) and leaving only a small stump of a tail. Cases are quite numerous in which, by the embryonic freak of atavism, the tail grows until it is about a foot in length and has the requisite nerves and muscles for "wagging" it. In civilized countries it is amputated in childhood, but among lower peoples—the Polynesians, for instance—one occasionally sees a man with a conspicuous tail. There is no evidence to support the old belief that there are races of tailed men, and the earth is now so fully explored that it is unlikely. Beyond a general suggestion that the vertebræ fused to provide a solid support for the body when the anthropoids began to walk more or less erect, we still await the explanation. The photographs and drawings in Haeckel's *Evolution of Man* (cheap ed., 1912, Ch. XV) may be

recommended to the sceptical. For the answer to the charge that these are unreliable see Haeckel.

Taine, Prof. Hippolyte Adolphe, D.-ès-L. (1828–93), French historian. In his early years he was a professor of philosophy and rhetoric, but his outspoken Rationalism aroused such hostility that he had to retire and turn to literature. In 1864, when the influence of the Church was on the wane, he became professor of the history of art and æsthetics at the School of Fine Arts, and he was admitted to the Academy, from which, although he was one of the leading French historians (*Histoire de la littérature anglaise*, 3 vols., 1863, *Les origines de la France contemporaine*, 3 vols., 1876–91, etc.), the clergy had hitherto got him excluded. He lectured on French literature at Oxford. "He was," says the *Grande Encyclopédie*, "with Renan, and perhaps more than Renan, one of the intellectual guides of the generation formed between 1860 and 1890." In his later years he was more conservative in social and political matters, but he never abandoned his Agnosticism. See Prof. Boutmy, *Taine, Scherer, Laboulaye* (1901).

Talleyrand-Périgord, Prince Charles Maurice de (1754–1838), French statesman. Son of Count de Talleyrand-Périgord, he was lamed in his infancy and thus cut off from the usual career of the noble and destined for the Church, which was then still very corrupt and indulgent. He became Agent-General (treasurer) of the clergy and Bishop of Autun. At the States-General which opened the Revolution he took a leading part on the rebel side—he had probably been a sceptic for years—and was President of the Constituent Assembly. He had a large share in framing the Constitution, proposed the nationalization of Church property, and drafted a fine scheme of education. In 1791 he formally abandoned the priesthood and was excommunicated, though Napoleon later compelled the Pope to lift the ban and relieve him of the priesthood. He quarrelled with the revolutionaries after the Terror, and Napoleon made him Foreign Minister—the greatest in Europe at that time—and Prince of Benevento

and Ponte Corvo. After the fall of Napoleon he did great work for France at the Vienna Congress, and he took office under Louis XVIII. Much of the irony about his changes of allegiance is misplaced. He was a sincere republican but had good ground to desert the Revolution at the Terror; and he never pretended any enthusiasm for Napoleon or Louis XVIII. Unlike Laplace and others, he defied the Church and remained Agnostic to the end, when he went through the form of reconciliation in order to secure a quiet funeral. The Rationalist interest of his career is fully treated in McCabe's *Talleyrand* (1906).

Tallien, Jean Lambert (1767-1820), French politician. A journalist who became one of the leading members of the Paris Commune during the Revolution, and saved many from cruel treatment. He sustained his humane efforts as a member, later, of the Committee of Public Safety and the Council of Five Hundred. He was one of the corps of savants whom Napoleon took to Egypt, and after the fall of the Emperor he refused to be reconciled with the throne and the Church.

Talmud, The. The word means "the teaching," and the book is in fact a collection of the teaching of the Jewish rabbis from the beginning of the Christian era. The canon of sacred writings was closed after the Ezraist revision [see] and it was forbidden to write further religious books. As the commentaries on the Law and the Prophets of the more famous rabbis multiplied, and the ban on writing had led to a remarkable cultivation of memory in the schools, it was decided in the second century A.D. to make a collection of them, and the compilers went from school to school throughout the Jewish world. This compilation is the oldest and most valuable part of the Talmud, the Mishna. The later or supplementary collection is known as the Gemara, and differs in the Babylonian (which is the version usually quoted) and the Palestinian Talmuds. The works were not written until the fourth and fifth centuries. They contain a vast amount of tedious and hair-splitting commentary on the Law, but the accounts of the moral teaching of the earlier rabbis are interesting because

they confirm that there is not a single moral sentiment attributed to Jesus in the Gospels that was not current in the Jewish schools at the time, and that the Gospel parables [see] were mainly taken from the rabbis and were generally reduced in moral and intellectual quality by the compilers of the Gospels. See M. L. Rodkinson, *Has Midrash* (1903), and McCabe's *Sources of the Morality of the Gospels* (1914). The latest and best English translation of the Talmud is *The Babylonian Talmud* (1935, etc.).

Tammany. This American political body, a rich source of corruption in New York, has always had a close connection with the Catholic Church. It originated in a Society of St. Tammany—which is probably the humorous adoption of the name of an Indian chief—which was one of many patriotic societies founded at the close of the War of Independence. In 1789 it became a political organ of the Democrats, its object then being stated as to check the growth of wealth and maintain the purity of the principles of the Revolution. In a few years it became a corrupt machine for controlling votes and exacting rewards from the members it returned at State and Federal elections. The reformer, Robert Dale Owen, son of Robert Owen, fiercely attacked it as "subversive of morality," and *The History of Tammany Hall* (1901) by Myers, which is impartial and scholarly, is a terrible record of civic and political corruption. It is estimated that Tammany's "Tweed Gang" cost New York at least \$160,000,000 between 1860 and 1870, and there were two later "bosses" and gangs. From the first it was mainly run by Irish Catholics, and it initiated Al Smith's campaign for the Presidency. An article in *Collier's Weekly*, February 11, 1933, showed that it was then as much under Catholic influence as ever. The average Tammany politician, it said, "does not know, or if he does know he does not care, a rap that the entire system has its being in prostitution." Of its thirty-six Captains, thirty-four were Catholics and two Jews. Cardinal Hayes was represented on its Board of Strategy by Mgr. Chadwick, whose church was

attended by the Tammany politicians. There was an equally revealing article on it by R. Glendinning in *Plain Talk Magazine*, February, 1933. See also the anonymous work (by McCabe) *The Taint in Politics* (1920).

Tammuz. The Babylonian version of the spring or fertility god. The accounts in the Syrian and Greek mythologies are late and worthless, and some authorities suggest that Tammuz was a King of Erech, in Sumerian times, who was later deified. Dr. S. Langdon (*Tammuz and Ishtar*, 1914) shows ground to assume that Tammuz was originally connected with the sea and was sexless. There may have been deities of the heavens, the earth, and the sea. Originally the first of these was the great god—one wonders if this did not influence the rise of the Persian ethic—but the invention of agriculture gave the priority in importance to the earth-goddess Ea in the mind of the people, while Marduk, the sun-god, remained officially the chief God. The invasion of Sumeria (early Mesopotamia) by the Semites brought the vegetation-goddess Ishtar [see], who superseded Ea and was associated with Tammuz. In the covering myth, Ishtar had a child by Tammuz and entrusted it to the goddess of the underworld, who developed such an affection for it that she wanted to keep it. The earth was desolate, and Ishtar appealed to Marduk, who ruled that the child must remain with the goddess of the underworld during a third of each year: the usual allegorization of the winter, spring, and summer seasons, though in Babylonia ignorance of astronomy (at an early date) disturbed the calendar and put the "death and resurrection" festival—to which Ezekiel ("women weeping far over Tammuz," VIII, 14) refers—in midsummer. The god was represented by the figure of a handsome young man lying on a bier. [See **Resurrection**.] How Ishtar later became an ethical deity and provided part of the mythological equipment of Mary is told under that title.

Tanit. The Phœnician form of the fertility-goddess, or Great Mother, who was the chief object of popular worship from Asia Minor and Crete to Syria and

Mesopotamia. Augustine describes, in his *City of God*, how he saw the ceremonies at Carthage, where Tanit was known as Ashtari, as late as the fourth century of the Christian era. The great temple at Carthage, founded by the Phœnicians and rebuilt by the Romans, was considered by some an eighth Wonder of the World. The priests of it were castrated and wore feminine dress, with long oiled hair and painted lips.

Taoism. The popular Chinese native religion. It claims to have been founded by Lao-tse [see], a contemporary of Kung-fu-tse. Unlike Kung, he mixed mysticism with his ethic, and it easily attracted all sorts of superstitions and ritual so that it became a religion of tawdry popular attractiveness and was favoured by Chinese monarchs who wished to keep the mass of the people ignorant and unthinking. Some of these tried to annihilate Confucianism, a code of life which stimulated thought. There is, as in the case of Christianity, a small amount of more refined, though very mystic, Taoist literature, but the prevailing religion which bears that name is a tissue of magic and superstition. For Chinese evidence that it is not taken seriously to-day by the natives, see **China, Religion in**.

Tarsus. The city from which Paul is supposed to have come. The large knowledge of it which modern scholars have put together explains why we might very well expect a new religious synthesis from a citizen of it. Probably it was one of the Ionian [see] cities, and by the first century it was one of the richest cities of the eastern Mediterranean and an obvious centre for the busy and advanced shipping of the time. It had therefore a high culture, and Stoicism was strongly represented in its university. All philosophies would be taught there, and the temples represented every Greek and Oriental cult. One of the leaders of the religious wing of the Stoics came from the district, and, on the other hand, the city was the special seat of the cult of Sandan, with an annual death and resurrection festival. [See **Paul**.]

Taylor, Helen (1831–1907), reformer. She was the step-daughter of J. S. Mill,

and she kept house for him after the death of her mother (1858). She not only devoted herself to his welfare, but co-operated with him in writing his *Subjection of Women* (1869). After Mill's death she did distinguished work for Rationalism, editing Buckle's works (1872) and Mill's *Autobiography* (1873) and *Essays on Religion* (1874). As a member of the London School Board she exposed the scandals of industrial schools and wanted the abolition of school-fees and the provision of free food and boots for poor children. She fed and shod a large number of children at her own expense.

Taylor, Robert (1784–1844), writer. A surgeon who in a mood of piety took orders in the Church of England, but was converted to Deism by a parishioner. He resigned, and stated this in advertising in the *Times* for employment. The distress of his mother caused him to return to the Church, but he was expelled because of the advanced Rationalism of his sermons. He founded a Deistic chapel and was twice sent to prison—for a year in 1826, and for two years, with a fine of £200, in 1831—for blasphemy. He was eccentric, preaching in episcopal robes and calling himself a Christian, but the very large amount of research in his *Syntagma of the Evidences of the Christian Religion* (1828) and *Diegesis* (1829), made them valuable quarries for Rationalist critics for half a century. It is advisable to check his quotations before using them.

Taylor, Thomas (1758–1835), Hellenist. He read Bolingbroke and Hume in college-days and became "a complete sceptic" (*Dict. Nat. Biog.*). A close study of Greek philosophy in his leisure—he was a bank-clerk—made him the leading authority on Neo-Platonism, and he reached a high position in the world of scholars by his translations of Plato, Aristotle, Plotinus, Jamblichus, Porphyry, Proclus, and Julian. His own creed was a sort of polytheism based upon Neo-Platonism (*A New System of Religion*, 1791).

Taylor, William (1765–1836), "Taylor of Norwich." A Norwich manufacturer who took an active part in the radical struggle until the French Revolu-

tion, and he then turned to philosophy and literature. He translated several works from the German and wrote a much esteemed *Historic Survey of the German Poets* (3 vols., 1820–30). He never attended church after his mother's death, and in an anonymous work, *Letter Concerning the Two First Chapters of Luke* (1810), he argued that Jesus was the illegitimate son of Mary. He is Pantheistic in his *Memoir of John Frensham*.

Tchaikovsky, Peter Ilich (1840–93), famous Russian composer. A Civil Servant with a legal training, who discovered that he had a genius for music, and after composing an opera, in 1867, produced a large number of songs, cantatas, etc., and was recognized as one of the first composers in Europe. It is now never mentioned that he was an advanced Rationalist. In his letters (*Life and Letters of P. I. Tchaikovsky*, Engl. trans., 1906) we find him using Theistic language until late in life, when he became an Agnostic. In the year before his death he wrote his brother that he was reading Flaubert, and said: "I have found some astonishing answers to my questionings as to God and religion in his book" (p. 688). Flaubert was an Atheist. A priest, at the request of his brother, administered the sacraments to him while he was dying and unconscious; as was done in the case of many distinguished Rationalists.

Tchekov, Anton Pavlovich (1860–1904), leading Russian novelist and dramatist. Although he was the son of a liberated serf, he was educated at Moscow University and devoted himself to letters. After 1890 he was considered the greatest Russian story-writer since Turgeniev. He wrote 150 short stories and a number of novels and dramas of the materialist school. His brilliant career was prematurely ended by consumption.

Telemachus. Religious literature, and much other literature, still tells how an heroic Eastern monk of that name broke into the arena at Rome during the gladiatorial games and so deeply impressed the Romans, by the sacrifice of his life, that they abolished the combats. The writers usually omit the date (about A.D. 404) and do not recall

that Rome had at that time been under Christian Emperors, who had made no effort to abolish the games, for 100 years; nor do they observe that the games continued in other parts of the Empire. It is more serious that scholars have long pointed out that the story is part of the mythical martyr-literature. No Roman writer of (or near) the time mentions such an occurrence. We first trace the story in Greek literature of fifty years later, and it was still later when Rome itself discovered this "St. Telemachus." The games [see] ceased because, after the Fall of Rome, there were neither Emperors nor Senators rich enough to finance them, as had been the custom. They had often cost tens of thousands of pounds for a day's entertainment. Gibbon (Ch. XXX) does, it is true, seem to endorse the legend, but adds: "I wish to believe it." The moral of the story, that the Church abolished human and animal fights, is amusing when we reflect on the appalling human combats (tournaments, etc.) of the Middle Ages, and the brutal animal fights as public spectacles, which the Church permitted until the sceptical nineteenth century reformed its ethical code.

Teleology. The science (or art) of detecting and proving an end (*telos*), aim, or design in nature. The arguments are discussed under **Design**; **God**; and **Purpose**; and in the article **Dysteleology** it is shown that, while the arguments for design are now worthless, since science has explained most of the phenomena and gives promise of explaining the remainder, nature is full of features which show the opposite of design.

Telepathy. A supposed power of one mind to communicate directly with another mind without the mediation of material organs. The claim was plausible at a time when the mind was regarded as a spirit, and certain types of novelists and mystic writers maintain it on this obsolete ground, attributing weird powers to Thibetan monks (the crudest and most ignorant in the world) and others. Now that even the thinker who holds to the spirituality of mind grants that it works through a material organ, the ground of the belief in

telepathy or thought-transference is removed. With the invention of wireless telegraphy a new basis for the belief was claimed. It was said (by Sir W. Crookes and others) to be entirely in harmony with science to suppose that one brain could send out etheric waves which another brain, properly attuned, might receive and interpret. The analogy breaks down when we consider the very elaborate character of the transmitter and receiver in wireless telegraphy and the high power required in the transmitter (whereas popular belief particularly attributes thought-transmission to dying persons with feeble brains). The existence or otherwise of some material transmission between brains, does not concern Rationalists; but in fact no claims on behalf of telepathy have yet been scientifically established, and large sums of money offered for proof have never been claimed. In 1911 an advertiser in the *Times* offered £1,000 for such proof, and for several years an offer of £100 was offered in the *Literary Guide*. See McCabe's *Spiritualism* (1920, pp. 193-4).

Templars, The. An abbreviation of the name of the Knights of the Temple of Solomon. Although it is still the general custom to speak of the high qualities of the knights of the Middle Ages, whose almost universal corruption is attested by the historical authorities [see **Chivalry** and **Crusades**], the undisputed story of the founding of the various orders of religious knights plainly tells of this corruption. The nobles and knights of the First Crusade, for whom at least religious writers claim real devotion, became so loose in their conduct in a few years that one genuinely religious knight at Jerusalem prepared to found a society of those who wished to lead straight lives and continue to fight the Moslem. He found that only eight out of all the Knights who survived in the East were willing to join him. These were the original Poor Soldiers of the Temple. The number slowly increased, and in 1128 they were incorporated as a monastic order with the usual three vows and the title of Knights of the Temple of Solomon or (from their device) the Red Cross Knights. They were barbaric in fight-

ing—"just brutal, pious, simple-minded men," says Professor Langlois—and in their houses they followed a modification of the Cistercian Rule. Their rare example of piety and asceticism attracted alms from all parts, and the communities, as is usual in the history of all monastic bodies, became wealthy and relaxed their rules. They established recruiting centres, which became opulent houses, in all parts of Europe, as the Temple district and church remind us in London to-day. In the twelfth century they owned all the land from Whitefriars to Essex Street, and there was a correspondingly large and rich estate at Paris (le Temple). By 1200, they were very rich and luxurious. Two of the popular phrases for heavy drinking were "He drinks like a Pope" or "like a Templar." They rivalled the Jews in banking, and had thousands of large estates and an enormous trade. It is estimated that their income was £6,000,000 a year, and, though Jerusalem had been won back by the Moslem, they did not stir a finger to regain it. Rome had received constant complaints about their luxury and vices since the middle of the twelfth century, but it shared the loot and took no effective step until Pope Clement V got the tiara through the French Court on condition that he initiated a trial of the preceding Pope Boniface VIII [see], and of the Templars. Catholic writers try to mitigate the situation, and throw doubt on the trials (in 1309) by protesting that the greedy monarch wanted the wealth of the Templars. It is true; though the spectacle of these thousands of idle and corrupt men living luxuriously in religious dress makes this "greed" not inexcusable. It is said also that, as horrible torture was used to extort confessions from the knights, we cannot trust the results. It is, again, true that they were tortured; and we are fortunate here that the apologist concedes, in his own supposed interest, the barbarism of the age—the beginning of the fourteenth century—which he usually denies. The feet of the accused were oiled and fired, splinters were driven under their toe- and finger-nails, weights were tied to their genital organs, and so on. Some underwent torture six or

seven times. A large number, including the Grand Master and three other leading Masters, confessed and were burned alive. The charges were the general practice of sodomy in all houses, obscenity in the admission of novices, etc. A religious monk would, of course, have faced any agony rather than admit such things if the charge were false; and all would know, in that Age of the Inquisition, that confession would be followed automatically by the death-sentence. After the recent revelation of general sodomy in German monasteries [see Monks] it is idle to say that the details are incredible. The French Court was of the highest character, and the Pope endorsed the verdict by suppressing the order. The other military orders (Hospitallers, etc.) fell into the same vicious and luxurious ways. Dean Milman has a long account of the trial in his *History of Latin Christianity* (1864, VII, 220–52), and see, for the whole subject, F. C. Woodhouse, *Military Religious Orders of the Middle Ages* (1879).

Temple, the Right Hon. Sir William (1628–99), statesman. After some years in the diplomatic service he was appointed Master of the Rolls for Ireland and created a baronet. Temple was one of the most elegant writers of his time, and the Deism in his chief works (*Observations Upon the Universal Providence*, 1672, etc.) greatly angered the clergy. Bishop Burnet says, in his *History of His Own Time* (II, 70): "He thought religion was only for the mob. He was a great admirer of the sect of Confucius in China, who were Atheists themselves but left religion to the rabble." An editorial note to this passage says: "The author should have done more justice to the character of this truly great man . . . one of the ablest, most sincere, generous, and virtuous ministers that any age has produced." The *Dictionary of National Biography* says that Temple was "untainted by corruption in one of England's most corrupt periods."

Temporal Power. A Catholic expression for the secular authority of the Popes in virtue of their ruling the Papal States. See article under that title for the origin and an account of the

gross mismanagement of the provinces. In what sense the infamous compact of the Vatican with Mussolini [see] has again made the Pope a temporal monarch is not plainly stated. Roman Officials say that "the Vatican City is not a State, but has a State." But it exchanges ambassadors like other Powers, demands a voice in international affairs, and sells titles like other Governments. More than a hundred American Catholics, generally rich, have the title from Rome of marquis, marchioness, knight, etc.

Tennyson, Alfred, first Baron (1809-92), poet. He is commonly represented as orthodox, and in 1882 he deeply offended Rationalists by attributing an unworthy character to an Atheist in his play *The Promise of May*. In point of fact, he held all his life the Pantheistic views which he expresses in the poem *In Memoriam*, doubted immortality, and rejected all Christian doctrines. The poet, Allingham [see], records, in his *Diary* (p. 127), that Tennyson said to him: "I believe in Pantheism of a sort," and that in 1867 he was "uncertain regarding the condition and destiny of man" (p. 149). His son and biographer reluctantly confirms this (*Alfred Lord Tennyson*, 2 vols., 1897). A few months before he died, the poet was persuaded to take the Communion—a fact which the religious press loudly advertised—but he warned the clergyman that he did not accept the Christian doctrine of it (II, 412), and he had no further attentions from the Church. A few days before death he spoke with great admiration of Giordano Bruno and Spinoza, and said of the former: "His idea of God is in some ways mine" (II, 424). Jowett says, in an Appendix to the biography, that Tennyson was "not an upholder of mystery-mongers," and Lady Tennyson admitted that he said to her: "About a future life we know hardly anything" (II, 467). C. F. G. Masterman (*Tennyson as a Religious Teacher*, 1900, Ch. XIII) has to admit all this, but does so, as one would expect, more gracefully than graciously.

Terror, The Red. A short period (1793-4) in French history, when executions and massacres were appal-

lingly numerous. It is usual to call this a stage in the French Revolution [see], but on the analogy of other revolutions we should say that the Revolution had occurred four years before the Terror began. Although the highest authorities in France have now settled the facts about every phase of the Revolution (1789-84), and historical works in other countries adopt their findings, false and confused statements about the facts are habitual in religious and popular literature, and are often incautiously admitted by academic writers who are not historians. The motive of this is now in part political, but it has always been for the most part religious. Such statements are understood to support the claim that "the outrages of the French revolutionaries"—to which are now added the (mainly imaginary) outrages in Spain, Russia, and Mexico in recent times—prove that a people that casts off the "restraints of religion" lapses into an animal ferocity and lubricity. The student who is familiar with the history of the Catholic Middle Ages and its grim record of savagery [see *Albigensian Massacre*; *St. Bartholomew Massacre*], massacres of Jews, etc., and vice, is apt to be impatient with the argument, but he must remember that few are now taught the truth about the Middle Ages, while, for the history of the last century and a half, popular disorders are alleged, even in schools, without the least regard to research.

Of the French Revolution in particular, the general public have a ludicrously confused and false idea. Three periods of violence may be distinguished in the five years following upon the Revolution of 1789, which are (especially by the apologist, who wants to put as many outrages as possible to the credit of "the revolutionaries") covered with the general title of the French Revolution. That there were many isolated outrages in 1789 surprises no historian. Only two centuries earlier the Catholics of France had perpetrated, and with no pretext but sheer religious hatred, massacres in which more people perished in four days than during the whole five years of what is called the French Revolution, with more savagery on the part of the butchers and under the lead

of the Catholic Court and nobles. Not the least effort had been made since then to elevate the people, who were illiterate to the extent of more than 90 per cent., and the tyranny and injustice of the Court and nobles and corruption of the Church had grown steadily worse since the beginning of the reign of Louis XIV [see]. But in 1789 the authorities checked the outrages, and the country entered upon several years of generally peaceful reconstruction until the country was threatened by invaders and civil war: for both of which the clergy and nobles were responsible. [See *French Revolution*.] Then, in 1792, the panic led to the September Massacre [see]. It is dishonest to quote this as an instance of what a city without religion will do when all, even conservative, historians admit that only a few hundred men were concerned in the massacre: that the people of Paris were filled with indignation and disgust; and that, as the aim was "to purify Paris" and half the victims were criminals or prostitutes, the perpetrators seem to have been largely religious fanatics. The country continued, apart from the religious civil war, on orderly lines until, at the end of 1793, the political quarrel of the Girondists and the Mountain reached a stage of passion and civil war. Robespierre, who led the victorious Mountain, not only believed in God and vituperated Atheism, but was so deeply influenced by his belief that he imposed the worship of God as the State religion. It was under the ægis of this return to a State-cult that most of the outrages occurred.

It is a repulsive page of history—one more added to the bloody chronicle of Christian Europe—but the common representation of it as a monstrous slaughter of priests, nuns, nobles, and pious Catholics, is completely false. The severest research has established about 18,000 deaths in two years (there were probably 50,000 in a few days at the St. Bartholomew Massacre), and, of these victims, 67 per cent. belonged to the working class and were practically all republicans. Only 8 per cent. were clerics and nuns, 6 per cent. aristocrats, 7 per cent. soldiers, and 12 per cent. middle-class men. Lavissee's standard

work *Histoire de France Contemporaine* (1920, II, 199) gives the analysis and the authorities. The *Cambridge Modern History* says that 2,628 were guillotined at Paris, and that "it is ludicrous to suppose that the butchers represented more than a few thousand of the people of Paris." In July, 1794, the moderates, "with public opinion on their side," says Sir R. Lodge in his conservative *History of Modern Europe*, united against Robespierre, and ended the Terror. Yet Catholic and other writers to-day still build upon the frantic reports of refugees that 600,000 to 700,000 were slaughtered and that they were mostly Catholic victims of a people "robbed of their religion." It is a platitude of the history of the time that, as will be shown in the next article, the Catholics entered upon a savage White Terror as soon as Robespierre fell. But the moderate men who had secured power checked this. It is ironic to add that they also abolished the Cult of the Supreme Being, and, with the return to general Atheism, the country passed into a condition of normal tranquillity and prosperity.

Terror, The White. The argument, based upon a scandalous perversion of historical facts, that the mass of the people are apt to break into savage violence when they abandon religion has been so flagrantly used in the interest of the Churches in our time that we give the facts in a score of articles of this work. The broad truth, which any impartial person would on reflection expect to find in history, is that from the Fall of Rome, in the fifth century, to the French Revolution the people, living under a despotic feudal system, had rarely an opportunity to indulge in such outrages, and whenever they had this opportunity (Peasants' Wars, etc.), or the authorities encouraged them (chiefly in massacres of Jews or heretics), these mediæval Catholics behaved without restraint. But it is an equally important general truth of European history that in all such cases the people merely borrowed the methods of their "betters," especially of the Church. We have shown that it was by violence that the clergy retained their authority in Europe from the period of its mental awakening,

in the twelfth century, to the Reformation, and in Catholic lands until the middle of the nineteenth century—a policy which it has eagerly resumed in our Fascist Age, its first opportunity to do so. Most people are, however, now encouraged in the idea that, while there may have been a lot of mutual slaughter of sectarians in past ages, it is particularly since the French Revolution that these mass-exhibitions of ferocity, or “red” outrages, have occurred. In various articles (*Democracy; Spain; Russia; etc.*) it has been shown that this claim has a thoroughly mendacious basis; that still in the last century and a-half the people, in their revolts, behaved with far more restraint than victorious reactionaries (of Church and nobility); and that, as everybody knows, it is chiefly in Catholic countries (Roman or Orthodox) that mass-outrages (Jewish pogroms) have continued to occur periodically. There is, however, a particular audacity in dating the legend of “Red outrages” from the time of the French Revolution, and it reflects very gravely on our system of education in school, college, Press, and literature, that this should be possible.

For the Red Terror was followed in France by a White (or Catholic) Terror, which was at least equal in savagery and may—this point is obscure—have been equal in the number of victims. One of the excuses made for the September Massacre was that there were large bodies of Fifth Columnists (Catholic conspirators) in the cities of France. At the fall of Robespierre this was shown by very serious revolts. At Lyons, 20,000 Catholics seized the city and fell with ruthless savagery upon the Republicans. In sixty-four Departments of the country there were similar, though smaller, revolts. Men and women were arrested and, without the pretence of trial, barbarously treated and murdered. At Marseilles alone, 200, mostly republicans put in jail in the late Terror, were butchered. At Tarascon, Catholic ladies were provided with seats to see eighty republicans dragged by the feet to the top of a tower and thrown into the river. In a large number of towns the victims were numbered by the hundred, and the Catholic savages often

swept country districts. Martin, who reproduces, in his *Histoire de France*, many of the documents in which the commission of inquiry presented its findings, says that “many thousands” were killed, and with “a mixture of cold cruelty and depravity which was more hideous than the brutal ferocity of the Jacobin Terrorists”; and the latter part of this sentence shows that Martin had no prejudices in favour of “Reds.” Some historians—see especially E. Dau-det, *La Terreur blanche* (1878) and Lavissee (Vol. II)—estimate that more were killed in these few months than in the Red Terror. Had the authorities at Paris not taken energetic action, the orgy of fanaticism would have been appalling. But that the firm control of the Directorate, and then of Napoleon, merely drove the fanatics underground was shown by a repetition of the outrages after Waterloo; and the monstrous spread of rape, pillage, and murder was now organized by Catholic nobles like the Duc d’Angoulême, and ignored by the restored monarchy until Wellington and the Allies protested. They were repeated at intervals during the next five years, and they were now, as is shown in the article *Democracy*, one section of a brutality that spread over Catholic Europe and in little more than half a century destroyed, with terrible brutality, the lives of about half a million unarmed men, women, and children. As in France, and in strong contrast to the revolutionary days, the outrages were applauded, if not organized, by “nobles” and priests. Few people have not heard the questionable story of republican women, at Paris, knitting as they watched the guillotine at work; but how many ever heard that, in the reaction, “the embroideress took the place of the knitters,” though this is certain in a large number of cases in France and Spain? A history of these features of the Revolution and the subsequent reaction is sorely needed.

Thackeray, William Makepeace (1811–63), novelist. He was educated in law, but deserted it for journalism and letters, and in 1847 his *Vanity Fair* placed him in the front rank of British novelists. He was the first editor of the *Cornhill*, and was for the next fifteen

years one of the most respected figures in the London literary world. Like Ruskin and Tennyson, he deprecated criticism of religion, but was, like them, a Rationalist. In a letter that is included in the *Letters of Dr. J. Brown*, Thackeray describes a certain preacher as "on the evangelical dodge," and exclaims: "Ah, what rubbish!" His chief biographer, H. Merivale, says that "he seems to have formed no very definite creed" (*Life of W. M. Thackeray*, 1891, p. 31). Louis Melville (*Life of W. M. Thackeray*, 1899, II, 105) quotes him saying: "About my future state I don't know: I leave it in the disposal of the awful Father." Melville, it is true, ascribes to him a prayer which begins "Our Lord Jesus Christ," but his authority here is unsound. Thackeray was—as confirmed to the present writer by his son-in-law, Sir Leslie Stephen—a Theist, but sceptical about a future life. Spiritualists claim him as an adherent, but he merely took a transitory interest in the movement while it was novel and little criticized.

Thanatism. Haeckel coined the word thanatism (from *thanatos*—death) and athanatism for disbelief or belief in immortality. The terms were not adopted, as there seems to be no reason to give a special name to people who reject the belief in survival.

Theism. Belief in God. The word, which first occurs in Cudworth's *Intellectual System of the Universe* (1670), was little used until rejection of the belief spread widely in the nineteenth century, and many were anxious to dissociate themselves from the Deists of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Compare the terms "Atheist" and "Agnostic," which now commonly mean the same thing. As is explained in the article **Deism**, an attempt has been made in recent times to distinguish between the terms by saying that the Deists believed only in a transcendent [see] God, while Theists believe in an immanent [see] God. It is shown that this is false, as the Deists admitted immanence just as Christians did or modern Theists do. Even some Protestant theologians have pointed out, disdainfully, that the words "immanence" and "transcendence"—"in the world"

or "above or outside the world"—have no application to a pure spirit. The distinction is part of the Modernist pretence to have made religious propositions more palatable. A second distinction is that the Theist is one who believes in God on rational philosophical arguments. Here again there is no real difference from the Deists, whose basis of belief was invariably philosophical argument; indeed, Catholic, and most Protestant, writers still profess to build on such a basis. Prof. Taylor, who proceeds on this distinction in the article "Theism" in the *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics*, makes the astonishing statement that the trend of philosophy since Plato has been in the direction of Theism. Greek philosophy [see] was overwhelmingly atheistic after Plato, who had very little influence on it, apart from a small minority of the Stoics and the semi-philosophical Neo-Platonists. The Schoolmen [see] were not free in what are called their philosophical speculations, but bound by theology, and in modern philosophy (Locke, Leibnitz, Hume, Kant, etc.) the trend has been toward the scepticism which is so common in recent philosophy [see] that most of its exponents do not regard the question of the existence of God as belonging to their province. In 1930 those interested in philosophy in America selected thirty-four leading representatives to give their theories, and expressly asked them to state their religious views. Only ten out of the thirty-four professed a belief in God (generally an impersonal God or a mere name). On the other hand, it is shown in the article "God," in the same *Encyclopædia*, that the Theistic philosophers, while united in condemning as irrational the popular arguments (First Cause, Prime Mover, Designer, etc.) for the existence of God, are very far from agreement as to what are sound arguments. Compare the widely divergent theories of Prof. W. R. Sorley (*Moral Values and the Idea of God*, 1924), Prof. A. S. Pringle-Pattison (*The Idea of God in the Light of Recent Philosophy*, 1920), Prof. S. Alexander (*Space, Time, and Deity*, 1920), etc. The Theist or Deist is properly one who believes in God, but rejects Christianity (and usually immor-

tality), and in the biographical notices in this work the description is assigned according to the expressed or assumed preference of the subject. In accordance with general usage the word "Theist" is considered more appropriate for Rationalist believers in God since the extinction of the old Deistic movement, about a century ago. Loosely, however, the title is given to any man, Christian or Rationalist, who believes in God.

Theocracy. Literally, a State that is ruled by God: in practice, a State that is ruled directly, not through lay politicians or monarchs, but by Churchmen or, like Tibet, by monks. It is obvious that a sharp line cannot be drawn. States with a clerical chief minister—in recent times Austria under Seipel, Slovakia under Tiszo, etc.—are hardly more theocratic (priest-ruled) than Spain, Portugal, Vichy France, Eire, and most of the South American Republics. The latter are, in fact, more entitled to be called theocratic than France was under Richelieu or Mazarin or even (normally) the Holy Roman Empire and most of the mediæval Kingdoms. It is a question of the degree of subordination of a State to the Church. The Roman Church still insists, in its Canon Law and even in recent Papal declarations, that it has power over the State on any question which the Church itself, the sole judge, chooses to regard as in any way affecting morals or religion.

Theodoric, King of the Ostrogoths (453–526). The life and work of Theodoric contain a lesson of great value to Rationalism which is entirely ignored in all encyclopædia notices of him, and not sufficiently pointed out in Hodgkin's generally admirable *Theodoric the Goth* (1891). It is vitally relevant to the question whether the Papacy promoted the civilization of Europe or whether the Goths and Vandals, as is usually said, so thoroughly destroyed the ancient civilization that the Church inevitably took six further centuries to initiate the nations into the elementary civilization of the twelfth century. Recent deplorable developments in Germany (since 1914) have made it easier for Catholic writers to

impose their untruthful version. Hilaire Belloc, clumsily echoed by G. K. Chesterton and other popular Catholic writers, has won wide acceptance for his claim that European civilization owes everything to the Romans and that the Teutons were always destroyers. As is shown in several articles of this work [**Christianity**; **Papacy**; etc.], this is the reverse of the historical truth. The only serious efforts made to rescue or restore the Roman-Greek civilization down to the fifteenth century were made by Teutonic monarchs and peoples—Theodoric, the Lombard Kings, Charlemagne (in a less degree), the Saxons (again a much less important attempt), and Frederic II—and the finest of these efforts were thwarted by the Papacy. The Goths who invaded southern Europe, in the fifth century, divided into two streams; Visigoths and Ostrogoths, or Western and Eastern Goths. The Visigoths, who settled in Spain and soon accepted Trinitarian or Roman Christianity, degenerated lamentably. The Ostrogoths, who settled in North Italy and remained Arians, made, under Theodoric, the finest of all efforts to restore civilization until the Arabs settled in Spain. Their story, like that of the early Arab rulers in Syria and Spain, completely discredits the Catholic myth that it takes centuries to raise men from barbarism. Theodoric was born in a camp of the barbaric Goths, and, although as a youth he spent several years (as hostage) at Constantinople, we see how little that degenerate Christian civilization did for him from the fact that he never learned to write his own name. Hodgkin, a fine student of the Teutonic peoples, but assuming the conventional account of the Byzantine Court, here makes one of his few mistakes. The Eastern Roman Empire had already become corrupt and brutal. Theodoric was a normal barbaric chief, and ruthless bandit, when he returned to the West, but the sight of the remains of the old civilization in Italy, where they were still massive and inspiring, gave him a lofty ideal. The next thirty years were, says Hodgkin, "a time of unexampled happiness in Italy," and Theodoric "ruled Italy with unquestionable justice and wise fore-

thought, making the welfare of every class of his subjects the end of all his endeavour, and cherishing civilization with a love and devotion almost equal to that which religious zeal kindles in the heart of its surrendered votaries" (p. 127). He was, in fact, the true successor of Hadrian, paying equal attention to the promotion of prosperity, justice, and culture. Though he was an Arian—the corruption of the Papacy did not dispose him to accept its rule—he was ideally tolerant. This "barbarian" offered the Romans a large sum to restore the splendid old monuments, and some of his own fine edifices in Ravenna still defy the hand of time. But Rome intrigued incessantly with the Greeks to destroy his work and secure his territory, and when, having no son, he had to leave his rule—he is credibly said to have been poisoned—to his accomplished daughter Amalasuntha, they induced the backward Gothic soldiers to rebel and ruin the civilization. It was restored and further developed a century later by the Teutonic Lombards—a new wave of "barbarians"—only to be ruined once more by the Popes. But the anti-Papal cities of the Ostrogoth-Lombard region never quite forgot their culture, even when Rome, in the tenth century, sank to savagery, and they led in the eventual revival of Europe. See Dr. Hodgkin's *Italy and Her Invaders* (8 vols., 1892-9) besides the above-mentioned biography.

Theology. The systematic exposition, analysis, and interpretation of the beliefs of a creed or religion. The not uncommon protest of liberal critics that they assail theology, but not religion, implies that either they misconceive the relation of theology to religion, or they hold an unusual definition of religion [see]. The man who rejects the Christian or the Catholic theology rejects the Christian or the Catholic religion. Most of the historic religions (Egyptian, Hindu, Persian, Jewish, Moslem, etc.) inevitably developed theologies. The Christian Fathers began the work in the second century. Controversies about the precise meaning of texts in the sacred writings of any religion always lead to this development. When all supernatural or revealed religion is dis-

carded, treatises on God and immortality are still correctly entitled "Natural Theology"; and even on the rejection of these beliefs the element of dogma is not necessarily escaped, for treatises on ethics are apt to be equally dogmatic.

Theosophy. Literally "wisdom about God," with the suggestion that its statements are much superior to the "knowledge" of God derived from nature, or the supposed revelations of the great religions and have come down more or less secretly from a wiser age. The name is now practically restricted to the Theosophical Society (or its creed), which was founded in the United States, in 1875, by Mme. Blavatsky and Col. Olcott. The chief founder, Mme. Blavatsky, was so transparent a fraud and adventuress, and the tenets are so crude from a modern point of view, that few are interested in it. At the time when the adventuress looked round in America for a new cult to provide her with a living, Thibet was still sealed against foreigners. While, therefore, some mystics looked to ancient Egypt for an esoteric wisdom—a practice which the progress of Egyptology rapidly undermined—Mme. Blavatsky chose Thibet. Later, freedom to explore the country showed how ludicrous her choice was. Thibet has never been civilized—even the civilization of China is far younger than that of India, Mesopotamia, and Egypt—and its monks are particularly crude and ignorant. The teaching foisted upon these fictitious Mahatmas of Thibet is, said the eleventh edition of the *Encyclopædia Britannica*—the article is, of course, now altered—"a crude compilation of vague contradictions and garbled extracts from various periods, books, and translations." It must be read elsewhere. The small society—its world-membership is about 5,000—has been split by violent quarrels, once over leadership, and once, in more recent years, by a moral scandal. For a temperate account of Mme. Blavatsky see V. S. Soloviev's *A Modern Priestess of Isis* (1875). J. N. Maskelyne's *Fraud of Modern Theosophy Exposed* (1912) and E. Garrett's *Isis Very Much Unveiled* (1894) are more drastic.

Therapists, The. An ascetic body

that multiplied in Egypt just before the beginning of the Christian era. We know them only from a short description in Philo's *Contemplative Life*, but they had so high a repute for asceticism and self-sacrificing service of the sick—the name means “healers”—that Bishop Eusebius claims them as a Christian sect. The authorities agree that they were pre-Christian and probably, like the contemporary Essenes, an outcome of the mystic-ascetic views which the Jews of the Dispersal [see] often adopted from their neighbours. To what extent they show Greek, Egyptian, Persian, or other influence is not agreed; but they, like so many movements of the time, testify to the rich development in the second and first centuries B.C. of the ascetic and mystic ideas which took shape in Serapianism, the later cult of Isis, Christianity, Neo-Platonism, Mithraism, etc.

Thiasoi, The. The Greek name for the trade-unions of the workers, called by the Latins *collegia* [see], which spread over the Greek-Roman world long before Christianity arose. The Greeks also called them *hetairia*, which means “comradeships,” not, as is often supposed, colonies of loose women. They probably originated in Lydia [see], where the brotherhood of man was particularly esteemed. A. Kalthoff's *Rise of Christianity* (1907) has a good account of them and their possible connection with the rise of Christianity (pp. 100-11); but see any Classical Dictionary.

Thibaudeau, Count Antoine Claire (1765-1854), French historian. A lawyer who joined the revolutionaries, and after the death of Robespierre became President of the Council of Five Hundred. Napoleon made him a count and Prefect of the Gironde. He was exiled by the royalists, but returned after the Revolution of 1830 and devoted himself to letters. His chief works, in which his Deism occasionally appears, are his *Souvenirs* (1836) and *Histoire generale de Napoleon Bonaparte* (5 vols., 1827-8).

Thiers, Adolphe (1797-1877), famous French statesman. A Parisian lawyer who, in the period of royalist reaction, wrote a fine and bold defence of the Revolution (*Histoire de la Révolution*

Française, 1823-7) and became the leader of the Liberals. As Minister of the Interior, Minister of Public Works, Minister of Foreign Affairs, and President of the Council, he won the repute of being the greatest statesman of France in the second half of the century, if not the greatest in modern times. As the democratic movement developed, he became more conservative in politics and retired to letters (*Histoire du consulat et de l'Empire*, 1845-62, etc.), but he strongly opposed the imperialism of Napoleon III, saved France in 1871, and was first President of the Third Republic. The more radical often attacked him in his later years, but he remained a loyal Republican and Agnostic until he died.

Third Eye, The. [See Pineal Body.]

Thirteenth Century, The. Since the development of cathedral-building and of universities culminated in the thirteenth century, Catholic writers have always selected it as the flower of the Middle Ages, if not the greatest century in history. Catholic influence, especially in America, has unfortunately led a few historians to give some support to the claim, and it is very widely advertised in popular literature. One would think that a century which opened with the savagery of the Albigensian Massacre [see], the development of the Inquisition, and the shame of the Fourth Crusade [see], and closed with the occupation of the “Holy See” by one of the most cynical and unscrupulous of the Popes, Boniface VIII [see], the opening of a long era of Papal corruption, and the terrible scandal of the Templars [see], would not lightly be selected for such eulogies. Academic praise of it is, in fact, often based on a misunderstanding or on a very partial selection of its brighter features. The weightiest authority of this school, for instance, Prof. Haskins (*The Renaissance of the Twelfth Century*, 1927) disdainfully observes that historical critics of the period “ought to know better,” and then says that they make it part of the Dark Age, in which they include “all that came between 476 and 1453.” It is explained, in the article **Dark Age**, that no historian extends the Dark Age beyond the eleventh century, and for a Harvard

professor of history to say that we include the great art of the twelfth, thirteenth, and fourteenth centuries, men like Bacon, Aquinas, Albert, and Frederic II, and the development of the universities and law schools in any Dark Age, is peculiar. A more resolute apologist is H. D. Sedgwick (*Italy in the Thirteenth Century*, 2 vols., 1913). He generally ignores the uglier features, and indulges in such rhetoric as this: "No other century can produce a list of men to match Innocent III, Frederic II, St. Francis, Ezzelino da Romano, Thomas Aquinas, Nocco Pisano, Giotto, and Dante." Omitting the very brutal (and now almost forgotten) Ezzelino, the three monks, and Frederic (who was not an Italian), how does his crop compare with the century of German history which produced Handel, Bach, Beethoven, Frederic the Great, Goethe, Schiller, Lessing, and Kant? Or the age of Elizabeth, Bacon, and Shakespeare in England? Or the Periclean Age at Athens? Or even the Victorian Age in science, letters, and statesmanship? Rationalists are accused of a grave lack of impartiality in historical judgment, and they are then confronted with these grossly partial characterizations of a century which even a Positivist writer, J. Cotter Morison (*The Service of Man*, cheap ed., 1903, pp. 64-8), pronounced, after careful study, "an age of violence, fraud, and impurity such as can hardly be conceived." We must, in fact, not allow too great an advance even on the Dark Age. Bryce, who had certainly no Rationalist bias, says in his *Holy Roman Empire* (8th ed., 1887): "During the three centuries that lie between Arnold of Brescia and Porcario the disorders of Rome were hardly less violent than they had been in the Dark Age." The period which he here stigmatizes as, in a most important moral respect, no better than the Dark Age is about 1150-1450, or the cream of the Middle Ages. Gregorovius fully supports his statement as regards Rome, and the authorities quoted under *Chivalry*; *Middle Ages*; etc., tell of the same condition in England, France, Germany, and Spain.

A balanced estimate of the character of the Middle Ages is attempted under

that title. The common procedure of those who accuse Rationalist historians of a vicious partiality is well illustrated in the case of England. They stress and idealize "the coming of the friars" (who were already corrupt [see *Franciscans*]), and they ignore, or mention only in a few misleading sentences, the appalling condition of the Court of Edward II and such spectacles as the public castration of a leading noble, before a crowd which apparently included women and children and the dissolute queen, for sodomy with the King. It is the same in every country and in all popular and religious accounts of the Crusades, Chivalry, the Guilds, and the Friars. See articles, with authorities, on each. The thirteenth century had, according to all the leading historical experts on that age, all the grossness—general sexual freedom, sodomy, cruelty, dishonesty, torture, public mutilations (eyes and testicles), etc.—of the mediæval period. Of the two prominent features of it which plausibly or superficially encourage the apologist, the first, the splendid development of art, is quite wrongly attributed to religious inspiration, and Rome was almost the last city in Europe to share it. [See *Art*; *Cathedrals*; *Renaissance*.] The second, the considerable growth of university life, was more closely and less flatteringly connected with the Church. [See *Scholastics* and *Universities*.] The intellectual movement, of Arab origin, made very promising progress *until* the thirteenth century, and it was precisely in that century that the Church crushed independent thinking and democratic aspiration, prevented the development of the new science, and diverted the mind of Europe into the sterile wastes of theology. In short, a broad and just view of the thirteenth century is that it witnessed an acceleration of the pace of the economic development which had been in progress for a century and a-half, with the usual gain to art and culture and the creation of a large middle class; but just in those moral respects in which we might look for religious influence—vice, cruelty, social injustice, lying, and general grossness—it remained part of one of the worst periods of normal history.

Thirty Years War, The. A war, or connected series of wars, from 1618 to 1648, which all historians admit to have been in very large part religious—most authorities say primarily or mainly religious—and to have been one of the most savage and destructive in history. Even the Catholic reviser (X) has not ventured to delete this sentence from the opening paragraph on it in the *Encyclopædia Britannica*: "It was primarily a religious war, and was waged with the bitterness characteristic of such wars." Starting in Bohemia, it raged as far north as the Baltic, and from the frontiers of France to those of Russia; and, says the new *Encyclopædia Americana* (which is saturated with Catholic influence), "few wars have been more calamitous in their general effect on the mass of the people, and the happiness and progress of mankind." The *Cambridge Modern History* (Vol. IV, 417-25) says that it furnished "the most appalling demonstration of the consequences of war to be found in history." No historian has been able to tell us the total loss, but the best estimate puts the deaths in the German (Roman) Empire alone at 10,000,000 (out of 16,000,000). In some provinces only a tenth of the population survived. In Bohemia 24,000 out of 30,000 villages, 600 cities out of 730, and more than 2,000,000 out of 3,000,000 people, were destroyed. Moral principle was suspended for a generation, and religion, for which the war was fought, was "trodden underfoot." Catholic writers of the time tell of armies of 100,000 German women following armies of 50,000 men and selling their services for a little food. The rival armies devoured Europe like swarms of locusts, and the overwhelming majority of the deaths were due to famine, disease, and outrages on civilians. There were parts of Alsace which had to be left uninhabited for a year because of the stench of the unburied dead (J. B. Ellerbach, *Der dreissigjährige Krieg in Elsass*, 1912). It is of incidental interest to note that half the hundreds of thousands of soldiers who raped or otherwise used German women without the least restraint for a generation were not Germans, but Scandinavians, Spanish,

etc., so that the historian smiles at the modern racial theory of "pure German blood." Whether the soldiers were Catholic or Protestant made no difference to their behaviour.

We are here chiefly concerned with the religious character of the war. Seeing that the Powers engaged were Catholic on the one side and Protestant on the other, and that the Catholic leaders appealed to the Pope throughout for subsidies on the ground that it was a war to destroy Protestantism, older historians, even Catholic, would have been astonished if any writer had hesitated to call it a religious war. In our age, however, when the Inquisition is defended in our most scholarly encyclopædia, the Reformation is described as a socio-political phenomenon, and the Dark Age is said to be a myth, there has been the inevitable attempt to represent the savage Thirty Years War as mainly or to a most important extent a political struggle or series of struggles. No one ever questioned that political antagonisms embraced the opportunity to assert themselves, but writers of this new school omit facts of primary importance. One such point is the undisputed fact that the Popes of the later sixteenth century, seeing the failure of all propaganda and of local armed conflicts, stored in the vaults of Sant Angelo a vast sum, equivalent to millions in modern money, for the purpose of a comprehensive military campaign to destroy the heretics. A second point of vital relevance is that the Jesuits, who were now the special fighters against Protestants and dictated the policy of Popes and princes, were convinced that the heresy could be extinguished only by violence, and they were the teachers and confessors of the Catholic nobility everywhere, preparing them for the struggle. Maximilian of Bavaria, who provoked the outbreak, the Emperors Ferdinand II and Ferdinand III, and the great Catholic generals Wallenstein and Tilly, were pupils of the Jesuits and very docile to them. Jesuits abounded in the camps—there were eighteen in one camp—fired the troops, and at times, as in the siege of Prague, joined in the fighting. Interesting as it may be to disentangle the political

elements, though even these were generally complicated by religion, the monstrous struggle stands out in history as the final effort of the Papacy and the Jesuits and their aristocratic and military pupils to crush Protestantism and freedom of conscience. One of the most ironic features of it is now rarely noticed. Near the end, in the years of exhaustion, the Catholic leaders, pleading that the aim of the war was precisely to extinguish Protestantism, called for the Papal treasure in Sant Angelo, which would, they said, give them victory. The miserable Pope of the time, Urban VIII [see], who had already incurred the anger of Catholics by secretly supporting France in its alliance with the Protestants, refused to grant any subsidy and squandered the whole treasure on his family. So even some Catholic historians now admit, for L. von Ranke gives documents in the Appendix to his *Popes of Rome* (Vol. III) which put it beyond question. See Urban VIII and McCabe's *History of the Popes* (1939, Book IV, Ch. II). Of the two most important recent English works on the subject, C. V. Wedgwood's *Thirty Years War* (1938), fairly appreciates the share of sectarian hatred, while H. G. R. Reade's *Sidelights on the Thirty Years War* (3 vols., 1924) is remarkable for the vast amount of research it expends on political and military aspects, and the skill with which it overlooks the most salient religious features and the conduct of the Jesuits and the Pope.

Thomas Aquinas. [See Aquinas, Thomas.]

Thompson, Sir Henry, first baronet, F.R.C.S. (1820-1904), surgeon. Professor of pathology and surgery at the Royal College of Surgeons, and surgeon-extraordinary to the King of the Belgians. The distinguished surgeon, created baronet in 1899, also wrote novels and painted pictures which were exhibited in the Academy and the Paris salon. In 1902 he aroused a good deal of discussion by a little book, a reprinted article from the *Fortnightly*, with the title *The Unknown God*. He described himself as "emancipated from the fetters of the creeds" (p. 85) and retaining only a belief in a Great Power. "I

am Agnostic to the backbone," he wrote to Clodd (*Memories*, p. 48).

Thompson, William (1785-1833), Irish economist. A wealthy Irish landowner who adopted the principles of Bentham and Robert Owen and sought zealously to spread them in Ireland. Long before the time of Marx he contended that all wealth ought to go to the producers (*Inquiry into the Principles of the Distribution of Wealth most conducive to Human Happiness*, 1824). He worked also for the emancipation of women, and he came to London to join in the Owenite campaign. An Agnostic of austere character, a vegetarian, and teetotaler who commanded general respect, he left his body to science and his wealth for propaganda.

Thomson, James (1834-82), poet. A teacher who joined Bradlaugh and wrote in the *National Reformer* over the initials "B.V." (Bysshe and Vanola, standing for Shelley and Novalis). His poetry was highly appreciated by D. G. Rossetti, and his most famous poem, *The City of Dreadful Night* first appeared in the *National Reformer* (March to May, 1874).

Thoreau, Henry David (1817-62), American writer. A teacher who devoted himself to writing on natural history and won a high reputation in America. From 1845 to 1847 he lived a very simple and solitary life in a hut at Walden, and the account of his experiences (*Walden, or Life in the Woods*, 1854) was much read throughout the century. He later supported himself by writing and by making lead-pencils. He belonged to the Transcendentalist group of Boston, and was a great friend of Emerson, whose vague Pantheism he shared. He was fond of quoting the line of Ennius: "I say that there are gods but they care not what men do" (C. J. Woodbury, *Talks with Emerson* (pp. 93-4).

Thorwaldsen, Bertel (1770-1844), famous Danish sculptor. Son of an Iceland wood-carver, he nevertheless had a thorough education in art, and received a Government grant to study at Rome. He became one of the most distinguished sculptors of his age, and was a member of the Copenhagen Academy and the Council of State. Although much of his

work was religious—notably the statue of Paul VII in the Clementine Chapel—he had rejected Christianity in youth under the influence of his passion for classicism. His only interest in it was artistic, he said, when people referred to his religious work: “Neither do I believe in the gods of the Greeks, yet for all that I can represent them.” He helps us to understand the mind of the Renaissance artist. A religious biographer, J. M. Thiele (*Life of Thorwaldsen*, Engl. trans., 1865), quaintly says that “even his greatest admirers failed to find in him that kindred spirit to Christianity which is deemed essential to the happy delineation of holy and sacred subjects.” He left his sculptures and 75,000 *thalers* to the City of Copenhagen.

Time. [See *Space and Time*.]

Tindal, Matthew, B.A., D.C.L. (1657–1713), lawyer and writer. A London lawyer who became a Roman Catholic in the days of James II, but reverted to Protestantism and violently inflamed the clergy by his *Rights of the Christian Church Asserted Against Romish and All Other Priests Who Claim an Independent Power Over it*. The libels of him which the clergy put into circulation are refuted in the *Dict. of Nat. Biog.* The book was burned by the common hangman, but Tindal went on to publish a Deistic work, *Christianity as Old as Creation* (1730), which was of much use to Voltaire and other Deists. He called himself a Christian (in the ethical sense) Deist, but the Bishop of London prevented the publication of his reply to his critics.

Toland, John, M.A. (1670–1722), Irish Deist. He was believed to be the son of an Irish priest, and was educated at Glasgow, Leyden, and Oxford Universities. He adopted Deism at Leyden and wrote his *Christianity Not Mysterious* (1696), which the House of Commons ordered to be burned and the author arrested. He is often represented, by writers who have never read his work, to be a superficial popular writer, but he was a brilliant linguist and an accomplished and much-travelled man. He was received with great respect at the Courts of Hanover, Potsdam, and Vienna, and he dedicated

his *Letters to Serena* (1696) to the Queen of Prussia, but he was bitterly persecuted in England and Ireland. In several pamphlets he is openly Deistic and anti-Christian, and he inaugurated the broader phase of English Deism.

Toleration. The admission of the practice of other religions than that associated with the State, or the attitude, adopted on principle, not as a matter of expediency, that all religions have a right to freedom. In the ancient world the question rarely arose on account of the plurality of deities and cults. Intolerance was asserted only when the priests of one cult tried to secure a monopoly as the priests of Aten did in Egypt in the days of Amenophis IV—whose sceptical predecessors had been ideally tolerant—the Taoist priests in China in a few periods, the Persian priests on various occasions, and the Jewish authorities after the establishment of the cult of Jahveh. Confucian monarchs in China were very tolerant, even to Jews and Christians, until political complications arose in modern times, and the heavy persecution of Christians in Japan was provoked by the mutual charges of bodies of rival missionaries that they were agents of their respective Powers. The Greeks were completely tolerant except of “atheism,” by which they meant an explicit denial of the existence of gods; though in the Greek colonial cities even this was often permitted to the philosophers and their followers. The Romans legalized all religions which did not threaten to injure the State, as did the cult of Bacchus (on account of its orgies), and Judaism and its Christian offspring on account of the chronic revolt and anti-Roman literature of the Jews. The story of persecution of Christians by the Romans is, however, based mainly upon a literature of unprecedented forgeries. [See *Martyrs and Persecution*.] There were only two short periods of general persecution, on civic grounds, and only a few hundred victims can be definitely traced in two and a half centuries. The Moslem are falsely said to have learned intolerance from Mohammed and [see] the Koran, and it is false that the spread and conquests of the Arabs were due to a zeal

to impose Islam on unbelievers [see]. In Syria, Spain, and Sicily, where there was much scepticism amongst the Caliphs and Emirs, there was complete toleration of Jews and Christians except when, at rare intervals, fanatics acquired power over the ruler. The Jews in particular, had their golden age under the Arab rulers of Spain, and the millions of Christians lived in perfect amity and freedom with the Arabs except for short periods when fanatics on either side wrought mischief. See McCabe's *Splendour of Moorish Spain* (1935).

It is therefore one of the clearest facts of religious history that the Christian Church, until the seventeenth century, and the Roman (and in part the Greek) Church until to-day, have far surpassed all the other religions of history in intolerance. The early Church adopted that policy within twenty years of its own escape from repression, and it is the emphatic position of the law of the Roman Church to-day. The adoption of the policy is described under **Christianity; Paganism; and Persecution**. Before the end of the fourth century the practice of any religion but the Christian was forbidden by a series of imperial decrees under pain of imprisonment, confiscation, or death, and Leo I (440-61) laid it down in his letters that the death-penalty for dissenters, which began to be inflicted during his pontificate, was just because "those who fear corporal suffering will have recourse to spiritual remedies" (*Ep.*, XV, etc.). As Europe passed into the dense general ignorance of the Dark Age, in the next century, rebels were rare, but the policy was truculently applied as soon as Europe began to recover and to think. From 1100 onward the death penalty was increasingly inflicted until, after 1200, massacre was used (Albigensians, etc.) on an appalling scale and tribunals were set up all over Europe. [See **Inquisition**.] One historian, Sprenger, estimates that there were more than 10,000,000 victims during the next four or five centuries. The Protestant Churches at first used the civil law, into which Rome had got its policy introduced, against the Catholics, but the rise of the Jesuits had by this time

coupled political intrigue with religious zeal, particularly in England, and the Catholic "martyrs" were generally political conspirators. Protestant nations generally abandoned the death-sentence after the Thirty Years War. England, which had never admitted the Inquisition, annulled its law *De haeretico comburendo* (that heretics must be burned) in 1678.

Roman Catholic countries continued to apply the policy in its most ghastly form until the growth of scepticism checked it: first in France, where Voltaire made a superb defence of Protestant victims; then in Italy, Spain, and Latin America. With the downfall of Napoleon and the final extinction by the Holy Alliance of the finer ideals of the French Revolution, the Church of Rome reasserted its murderous policy. [See **Democracy and White Terror**.] But since two of the five members of the Holy Alliance were Protestant and one schismatical, while scepticism spread again in the fourth (France) and fifth (Austria), the naked policy of religious intolerance had to be clothed. Rebels against the Church were identified with rebels against absolute monarchy, and the Powers of the Holy Alliance acquiesced until after the middle of the century, when modern humanitarianism asserted itself, and Rome was compelled to allow British and American Catholics to profess religious tolerance. In the first quarter of the present century Catholic literature in Britain and America was chaotic and largely dishonest on the subject. The stricter apologists, like Mgr. Ryan, a leading moral theologian and economist of the American Church, provoked smiles when they tried to defend the principle of intolerance by a bland claim that Catholics have a right to toleration or complete freedom everywhere and must not be expected to extend these to Protestant countries because "error has not the same right as truth" (*The Catholic Church and the Citizen*, p. 36). Most of the Catholic apologists, especially in America, contended that the Church had abandoned the policy, and even that they would not obey if Rome ever tried to enforce it. The bolder claimed, indeed, that the

principle of liberty in the American Constitution was borrowed from the mediæval theologians Aquinas, Suaren, and Bellarmine, and that Rome was the first to apply it to religion. [See *Maryland*.] It is shown, in the article *Death Penalty*, that, while apologists were writing these things for the public, Rome was issuing in a dead language—but the living language of the clergy—manual after manual of Canon Law (by Marianus de Luca, Cardinal Epicier, Fr. Cappello, etc.) with emphatic claims that the Church “can and must put heretics to death,” elaborate arguments in support of the claim, and stern condemnations of Catholic writers who said that the law was abandoned! The British and American Press refused to print a word of the Pope’s open letter in the *Osservatore Romano* on May 20, 1929, in which, while saying nothing about “the right of the sword,” he insisted on the Catholic principle of intolerance and recognized Mussolini’s permission of Protestant worship in Italy solely as a matter of expediency. Critics of the Church of Rome can hardly be expected to discuss it with courtesy when they find its interpreters to the public so gravely misrepresenting its solemn official teaching, and this teaching a flagrant defiance of the fundamental principles of modern thought. This intolerance, a relic of a semi-barbaric age that is clearly maintained only in the interest of the priesthood, is the real basis of all the Catholic appeals to crush Bolshevism by violence, for the Papacy could not on its own principles erupt into such sacred fury against an attempt as such to alter the inequality in the distribution of wealth. Bishop Creighton’s *Persecution and Tolerance* (2nd ed., 1906) is too discursive. An accurate and thorough history of Roman Catholic intolerance and persecution is required.

Tolstoi, Count Lyev Nikolaevich (1828–1910), Russian moralist. His experiences as an aristocratic officer in the Crimean War deeply influenced him and made him turn to humanitarian work. In this he found that he had the advantage of a brilliant literary style, and his didactic novels were read all over the world. His influence, however,

was checked by his development of a drearily ascetic ideal of life and his refusal to consider patiently the human potentialities of science. In his later years the world honoured him for the consistency of his life and the high quality of his earlier art, but the essays he continued to write were arid and of comparatively little influence. He was a Theist, but, while he called himself a Christian on ethical and sentimental—and entirely uncritical—grounds, his writings contemptuously reject Christian doctrines.

Tone, Theobald Wolfe, B.A., LL.D. (1763–98), Irish Deist. A Dublin lawyer who, stimulated by the French Revolution and literature, was converted to Rationalist and Republican ideas. From the inevitable persecution in Ireland he passed to America, later to France, returning to Ireland for the rebellion of 1798. When he was arrested he tried, and failed, to commit suicide, “I am sorry I am such a bad anatomist,” he said. He refused the ministration of a priest, and in his diary (published by Barry O’Brien as *The Autobiography of Wolfe Tone*, 1873) he drastically rejects Christianity and deplores the “horrible religious discords” it excites (I, 114; see also 40–45). Few Irishmen who boast of their brilliant patriots of French revolutionary days know that most of the abler of them were Rationalists.

Tooke, John Horne, M.A. (1736–1821), writer. He was admitted to the bar, but his father insisted that he should become a priest of the Church of England. Adopting Rationalist ideas, he discarded the clerical dress and took to politics. He visited Voltaire at Fermy in 1766, and in a letter to Wilkes afterwards regretted that he had ever had “the infectious hand of a bishop waved over him.” He resigned his living, but kept the clerical title, and, as “the Rev. Horne Tooke,” was one of the most prominent figures in the reform-movement of the time. He was condemned to a year in prison and a fine of £200 for defending the American revolt, and was later charged with high treason for his defence of the French Revolution. The legal authorities refused to let him practice, and the

political authorities would not let him take the seat in the House to which he was elected, on the ground that he was a clergyman; and one biographer calls him "a great stickler for the Church of England." The truth is that he sufficiently showed the faith of his later years by leaving instructions (which were disregarded) that he was to be buried in his garden at Purley, and the only speaker was to be his Atheist friend Sir F. Burdett [see]. Such was almost the only "clergyman" in England to take part in the work of reform in those perilous days. His *Diversions of Purley* (2 vols., 1786, 1805) was one of the most successful literary works of the time.

Torture, Christianity and. A feature of the Dark Age, and even of the second and brighter part of the Middle Ages, that seems to justify the application of the word "semi-barbarous" was the appalling extent and savagery of the use of torture. The infliction of it, either as punishment or to extort confessions, was generally abandoned by peoples when they rose to the level of civilization, and it had a very restricted place in the older codes of law. Even in the case of China it is not an institution that was taken up from barbarism to the civilized level, but was, experts say, introduced into Chinese life at a later date from some part of the surrounding barbarism, probably by a barbaric usurper. In the Babylonian Hammurabi Code [see], and the Hebrew Code that was founded upon it, we find it only in the form of the *lex talionis* (an eye for an eye), and many authorities think that this was obsolete. Hindu law, especially from the time of Asoka [see], whose criminal legislation was, like that of Chinese Emperors of the T'ang Dynasty, very humane, was equally enlightened. Torture was almost unknown in Greece except in the case of slaves, and the partial recognition of it in Roman law was sternly condemned by the Stoic-Epicurean moralists and jurists (Seneca, Ulpian, etc.). Under the Republic only slaves had been tortured, and, although the Emperors extended it to freedmen for crime when that class increased, the law was again moderated by Diocletian before the

period of Christian influence began. The fiendish tortures described in stories of the martyrs are like the other stupid anachronisms of such stories. Most of these tortures were unknown to the Romans. The stories, in fact, are useful in showing how rapidly Europe sank from the civilized to the barbaric level, for they reflect the environment (generally of the sixth and seventh centuries) in which the fictitious lives of the martyrs were composed. The use of torture, apart from burning heretics alive, which Pope Leo I [see] encouraged in the fifth century, began unofficially in the ghastly quarrel—ironically a quarrel about the divinity of Christ—with the Arians in the fourth century, within a few decades of the attainment of liberty by the Church. In the fierce sectarian hatreds of that quarrel fiendish torture was used. Women, especially "sacred virgins" on either side, had their breasts crushed or scorched, were beaten with thorn-clubs, and were compelled to sit on hot iron plates. The Goths and Vandals were humane in comparison. The barbarism spread also in the Greek or Byzantine world, in spite of the failure of the "barbarians" to invade it; but we are here chiefly concerned with Europe.

The development cannot be traced here. It is enough that when, in the Dark Age, the Teutonic peoples had settled down as the German, French, and other nations in their early form, a monstrous and universal practice of torture spread over Europe and the Byzantine Empire. The study of codes of law is here of minor interest. During the Feudal Age—to the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries—the owners of the serfs (who were at least four-fifths of the population) inflicted torture and mutilation on them, for real or suspected offences, without restraint. During the early reigns of the Norman Conquest, kings and nobles devised and inflicted the most horrible tortures on Anglo-Saxon offenders or any, even clerics, monks, and nuns, who were suspected of having concealed money or treasure (Freeman's *Norman Conquest*, 6 vols., 1870-5, *passim*, and Trill's *Social History of England*, Vol. II). Jews were

everywhere tortured on the same ground; and during what is called the Age of Chivalry (1100–1400) the knights, nobles, and even princes and “noble” ladies (who often led their own bandit troops), wrought fiendish tortures, sometimes with their own hands, on travellers, priests, monks, nuns, etc., who were believed to have hidden treasure. See, especially, the *Historia* of Ordericus Vitalis (a Norman monk), Books 3–6. Practice was in those days not a reflection of codified law, and contemporary chronicles tell a different story from that of experts on legal codes. Abélard [see] tells, in his *Historia Calamitatum*, how, having been castrated by the hirelings of a canon of the Paris cathedral in 1118, he demanded the legal infliction of the same mutilation, as a matter of common usage, on the canon; and as late as 1500 we learn from a Venetian ambassador (quoted by Thuanes in his notes to Burckhard’s *Diarium*) that castration was still practised on offenders by the Papal authorities at Rome, the victim having to carry the tokens of his guilt through the streets on a pole. As we find pious abbots castrating their monks for irregularities as early as the year 600, this ghastly torture was used all over Christendom for nearly 1,000 years. Cutting or burning out the eyes was an even more common practice. Chopping off hands or feet or ears, and cutting out tongues or piercing them with a hot iron, were equally common, so that a crowd in the early Middle Ages must have presented a pitiful spectacle. To say nothing of the judicial duel or ordeal of the Dark Age, boiling oil—coiners (cheaters of the King) were boiled in oil—and molten lead were poured over offenders, they were broken on the wheel or nearly torn asunder on the rack, the bones of the lower leg were broken with the “Spanish Boots,” and the thumbs with thumbscrews, weights were hung from the genitals, water dripped from a height on to the stomach, the feet were washed with salt water and goats brought to lick the soles, intense hunger and thirst were inflicted, men were hung up for hours by the wrists or (sometimes in the case of nuns), smeared naked with honey and spread in the sun to

attract insects, hot boiled eggs were fixed under the armpits of men or to the breasts of women, legs were wrapped tight in calf-skin and boiling oil poured over, hands or feet were burned off, string was tied tight round the head, nails were torn out and teeth broken, the flesh was torn with red-hot pincers. . . . Traill’s *Social England*, for this country, and Prof. Luchaire’s *Social France in the Time of Philippe August* (Engl. trans. 1912) give appalling cases and describe the knights and nobles of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries as taking a “ferocious delight in torturing all classes,” religious as well as lay. Bernard de Cahuzac, a high French noble, cut off the hands and feet and cut out the eyes of 150 monks and nuns in one community and left them to die because, he said, they had hidden their treasure. His “noble” wife assisted him, and with her own hands split the breasts and tore out the nails of the women. It will not be forgotten that in those days there were no anæsthetics or antiseptics, and surgery was itself deadly; or that just at this time—the beautiful thirteenth century—the Church consecrated the system in the practices of the Inquisition. So deep-rooted was the passion for torture that precisely when Italy was brightest with art and gaiety, during the Renaissance, the use of torture became more fiendish than ever. Two important Italian nobles invented a system of torture which was called the “Quaresima,” because it was so arranged that the victim would linger through forty days of torture. Burckhardt’s classical work on the Renaissance stresses the ghastly cruelty of that age of beauty and—some would have us believe—of piety. In France the *Archives de la Bastille* (Vols. V and VI) record that two grim forms of torture were used at Paris, and very frequently in 1680: The Spanish Boots (for breaking the bones of the lower limbs) and the “question by water” (ten quarts or more being poured into the body even of noble women). Voltaire’s *Treatise on Toleration* reminds us that Protestants were broken on the wheel as late as 1762. In England also we must not look to the law, but to the historical record of practice.

Sir W. Holdsworth's *History of English Law* (12 vols., 1903-38) hardly mentions the word "torture" until the sixteenth century, yet in Norman times it was as barbaric in England as in any country. In his fifth volume the author observes that it was illegal by the common law, but the Crown could order it. We see in the historical works quoted above that not only the kings, but every baron, made a ghastly use of it.

The wicked French Revolution finally abolished the official use of torture in all countries which its armies conquered, but at the fall of Napoleon it was resumed by the joint authorities of the State and the Catholic Church. It was used in the jails of the Papal States (Orsini's *Austrian Dungeons in Italy*, 1856) as well as those of Austria (less grossly), Naples, Spain, and Portugal. The recovery of sceptical humanitarianism after 1870, and the destruction of the Pope's temporal power, led to a general cessation of the use of torture except in Russia; but the idea that it was first resumed—to say nothing of the stupid idea that it was started—by either Bolsheviks or Nazis betrays an extraordinary ignorance. Torture, often of a fierce or an indecent character, was used in the jails of Catholic Spain [see] in the early years of the present century, and is used to-day in the same jails, and those of Portugal, Brazil [see], and other countries. The great Rationalists of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries (Montaigne, Bayle, Voltaire, Montesquieu, Beccaria, etc.) stirred the conscience of Europe against it after the Church had used or sanctioned it for more than 1,000 years; the Deists and Atheists of the French Revolution and Napoleon abolished it; but the countries ruled by the Roman Church have furtively returned to it whenever they had the opportunity. That feature of Catholic Christendom—Protestant countries abolished it much earlier—taken in conjunction with the general sexual licence, grossness, cruelty, social injustice, general illiteracy, persecution of opinions, etc., that accompanied it, shows the insincerity of the modern plea, which some sceptics repeat without serious historical inquiry, that Christianity in general, or Romanism in

particular, promoted civilization in Europe. There have been periods of reaction (Dark Ages) in the history of every long-lived civilization, but no period of brutality of equal duration to this; besides that, the modern apologists profess to regard the four centuries during which torture was most extensive and most ghastly, according to all authorities, as the choicest part of the Ages of Faith. No work on this aspect of European history is available. Prof. Letourneau's *L'évolution juridique* (1891) has a good section on torture in the Middle Ages, but general works on torture (F. Helbing, *Die Tortur*, 1913, E. Moret, *Histoire des supplices et des tortures*, 1889, etc.) are not helpful. Dante's description of hell (based on mediæval practice) gives a good idea of the barbarism. For torture in Catholic jails to-day see McCabe's *Papacy in Politics To-day* (1937). For atrocious torture in Portuguese jails, under the present Catholic-Fascist regime, see G. Seedes, *The Catholic Crisis* (1939).

Tracy, the Marquis Destutt de. [See Destutt de Tracy.]

Tracy, Count Antoine Louis Claude Destutt de (1754-1836), French philosopher. Father of the preceding (who is better known as Destutt de Tracy) and, it is believed, son of a Scottish adventurer, in France, named Stuart (corrupted to Destutt). One of the King's musketeers, then a colonel in the royal army, he accepted the Revolution and became a Field-Marshal. During the Terror he returned to the study of science and philosophy, and was a close friend of Cabanis and Condorcet. At the Restoration he was made a Peer, "but was chiefly occupied with philosophy." His principal work, *Elements d'Idéologie* (4 vols., 1817-18), is materialistic and regards theology as "a part of zoology." Jefferson, a great friend and admirer, translated it into English, and it had considerable influence in America. The chief recreation of Tracy's later years was to have Voltaire read to him.

Transcendentalism. A word of various meanings in the history of religion. The scholastics evaded the charge of anthropomorphism by saying that the attributes of mind are in God in "a

transcendent degree." Modernists now make it the antithesis of "immanence" [see] and say that the Deists recognized only a God outside man and the universe, or transcendent. [See articles under **Deism** and **Theism** for refutation.] The name is most often applied to the school of very liberal Theists or Pantheists of New England, who adhered to Emerson [see].

Transmigration. The supposed passing of a soul from one body to another of a different species, or metempsychosis [see]. Reincarnation is the transit to a body of the same species. The belief, which lingers in stories of were-wolves, etc., was very widespread in pre-civilized Asia and Europe, and is borrowed from Hindu philosophy as a sublime truth by a few mystics. From the scientific point of view it is below the level of discussion. [See **Mind** and **Prehistoric Man**.]

Transubstantiation. The changing of one substance into another: specifically the mediæval belief, amazingly retained in the Roman Church to-day, that in the ceremony of the Mass the priest, by breathing Latin words over wafers (of flour and water) and wine, converts their substance into that of the living body of Christ. The liberal writers who are lenient to Catholic doctrines and practices have no conception of the real crudeness of this doctrine. Not only are the shape, colour, taste, etc., of bread and wine, which are unchanged, called "accidents" which can remain when the "substance" is destroyed by the miracle, but the "presence" of Christ under these appearances has to be taken in the most literal sense. The living physical body of Christ, "whole and entire," with his human and divine personalities, must be believed to be present in every crumb of the wafer and every drop of the wine! The Church does not tolerate the slightest modification of this dogma, and the educated Catholics who tell friends privately that they accept only a symbolical or mystic connection of Christ with the consecrated wafers would at once be expelled from the Church if they wrote this. [See also **Eucharist** and **Mass**.]

Tree, Sir Herbert Beerbohm (1853-1917), actor. Son of a German named

Beerbohm, he became one of the greatest actor-managers of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. He also wrote a few small works, and he confesses his Rationalism in his *Thoughts and After-Thoughts* (1913). He believes that in time there will be "only one religion—the religion of humanity" (p. 30). He says of Shakespeare: "His wide spirit will outlive the mere letter of narrow doctrines, and his winged words, vibrant with the music of the larger religion of humanity, will go thrilling down the ages, while dogmas die and creeds crumble in the dust" (205).

Tree of Knowledge. There were sacred trees and sacred drinks (the soma of the Hindus, haoma of the Persians, nectar of the Greeks, Grail of the Celts, etc.) in nearly all early and ancient religions. The belief in a vegetation-spirit is the general explanation of this, but the discovery of wine led to a special cult of the vine as a means of communication with a divine spirit. Babylonian seals and Assyrian bas-reliefs show that there was a particular cult of sacred trees in Babylonia, and from there the Hebrew legend was derived. Some writers see a sexual meaning in the legend.

Treillard, Count Jean Baptiste (1747-1810), French statesman. A Parisian lawyer of high repute who accepted the Revolution and was one of the most pressing in the Assembly for the secularization of the Church and the burial of Voltaire in the Pantheon. He sat in the Convention, but was inactive during the Terror. He was later President of the Council of Five Hundred and one of the three Directors. Napoleon, who greatly esteemed him, made him President of the Paris Court of Appeal, Councillor of State, Count, and Grand Officer of the Legion of Honour. He had an important share in the drafting of the Code Civil and was a man of austere and universally respected character. He never abandoned Deism.

Trelawny, Edward John (1792-1881), writer. He is best known as an intimate friend of Shelley, with whom he lived in Italy. It was he who recovered Shelley's body and saved his heart from the flames. He also went with Byron to help the Greeks, and, among other

picturesque adventures, he swam the Niagara just above the falls. He wrote *Records of Shelley, Byron, and the Author* (1858). Swinburne describes him as "World-wide liberty's life-long lover." He was an aggressive Atheist, and held that Shelley "couldn't have been the poet he was if he had not been an Atheist." Edward Carpenter, to whom he said this, says that he "rolled out the word 'Atheist' with evident satisfaction" (*My Days and Dreams*, p. 121).

Trelawny, Sir John Salisbury, B.A., ninth baronet (1816–85), statesman. After serving some years in the army and at the Bar, he entered politics, and was chairman of various parliamentary committees. As chairman of the committee on Church Rates he issued a report which was full of thrusts at the Church, which he detested. He translated *The First Two Books of Lucretius* (1842), had a good deal to do with the passing of the Affirmation Bill, and was a strong supporter of Holyoake (see his letters in *Life and Letters of G. J. Holyoake*).

Trench, Herbert (1865–1923), poet. He was for some years Director of the Haymarket Theatre, and highly esteemed for his poems, in which he discloses a vague Pantheism ("Apollo and the Seaman" and others in *New Poems*, 1907). He vigorously rejects Christianity and says of Jesus: "His Kingdom hangs as hangs the tattered flag—Over the tomb of a great Knight of yore."

Trenchard, John (1662–1723), Irish politician. A barrister who, inheriting a fortune, devoted himself to political reform and Rationalism. In 1709 he published his Deistic *Natural History of Superstition*. He founded the *Northern Whig* and wrote letters weekly in the *London Journal*. Entering the British House of Commons, he was an ardent advocate of reform. The obituary notice of him in the *Biographia Britannica* described him as "one of the worthiest, one of the ablest, one of the most useful men that ever any country was blest withal." His scepticism was so notorious that he was widely believed to be the author of D'Holbach's virulently anti-Christian *Contagion sacrée*.

Trent, The Council of (1562–63). When the Papacy had been degraded for some 200 years [see *Renaissance, Popes of the*], the Church was compelled, especially as the Papal revenue fell sharply with the growth of Protestantism, to listen to the demand of Reform. For the unreality of what Catholics call the Counter-Reformation see article under that title; and the Council of Trent, which the faithful (especially the German princes) required the Pope to summon for the reform of the Church "in head and members," evaded the question of moral reform as far as possible and devoted itself chiefly to formulating a code of doctrine for the condemnation of heretics. By 1530 practically all northern Europe, including England, was lost to Rome, and the city itself had, in 1527, been thoroughly sacked and ravaged by the armies of the Catholic Emperor; yet the Papal Court clung to its corruption and obstinately rejected every plan of reform. The luxurious Clement VII (1523–34), a bastard of the Medici family, was succeeded by a Pope, Paul III (1534–49), who owed his advancement to the fact that his sister had been the favourite mistress of Pope Alexander VI, and who was himself the acknowledged father of four children. Protestantism was making rapid progress even in France, the German Emperor was alarmed, and the small minority of cardinals who were in favour of reform won increasing support. Few realize, from modern historical writing (under Catholic pressure) on these matters, that these few reforming prelates and scholars had for nearly a century drawn up plans of reform which included a quite repulsive account of the condition of the Church everywhere, yet the "Holy See" had turned down every plan and clung to its luxurious debasement. In 1536 the Pope, alarmed at the prospect even in Germany, began to toy with the idea of a Council. What the Germans demanded was a conference in which the leaders of the Reform would meet and discuss with Papal representatives. The Pope retorted that the Council must be held in Italy (where the Inquisition might make short work of the Reformers)

and under his own presidency, with the result that, on the date he announced for his Council, only five prelates took the trouble to appear. Three years later the desperate Emperor saw the Pope and insisted that a Council be held outside Italy, and thus Trent, near the frontier, came to be chosen. But the hypocrisy of Rome was still so obvious that when the Papal Legates arrived (1541) they found not a single bishop, and four months later only a dozen were present. The Pope willingly suspended the Council, but the advance of the Turks in Europe added to the troubles of the Church, and the Emperor persisted. That the real design of the Papacy, which was outraged at the idea of discussing with heretics or allowing any but itself to talk of reforming the Church, was to get the Catholic monarchs to unite and suppress Protestantism by force was so clear that when the Council of Trent opened, in December 1545, only twenty-five prelates attended, and the number had risen to only sixty in the following June. The sittings had again to be suspended, and the Emperor, seeing the Pope bent only on "the suppression of heresy," and incidentally on getting further wealth for his own worthless Farnese family, threatened to bring his army to Italy. Paul died at this juncture, but the Papal Court was still so stubborn in its corruption that the cardinals elected a more scandalous Pope than ever. Catholic historians like Pastor dispute only the charge, which was widely believed in Rome, that Julius III was a sodomist during his pontificate. The general grossness of his character is admitted. He was forced to resume the sittings of the Council, but they were again suspended, and did not effectively begin until 1562. There were grisly quarrels, especially as the Spanish and French cardinals wanted to check the Papacy, and the Italians retorted with unpleasant remarks about the new disease (syphilis) which the Spaniards had imported and the French were spreading in Europe. When German prelates described the corrupt condition of the Church, the Papal Legates insisted that the reform of this was the business of the Pope alone. The reform measures which

were passed—forbidding the sale of indulgences and the duel, and demanding an improvement of the morals of the bishops, clergy, and monks—had no effect in Catholic countries. The real work of the Council was, while rival schools of theology wrangled bitterly, to draw up a code of definitions of Catholic doctrine which would guide the Inquisitors when the war for which the Papacy still hoped (and which it attempted in the Thirty Years War) should have crushed the political power of the Reformers. The classical authority is the *History of the Council of Trent* of the contemporary Fra Paolo Sarpi, a learned Venetian priest of high character. Catholic writers generally make gross attacks on the work, but the above facts are almost all admitted by the leading Catholic authority on the period, Dr. L. Pastor. On the other hand, the usual Catholic accounts of the Council, which are too indulgently accepted by some American historians, are grotesque. They represent it as part of the Counter-Reformation [see] by which the Church is supposed to have purged itself, without pressure from outside, of such corruption as existed. There was no reform of the Church in Italy, France, Spain, and Portugal.

Trevelyan, Arthur (died 1878), writer. A Scottish landowner, brother of Sir W. Trevelyan, who actively supported Holyoake and the Secularist movement. He wrote to Holyoake: "I will thank you to propose me as a member of your Atheistical Society" (*Life and Letters*, I, 98). He wrote *The Insanity of Mankind*, which appeared in Holyoake's *Reasoner* (1850), and contributed to the *National Reformer*. He was at one time Vice-President of the N.S.S.

Trevelyan, George Macaulay (b. 1876), historian. As the name suggests, he is a grandson of Lord Macaulay, and he has attained a leading position in British historical literature (*History of England*, 7th ed., 1937, *England in the Age of Wyclif*, 4th ed., 1909, etc.). Particularly valuable are his works on the wresting of Italy from the Papacy (*Garibaldi and the Thousand*, 1909, and *Garibaldi and the Making of Italy*, 1911, etc.). He was for some years an Honorary Associate of the R.P.A.

Trinity, The. Most of the ancient religions—Egyptian, Persian, Hittite, Greek, Hindu, etc.—had trinities as families of gods, but the Christian Trinity was separately developed, so details of other religions may be read in the *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics*. Modernists, who are embarrassed by the absurd theological doctrine of the Trinity, attribute it to the “subtlety” of the Greeks—Greek Christians were hardly more subtle than our Fundamentalists—and call it a “damnable heritage” from the Greeks. It developed naturally out of the passionate squabbles, very largely conducted by ignorant monks, about the nature of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost (or Spirit) of the New Testament, and the Aristotelian ideas of “substance” and “person” were invoked to compose formulæ. There are supposed to be three “persons,” but one divine “substance” in the Trinity. The Roman Church suffers no modernist gloss on this archaic formula.

Tropisms. As is stated in the article on Instinct, that supposed “faculty” of animals is now resolved into an equipment of neuro-muscular or physico-chemical automatic movements in the animal organism, and there are corresponding movements in the plant. The word “tropism” means “turning,” and one of the simplest examples is the turning of flowers and leaves toward the sun under the influence of light (photo-tropism). Gravitation, or the attraction of the earth (geotropism), similarly stimulates movement and is illustrated in the downward growth of the roots. Warmth, chemical action, and other influences, cause such responses. The word was first used by the botanist De Candolle, for the movement of flowers, in 1835, and geotropism was detected in 1868. The research was considerably extended before the end of the last century, and Professor J. Loeb [see] discovered, by an immense number of experiments, that tropisms are found throughout the animal economy and explain the movements which had hitherto been called instinctive. See his *Forced Movements, Tropisms, and Animal Conduct* (1918). A very large number of physiologists took

up the research, and the literature is now enormous. Tropisms are automatic responses of the entire organism to physical stimulation (light, heat, gravity, chemicals, humidity, flow, etc.) just as reflex action is the response of a single organ. Models of insects have been made (with a small electric battery and motor and selenium cells for eyes) which will circle round and finally dash into a light just as a moth does. Great progress has been made in interpreting “instinctive” movements in the animal world by treating the organism as a complex mechanism of tropisms, hormones, enzymes, and automatic nervous responses; but this branch of biology is still young, and the writers who expect us at once to explain the more complicated activities of insects, birds, and mammals betray a large ignorance of scientific matters. The advance has discredited Vitalism [see] and enormously strengthened the materialist or mechanical theory of life. A useful summary of research is given in T. H. Savory's *Mechanistic Biology and Animal Behaviour* (1936), and a good short account in Wells and Huxley's *Science of Life* (1938 ed., pp. 1049–53). See also C. J. Herlick's *Neurological Foundations of Animal Behaviour* (1936). Although the science of tropisms is the most deadly blow at Vitalism, it is hardly noticed in Vitalist works like L. R. Wheeler's *Vitalism* (1939—one of the latest defences of it.).

Truce of God. A temporary suspension of warfare, chiefly over the week-end, observed or prescribed by the Church. Apologists represent this as a triumph of the Church in imposing at least an instalment of restraint on warring forces. The truth is that mediæval troops had no respect for priests, churches, or monasteries, and the clergy repeatedly tried to get this truce in their own interest. The Church never tried to enforce it as a law—warring Popes like Gregory VII never ordered their troops to observe it—and there is no trace of it before 1041. The only Pope who sought for a time to obtain it, Urban II, acted in the interest of his Crusade. The only scholarly study of it now available, with full documents, is L. Quiddé's *Histoire de la paix publique*

en Allemagne au Moyen Age (1929). The distinguished pacifist shows that the appeals for it by the clergy were local and occasional and there was little response. Most of the Christian references to it are sheer romance.

Truelove, Edward (1809-99), publisher. A follower of Robert Owen who, at the failure of the Owenite Movement, set up as a seller of advanced literature, and later as a publisher. He published works of Voltaire and Paine, and in 1858 he was charged (but not tried) for publishing W. A. Adam's *Tyrannicide*. In 1878 he was sentenced to four months in prison for publishing R. D. Owen's *Moral Physiology*, a quite puritanical Malthusian work.

Truth. Ever since Plato made a spiritual reality of the True, or Truth, much fantastic literature has been written about it. A few apologists still contend that the Good, the True, and the Beautiful, are bases for the belief in God, while some philosophers and moralists cling to the theory that we can know "higher" or "deeper"—it is a sufficient reflection on this sort of rhetoric that these contradictory words are used with the same meaning—truth by intuition [see]. For a time the discovery of Relativity led even a few scientific men to say that all truth was relative, or that what science teaches is the best "approximation" to the truth of which we are at present capable. Truth is a relation of correspondence between words or ideas and realities, and no one seriously questions that myriads of statements in science and history as well as ordinary life do correspond to reality.

Tucker, Abraham (1705-74), philosopher. A wealthy provincial who took up the study of philosophy, followed Locke, and became a Deist. His *Freewill, Foreknowledge, and Fate* (1763), published under the pseudonym of "Edward Search," has an important place in Deistic literature.

Turgenev, Ivan Sergievich, D.C.L. (1818-83), Russian novelist. Son of a Russian noble and educated at St. Petersburg and Berlin Universities, he devoted himself to letters and had to wait many years for recognition. He is now regarded as one of the greatest of

the brilliant Russian writers of the last century (*Virgin Soil*, 1876, etc.). He suffered imprisonment and exile for his radical sentiments, though his realistic pictures of peasant life had a large share in securing the emancipation of the serfs. Oxford University gave him his degree in Civil Law (1879). All his work excludes religion, and his biographer, Pavlovsky, says that he "was a Freethinker and detested the apparatus of religion very heartily" (*Souvenirs sur Tourgenief*, 1887, p. 242).

Turgot, Anne Robert Jacques, Baron de Laune (1727-81), famous French statesman. He was trained for the priesthood, but in his twenty-fourth year he decided that he "could not bear a mask all his life." He took up the study of law and political economy and rose in office until he became Controller-General of Finance, one of the greatest statesmen of his age, and one of the founders of the science of political economy. He had met Voltaire in Switzerland in 1760, and he was closely associated with him and the leading Rationalists of Paris for the rest of his life, contributing various articles to Diderot's *Dictionnaire Encyclopédique*. Except as a warm advocate of religious freedom (*Lettres sur la tolérance*, etc.), he wrote nothing on religion, and it is not clear whether he was an ordinary Deist or a Pantheist, but he identified himself with the great Rationalists, and the clergy eagerly joined in the plot to overthrow him.

Turkey, Religion in. The Turks had embraced Islam when they moved into nearer Asia, and, down to the time of the revolt against the Sultan, all except the Young Turks, who had been to a large extent educated in Paris, were Moslem. When Ataturk [see] rose to power, after the 1914-1918 war, and determined to modernize the country, he felt that vigorous action against the Churches must be included in his measures. There was no reference to religion in the New Constitution (1928)—in Western language, Islam was disestablished—the Caliphate was abolished, woman emancipated, and a modern law of marriage and divorce introduced. Clergy of all religions were forbidden to wear their religious garb except during service.

and, as Dr. H. E. Allen says, the nation was made conscious of its "heritage of corrupt despotism and religious bigotry" (*The Turkish Transformation*, 1935, p. 37). A short account of the revival of the country which had been regarded with contempt throughout Europe, though the average Turk of Asia Minor is a fine type, is given in E. W. F. Tomlin's *Turkey: the Modern Miracle* (1940). No figures are available, but the Atheism of Ataturk and his coadjutors spread rapidly in Constantinople and other cities.

Turner, Joseph Mallard William (1775-1851), painter. Son of a London barber, he had in boyhood a wretched life, which may in part account for the eccentricities of his later years; but he contrived to get an education in art, and had his first picture in the Academy in 1790. He became an Academician at the age of twenty-eight, and is now recognized as one of the greatest artists of the century. At his death he left his pictures to the nation and his whole fortune of £140,000 to found a home for decayed British artists. Ruskin, who fought strenuously for recognition of his genius, often reflects on his generosity and calls him "an infidel." P. G. Hammerton says, in his *Life of Turner* (1879, p. 367), that he "did not profess to be a member of any visible Church," and his chief biographer, W. Thornbury, regrets that at the approach of death he "had no religious hope to cheer him" (*Life of J. M. W. Turner*, 1862, II, 275).

Turner, Matthew (died 1788 or 1789), chemist. A Liverpool surgeon who became equally distinguished in chemistry, surgery, and anatomy. He was one of the founders of the Liverpool Academy of Art, at which he lectured. Priestley was inspired by one of these lectures to take up chemistry, but years later Turner published a very able reply to Priestley's theistic arguments (*An Answer to Dr. Priestley's Letters to a Philosophical Unbeliever*, 1782). He used a pseudonym, but Richard Carlile later published the book under his name (1826). Turner is described in the *Dictionary of National Biography* as a man of great respectability and attainments, and "an Atheist."

Twins, Identical. Twins which develop from the same ovum instead of from two different ova (as in three cases out of four). Systematic observation in recent years has discovered that identical twins have the closest possible resemblance to each other, even in details of behaviour. They begin to differ only under the influence of environmental differences and, as the years go on, may diverge considerably in character owing to such differences. The discovery has done much to reaffirm the influence of environment which the genetic theory had for some years thrust into the background or denied. It is also one of the very numerous discoveries in modern science which confirm the theory, which is accepted in the majority of recent American psychological works, that the "mind" [see] is only a name for the functions of the brain. See *Twins: A Study of Heredity and Environment* (1937), by Professors Newman, Freeman, and Holzinger.

Tylor, Sir Edward Burnett, D.Sc., D.C.L., F.R.S. (1832-1917), anthropologist. In early years he was employed in the brass-founding business of his father, a Quaker, but he developed consumption and travelled in Mexico, on which he wrote several works. In 1865 his *Researches into the Early History of Mankind*, including the first outline of his theory of Animism, put him in the front rank of anthropologists. His more famous *Primitive Culture* appeared in 1871. He was the first Gifford Lecturer and was professor of anthropology at Oxford. Apart from his theory of the natural origin of religion, he never clearly defined his Rationalist position.

Tyndall, Prof. John, Ph.D., LL.D., F.R.S. (1820-93), physicist. He was born in Ireland, and entered the Irish Civil Service, but was transferred to England. He taught mathematics at the Owenite College at Queenswood, but went to Marburg, where he graduated in philosophy, and was, in 1853, appointed professor at the Royal Institution. Already a Rationalist, he became a close friend of Huxley and one of the finest lecturers on science in England. A series of lectures in America made a profit of £7,000, and he gave this for the

popularization of science there. In 1874 he was President of the British Association and delivered the famous Belfast Address, the boldest utterance in such circumstances of any British scientist (published in the R.P.A. Reprint of his lectures, 1903). His ringing challenge, "We claim, and we shall wrest from theology, the entire domain of cosmological theory," caused

a nation-wide discussion. He later explained that he was not a Materialist or Atheist, but an Agnostic, as he left open "the mystery in which we dwell." He was a man of very severe character, and "in the pursuit of pure science for its own sake, undisturbed by sordid considerations, he shone as a beacon-light to younger men" (*Ency. Brit.*).

U.

Ueberweg, Prof. Friedrich, Ph.D. (1826-71), German philosopher. The son of a Lutheran pastor, he became professor of philosophy at Königsberg and wrote several works of distinction, chiefly his standard *History of Philosophy* (Engl. trans., 3 vols., 1872). Lange, in his *History of Materialism*, quotes Czolbe saying that Ueberweg was an Atheist and Materialist. As is common in this connection, Ueberweg himself denied this and claimed to be an Ideal Realist and Agnostic.

Uhland, Prof. Johann Ludwig, LL.D. (1787-1862), German poet. A lawyer who succeeded so well with a volume of poems, in 1815, that he devoted himself to letters and came to be recognized as one of the finest lyrical poets in Germany at that time. He had the chair of German literature at Tübingen, but he was compelled, after four years, to resign on account of his Rationalist and other advanced opinions.

Ulpianus, Domitius (wrote about A.D. 211-22), jurist. One of the great Stoic lawyers of the classic period of Roman law. He worked under Alexander Severus and was his chief adviser. The originals of his work are lost, but citations from him form about a third of the *Digest* of Justinian and evince a high moral spirit, in accordance with the "Law of Nature." He was murdered by the soldiers for curtailing their vicious privileges.

Ultramontanism. A term used in Romanist controversy and applied to those who, in an exaggerated degree or

against the national interest, look "beyond the mountains" (*ultra montes*), or to the Papacy, for guidance.

United States, Religion in. The United States Government is one of the few that still publish what purport to be official statistics of religion. The latest decennial "census" was taken in 1936, and reported 55,800,000 members of Churches in a total population of 126,000,000. In 1926 the number given was 54,500,000. The general population had increased about 10 per cent. in the decade; Church-membership had increased by only about 2 per cent. Especially as the Churches claim that their members generally avoid birth-control, which they all condemn, these figures indicate serious losses. The Baptists (1.2 millions), Methodists (7 millions), and Presbyterians (2.5 millions) admitted heavy absolute losses, not simply relatively to the growth of population. The chief increases claimed were those of the Roman Catholics (19.9 millions), Jews (4.6 millions), and Lutherans (4.2 millions); though, in view of the increase of population in the decade, these increases were not as large as they ought to be and they betray losses. It is to be noted that these six religious bodies, which constitute more than 80 per cent. of the total of Church members, are almost entirely Fundamentalist. The Methodists, who in America are less reactionary than the Baptists, could not be so described as a body, but they admit a loss of a million members in the decade. The Protestant Episcopal Church, corresponding

to the Church of England, and allowing great latitude because it includes such members of the wealthy and professional classes as find it expedient to support a Church, has only 1.7 million members. The Congregationalists and Christian Churches (now merged) number less than a million. The Universalists, whose Churches are little more than Ethical Culture Societies, number 54,000, and the Unitarians, many of whose Churches do not insist on belief in God, 64,000: and both bodies indicate an absolute loss. The statistics very strongly disprove the claim that the general public is attracted to Churches which jettison the old dogmas, or that even a large minority of Church-members have surrendered such doctrines.

On these figures, and setting aside the 4.6 million Jews, Christianity would be in a far better position in America than in other leading civilizations—the proportion of church-goers in France (in normal times) and Great Britain is at most one-fifth of the population—and the American Churches claim even larger figures. In 1939 they reported a total of 64,000,000, and the Catholic Directory claims 21,000,000 members. These differences are peculiar because the statistics published by the Government—ironically, by the Department of Commerce—are obtained from the clergy. There is no religion clause in the census papers. A distinguished clerical writer, the Rev. Dr. McConnell, says that they are “worth less than nothing” and that “not one parish in ten could find and locate one half the number of members it reports” (*Christianity, an Interpretation*, 1910, p. 229). Catholic officials, in particular, count lapses as well as practising (actual) Catholics, and the Catholic Archbishop of New Orleans had recently estimated the loss of his Church at about 4,000,000 in a few years (Catholic News Service, N.C.W.C., January 17, 1942). See **Roman Catholic Church** and J. F. Moore, *Will America Become Catholic?* (1931). In view of the much higher percentage of the agricultural or small-town population in America than in Great Britain, and the very large coloured population, as well as the great wealth—E. T. Clark (*The Exchequer of the*

Churches, 1932) estimates it at £7,000,000,000—and business methods of the Churches, there is naturally a higher total percentage of church-goers (between a fourth and a third) than in Great Britain; but, in the cities, occasional probes have disclosed a situation analogous to that of British, French, and German cities.

Universality of belief in God. It was at one time usual for religious writers, and it is still not uncommon in Catholic literature, to claim that all men in all ages have believed in God, and that therefore the belief is as normal an assertion of the mind as the belief in a material world. The factual basis of the argument is itself unsound. The Negritoes [see] have no belief in gods, and most experts on the Australian aborigines [see] say that they have none except where we can trace European influence. It is, however, a waste of time to-day to argue on this point, as the idea of religious instinct or intuitional perception is completely discredited in modern psychology [see]; yet it is only by an appeal to some such instinct that an argument could be made out of the supposed fact. When we find savages (from the Melanesian level upward) unanimous in the belief in gods, then the belief decaying at each notable advance of culture [see **Golden Ages**], and finally a world-wide growth of scepticism in the most enlightened of all ages and spreading in proportion to the intellectual quality of each class, the argument is clearly the feeblest of all the generally discredited “arguments for the existence of God.”

Universe, The. Some confusion is caused by the practice, since the expansion of astronomy in the last century, of speaking of “other universes than ours,” whereas the word is commonly understood to mean the sum total of material realities. Etymologically it means a unified system and is therefore properly given to each of the isolated systems or galaxies of stars. As no other such systems except the one to which our sun belongs were known before the nineteenth century, the word came to have the meaning of the totality of material bodies. When other systems, like the “nebula” in Andromeda,

separated from ours by vast stretches of relatively empty space, were discovered they were commonly described as "other universes" or "island universes." Astronomers now say that photographs indicate millions of them, and the next extension of the telescope will probably reveal far more. Astronomers generally speak of them as "galaxies" (Milky Ways) and of the whole collection as the Cosmos.

Universities, Origin of the. It is a prominent feature of the Catholic claim that the Church rendered valuable service to education to say that it "gave the world schools." [See Education.] That there were in Rome (and a few other Roman cities) higher schools (generally free) with a wide range of studies may be read in any history of education. They were not called "universities," because the word *universitas* had a different meaning in Roman law and usage. It meant a corporation or association. In the thirteenth century, when the Latin language was already debased, it was applied to associations of masters of various subjects in central schools, or schools in which law, medicine, or theology, or all three, were taught in addition to the Liberal Arts. Until 1233 they were called General Studies. On account of the scandalous neglect of the Arab-Persian civilization by European and American historians, no writer on the subject mentions that it had higher general colleges, free to most students of this kind, by the hundred long before the year 1000, from Spain to eastern Persia, and that numbers of Christian scholars (like Gerbert) were taught in these. Cordova alone had several hundred colleges, and in some at least of these philosophy, literature, history, and science (in a dozen specialized branches) were taught as well as theology. See Prof. Rivera's *La enseñanza entre los Musulmanes Españoles* or the summary in McCabe's *Splendour of Moorish Spain* (1935). It was under the stimulation of this tremendous Arab and Persian zeal for education, from the ninth century onward, and their collections of books (running to half a million when no Christian library had 2,000 [see Libraries]), that the few old

schools that had lingered through the Dark Age in Europe rose slowly to the status of universities. Rome was the last city to share in the development, and the earliest were the most clearly in contact with Arab culture. The (predominantly) medical schools of Salerno, on the fringe of the Sicilian-Arab world, and of Montpellier, the nearest in France to the Spanish-Arab cities and a centre of Jews from Spain, are usually counted the first. Rashdall, whose work is considered the chief authority, though later research has corrected it on some points, says that they were not universities, but medical schools; but Prof. Powicke corrects this in the second edition of Rashdall's work. They go back to the eleventh and twelfth centuries. Bologna is counted the first by Rashdall; and it was a centre of the old Lombard [see] zeal for culture and was now under the influence of the Arab south of Italy. Paris ranks next, and no one disputes that it was brilliant independent masters like Abelard (twice condemned for heresy) who drew crowds of students to it, or that France was more advanced in school-life because it was, through semi-Arab Barcelona, nearest to the Spanish schools. Oxford, under French influence, was next. But it is another gross defect of Catholic literature on the subject that it repeats wild mediæval estimates of the number of scholars which Rashdall, Coulton, and other authorities, have thoroughly discredited. Prof. Thorold Rogers says that these figures (30,000 to 50,000) claim "ten times more than the possible truth" (*Six Centuries of Work and Wages*, 1884, p. 167). The general conclusion is that about 3,000 is the upper limit, and from a few hundred to a thousand usual; but some hold that about the year 1300 the Paris University may have had about 6,000 (one mediæval writer says 60,000) scholars. By that time, however, the interference of the Church had perverted the teaching in the higher schools. Science was excluded, philosophy turned into "the handmaid of theology," and history, or a weird version of it, regarded as incidental. Most of the universities were chiefly occupied with theology, and the

crowds of students were no longer wandering scholars, but mainly clerics and monks. Dean Rashdall's *Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages* is the standard work, but should be consulted in the second edition (3 vols., 1936). N. Schachner's *Medieval Universities* (1938) is too lenient to the Church, though he admits that "the principle of authority was made a fetish." Helen Waddell's *Wandering Scholars* (1927) is interesting, but does not describe the origin of the wandering-scholar development in Spanish influence.

University College, London. Many references in the present work to this college, the nucleus of London University, make it advisable to say a little about its origin. Some professors, especially since its inclusion in the university with King's College and the Birkbeck Institute, prefer to forget its early connection with Rationalism, but it was expressly founded as a protest against the influence of the Church of England at Oxford and Cambridge, and the chief workers for its foundation were Rationalists. Prof. W. P. Ker, author of the *Oration on the Founders and Benefactors of University College* (1899), admits that it was the poet, Thomas Campbell [see], who in his resentment of what he called "superstitions' rod," started the idea of a college in London independent of the clergy; that the men most active in the establishment of it were Bentham, Mackintosh, James Mill, Grote, and Brougham, and that it was known as "the radical infidel college." Bentham, Grote, and Mill were aggressive Atheists. The Non-conformists, Catholics, and Jews had an equal interest in the founding of a university—the first prospectus spoke of it as a university—free from the control of the Church of England; but the Jews and Catholics did little (with one Jewish exception), and the Non-conformists far less, than the Rationalists, though all of them said that there was little Rationalism in the country. See Prof. Ker's *Notes and Materials for the History of the University College, London* (1898), and, especially, Croom Robertson's observations in his article on Grote in the *Dictionary of National Biography*. It was agreed that religion

was to be excluded, but the Nonconformists at once demanded that a minister should be appointed to the chair of philosophy, and Grote, Mill, and Brougham strongly opposed. The University was opened in 1829 with the chairs of mental and moral philosophy vacant, and when, later, a dissenting minister was appointed, in order to "appease orthodox sentiment" (or get funds), Grote resigned from the Council. The name was changed to University College in 1836. Grote returned to the Council and defeated an attempt to appoint Martineau to the chair of philosophy. At his death he left £6,000 to endow the chair of philosophy on the emphatic condition that no minister of religion should ever be appointed. A short history, to be pressed upon students when the normal life of the University reopens, might be useful.

Urban VIII (1623–44), Pope. He deserves special attention for two reasons. Apologists for his condemnation of Galileo represent him as a patron of science and a man of high character, who was quite pained at Galileo—they say—forcing the issue upon the Church; and, as his pontificate comes after the supposed Counter-Reformation and purification of Rome, the question of his true character is doubly interesting. It is shown, in the article *Galileo*, that the aged scientist did not provoke action by the Church, and that, instead of Urban treating him "with every consideration," he directed the whole persecution with great cruelty because he believed that Galileo had made fun of his pretence of a knowledge of astronomy. All Rome despised his abnormal conceit and arrogance—his slight patronage of culture was merely part of his pose as a great monarch—and the latest Catholic historian of the Papacy, Hayward (*History of the Popes*, 1931), very severely criticizes him and finds that, owing to his conduct, "the Papacy began to abandon the guidance of the world." Even the *Catholic Encyclopedia*, though its articles on the Popes are gross, charges Urban with "excessive nepotism." It is a mild expression for the way in which he promoted the fortunes of his utterly

corrupt family, the Barberini, by a colossal diversion of Church funds, and, from the Catholic point of view, to the very gravest detriment of the Church. Ranke shows that the income of his brother and three nephews rose from 20,000 to 400,000 crowns a year, and that they heaped up a fortune of, in modern money, about £100,000,000 (*The Popes of Rome*, II, 396, etc.). Rome and all Italy cursed the Pope. Indeed the whole Church hated and abused this "serene friend of science," as some of the apologists represent him, because a very large part of the wealth he showered upon his worthless family was a great fund collected by earlier Popes for the success of the war against the Protestants. The war ended in a compromise, or the victory of the Protestant powers, largely because of his refusal of the money and because he preferred the profit of his family to the fortunes of the Catholic powers. The *Cambridge Modern History* exposes his conduct and quotes him as actually saying, in a public speech at Rome, that Gustavius Adolphus, the great Protestant champion, was "rendering to Christian Rome services like those of Camillus to the pagan city" (IV, 68). For other authorities see McCabe's *History of the Popes* (1939, pp. 442-6).

Usury. Roman law had allowed a moderate interest on loans, though there are complaints in Latin literature of Jews charging excessive rates. The Fathers, however, deduced from the Jewish sacred book, despite the fact that a prudent steward who invests money is praised in the Gospels, that to take interest on money is the sin of usury. Addis and Arnold's *Catholic Dictionary*, and White's *Warfare of Science with Theology*, give ample quotations from the Fathers, but the point is not disputed. Writers on the subject seem to have missed the fact that the Roman Christians of the second half of the second century lent and borrowed money at interest freely and had a sort of bank of their own (Hippolytus's *Refutation of all Heresies*, Bk. IX, Ch. VII). The doctrine of the Fathers prevailed, and the Popes repeatedly condemned "usury," by which they meant any acceptance of interest

on loans. The Schoolmen (except Duns Scotus) proved, as usual, that the Church was right, and Aquinas, who is now described as very modern in his sentiments, was particularly vehement. There had been little trade or circulation of money in the Dark Age, but with the revival, or after 1100, the need of loans was acute, yet the Church continued in its blind opposition. It was this that forced the Jews—who were already damned, of course—into money-lending, but the Lombards (hence Lombard St. in London) and other Italians defiantly took up banking, and theologians began, in the fifteenth century, to distinguish between interest and usury. As late as 1550 a law of Edward VI stigmatized the taking of interest as "a vice most odious and detestable and contrary to the word of God." The modern plea that the Church was merely trying to "check the greedy capitalist" is nonsense. It forbade all interest, and on the ground of the Old Testament. White's *Warfare* gives the best account.

Utilitarianism. The theory that moral law is based upon utility, not upon revelation or intuition, or that immoral acts are those which are detrimental to the social welfare. The word was first used by J. S. Mill, though he was merely formulating the theory of morals which Bentham, Mackintosh, and James Mill had followed. Dr. E. Albee (*History of English Utilitarianism*, 1902) learnedly traces the development of the theory in England from the writings of Hobbes onwards, and Sir L. Stephen has a masterly work, *The English Utilitarians*, (3 vols., 1900), in which he shows that most of the Deists were Utilitarians. Some of the earlier Deists had appealed to moral intuitions, and Kant [see] tried to bring philosophy back to that point of view. If the word "utility" is understood in the broad sense in which the Utilitarians used it, not only the Materialist thinkers of ancient Greece, who were four-fifths of the whole and had by far the largest influence in the Greek-Roman world, but even Aristotle, adopted the principle. The fierce ethical controversy about it in the last century showed that opponents, whether Christian theologians or intui-

tionist philosophers, have to help out their case by taking the word "utility" in a narrow and superficial sense. There is no excuse for this in the writings or the character of Bentham, J. and J. S. Mill, Spencer, Stephen, etc., all of whom were moral idealists and would now be called Puritans. Every word adopted ("hedonism," "eudaimonism," etc.) by thinkers of this school has been similarly misinterpreted, and Bentham and Mill felt that utility was the aptest word in English. The moral act is that which contributes to the social well-being; the immoral act that which injures it. All writers on the subject have missed the fact that even the few

tical Scholastics of the Middle Ages, led by Duns Scotus, insisted on raising the question *why* God had declared certain acts immoral ("Why hath the Almighty fixed his canon?" etc.) and concluded that it was because they were socially injurious. The strongest point in the anti-Utilitarian case was that it provided no base for what was called personal morality, especially as regards sex. Now that psychology has abandoned the idea of intuition [see], the modern science of ethics is generally Utilitarian, though it finds the word "social" more expressive. See article, *Ethics*, and J. M. Robertson's *Short History of Morals* (1920).

V.

Vacherot, Prof. Étienne, Ph.D. (1809–97), French philosopher. He succeeded Cousin in the chair of philosophy at the Sorbonne, and had the rare distinction among philosophers of combining an aggressive Rationalism, which so embittered the clergy that they got him deposed from his chair and imprisoned, with such distinction in his science that his *Histoire critique de l'école d'Alexandrie* (3 vols., 1846–51) was crowned by the Academy, and, in spite of clerical opposition, he was admitted to the Academy of the Moral and Political Sciences. In his later works he speaks of God, but explains that he means only "the ideal of perfection in the mind of man."

Vale, Gilbert (1788–1868), American writer. An English student of theology who became a Rationalist and emigrated to America, where he founded the *Beacon* and wrote *Fanaticism, its Source and Influence* (1835) and other works. His *Life of Thomas Paine* (1841) contains letters of Washington to Paine which had been suppressed. The notice of him in Appleton's *Cyclopædia of American Biography* says: "Mr. Vale was a Freethinker, and all his writings are arguments for his peculiar tenets."

Valla, Lorenzo (1406–57), Italian humanist. Son of a Roman lawyer and priest; but he became sceptical,

wandered from one university to another, and was one of the most learned and brilliant critical writers of Italy in his time. Alphonso V made him his secretary and protected him from Rome when he exposed the fraud of the Donation of Constantine [see] and other basic Papal documents. His Latin work *De Voluptate* is Epicurean. The Papacy, in the end, drove him into silence and rewarded him with high honours. The fires of the Inquisition were then busy in Italy and menaced every critic of the Papal system, though obscene literature circulated freely.

Values. When, at the close of the last century, the attempt to draw a frontier protecting philosophy and religion from the advance of science by insisting that science dealt with material things only, broke down, some philosophers, chiefly Prof. Höffding, invented the formula that religion and philosophy alone are concerned with values. Höffding [see], a Rationalist, proposed that religion should now mean "the cultivation of values," and for years one read, sometimes even in scientific works, that "science does not discuss values" (truth, moral and æsthetic standards, and political and economic forms). It was in very many cases a plausible excuse for writing on religions, politics, economic systems, etc., without ex-

pressing an opinion on their truth or value. An alternative formula was that science studies realities, but not their relations. Many writers still adhere to these formulae, but there is in science an increasing impatience with them and a demand for the application of the scientific spirit to all questions of truth and value. No branch of knowledge is more concerned about truth—the relation of concepts to realities or the value of propositions—than science, and the modern science of ethics is certainly no mere description of realities; while scores of articles in this work show what a gain it would be if the value of religious institutions were examined scientifically or strictly in the light of facts (history and statistics).

Vambéry, Prof. Armin (1832–1913), Jewish-Hungarian philologist. A son of poor parents who contrived to get a university education and discovered a remarkable gift for learning languages. He knew a dozen before he was out of his teens. He taught at Constantinople, then at Buda-Pesth university, and was one of the most famous travellers, and linguists of his time. In his *Story of My Struggles* (Engl. trans., 2 vols., 1904) he declares himself an Agnostic, caustically criticizes religion, and thinks that “one grain of common sense is of more value than a bushel of theories” (p. 429).

Vanini, Lucilio (1585–1619), Italian Rationalist martyr. After brilliant university studies in philosophy, law, science and theology, he became a priest, but soon developed sceptical views and travelled over half of Europe, urging the study of science. He was expelled from France and was at one time imprisoned in the Tower of London. He wrote his *Amphitheatrum Æternæ Providentiæ* to disarm the orthodox, but in the following year wrote a Pantheistic work which was burned at Paris on the charge of Atheism. He was, in fact, nearer to Atheism than Giordano Bruno, and strongly attacked Scholastic theology. He was arrested in France as an “Atheist and Blasphemer.” His tongue was torn out and he was burned. He atoned for the weaknesses of his career (see Robertson’s *Short History of Freethought*, II, 52) by a brave death, pointing out that while Jesus had

sweated blood at the thought of death, he knew no fear.

Vatican, The. The “Vatican Field” (or district) lay outside the walls of the ancient city of Rome and was generally regarded as a dreary quarter across the river that was surrendered, until Nero built a palace and garden there, to cemeteries, criminals, and the lower types of foreigners. The Jews settled in it, and it thus became the cradle of Roman Christianity. The Mithraists also had their chief temple there. The Christians had no church or public meeting room until the year 222, when they took over a deserted wine-shop. By this time the priests had put into circulation the legend that Peter and Paul were buried there, and, although the Popes moved into the city, to the old palace of the Laterani, when Constantine gave it to them, the church on the Vatican—a low hill slopes down to the river—remained a particularly venerated centre. The Church of St. Peter was very rich, and in 850 the quarter was, to protect it from the Saracens, enclosed by Leo IV—hence the name of “the Leonine City”—within the walls. A small palace was built near St. Peter’s Church, but “the Vatican” did not figure conspicuously in history until the Roman Renaissance. The present Vatican Palace, and St. Peter’s, were built in the sixteenth century. For a description of the fabric and life of the palace by a non-Catholic, that is approved by Catholics, see G. Seldes, *The Vatican* (1927).

Vaughan, Prof. Henry Halford (1811–85), historian. He was educated for the Bar, but entered a legal branch of the Civil Service and devoted his leisure to philosophy and history. In 1848 he was appointed professor of Modern history at Oxford, his works having won high admiration. Dr. Jowett calls him “the most brilliant of all Dr. Arnold’s pupils,” and, when he was appointed at Oxford, wrote to Sir B. Brodie that Vaughan’s advanced Rationalist views would have to be concealed at Oxford (*Letters of B. Jowett*, p. 159). It is known that Vaughan worked for several years on a Rationalist book with the title *Man’s Moral Nature*, but the manuscript was destroyed after his death.

Vauvenargues, Luc de Clapiers, Marquis de (1715-47), French moralist. A noble whose health compelled him to retire from military service and who devoted himself to study and letters. He was an intimate friend of Voltaire. The only work he published, *Introduction à la connaissance de l'esprit humain* (1746), was described by Voltaire as "one of the best I know for the formation of character" and had a very great success. It is often described as "deeply religious," but does not go beyond Voltaire's Deism.

Vedas, The. Sacred books of the Hindus, the chief part of which, the Rigveda, contains the hymns or chants of the Aryan invaders of India. The invasion and the earlier chants are dated by modern scholars about 1300 to 1000 B.C. An inscription found in Asia Minor shows that in the fourteenth century B.C. the ancestors of the Hindu Aryans were still united with those of the Persians, living in Asia Minor, and most of the nature-gods of the Vedas were common to both, and largely common to all Aryan people. Dyaus-Pitar, the chief god, means "The Father in Heaven," or in the sky. The chants have the poetic quality of so many compositions of pre-civilized days, but the mythology and ethic are primitive. We now know that India [see] was civilized 2,000, or more, years before the Aryans reached it.

Veddahs, The. The pure Veddahs, who are now almost, if not entirely, extinct—the so-called Veddahs of Ceylon are of mixed blood—were part of the first human family which survived to modern times, the Negritoes [see]. They seem to have lived in Southern Asia and to have been scattered over the islands of the Indian Ocean by a later and higher wave of the race. If they had remained out of contact with higher tribes, their ideas would exhibit to us a very early phase of human culture and throw valuable light on the origin of religion. Even the few wild Veddahs who survived until recently, however, seem to show slight borrowings from the Tamils and Cinghalese. The best attempts to isolate and describe these pure specimens was made by Paul and Fritz Sarasin (*Ergebnisse*

naturwissenschaftlichen Forschungen auf Ceylon, 3 vols., 1887-93). They concluded that the Veddahs had no religious ideas. Their word for the dead, *yoka*, is Cinghalese, though they did not believe in a shade that survives death, and a sort of vague awe of the sun and (especially) the moon which they evinced is said to be due to Indian influence. Prof. and Mrs. Seligmann do not distinguish, in their work, *The Veddahs* (1911), between the wild and the ordinary Veddahs of mixed blood.

Vegetation Gods. It is disputed whether the cult of a spirit or spirits of vegetation preceded the cult of other nature-gods or of deified ancestors. Many writers on the evolution of religion do not always consult anthropology as to the precise cultural position of the tribes whose ideas they quote or the witness of reliable observers to the psychology of primitive man. It is the common opinion of such observers that the lowest human peoples have no general or abstract ideas, and this implies that they located spirits in individual trees before conceiving a spirit or god (or more usually goddess) of vegetation or fertility. Since agriculture is a late development—probably not earlier than about 8000 B.C.—the corn-spirit or goddess is a later mythological growth, and the vine or vine-spirit still later.

Verdi, Giuseppe (1813-1901), Italian composer. The author of *Rigoletto* and *Il Trovatore* is claimed in the *Catholic Encyclopædia*, but he is one of the many apostates from the Roman faith who were employed to compose music for its services. He was notoriously a Rationalist, and the Italian clergy were very angry at the anti-Catholic note in his *Sicilian Vespers* (1855). He sat in the new Italian Parliament after 1870, first as Deputy and then as Senator, on the anti-clerical side, and he expressly directed in his will that he was to be buried without "any part of the customary formulæ" (F. T. Garibaldi *Giuseppe Verdi*, 1903, p. 255). Verdi was a man of fine and generous character. In 1898 he gave 2,000,000 lire to the city of Milan to build a home for aged and infirm musicians.

Verestchagin, Vassili Vassilievich (1842-1904), famous Russian painter.

He served as an officer, of noble family, in the Russo-Turkish War of 1877-8, and he was so deeply moved by what he saw that in the interest of peace he painted a number of realistic pictures of war. Later he was recognized as one of the greatest of Russian painters. He painted two religious pictures, "The Holy Family" and "The Resurrection," but the Archbishop of Vienna compelled the authorities to withdraw these from the Vienna Exhibition in 1885. In his autobiography (*Vassili Verestchagin*, Engl. trans., 2 vols., 1887), he drastically rejects Christianity and deplores the widespread hypocrisy, especially in England (of which in all other respects he was an admirer), of professing to believe it. He went on a Russian battleship to get material for war-pictures in the Russo-Japanese conflict, and was sunk by the Japanese.

Verhaeren, Emile (1855-1916), leading Belgian poet. He was a Brussels lawyer, of a wealthy Catholic family, who left the bar for letters and the Church for Rationalism. He published 43 volumes of lyric and other poetry, and a few plays and biographies. In 1914 he was driven to England by the German invasion and was honoured by English, Scottish, and Welsh universities. At his death the *Annual Register* described him as "Belgium's most famous poet" and "the greatest exponent in European poetry of universal ideas." An intense humanitarianism and an advanced Rationalism were conspicuous amongst these "universal ideas." In *Les Moines* he says to the monks: "You alone survive of the Christian world that is dead." He was less aggressively anti-Christian in his later years, but remained an Agnostic. See Stefan Zweig's *Emile Verhaeren* (Engl. trans., 1910).

Vermiform Appendix, The. A more or less worm-shaped tubular appendage leading off the first part of the large intestine (the cæcum) at the point where it joins the small intestine. It has a very narrow inlet from the gut, so that seeds, etc., which are forced into it often set up the inflammation known as appendicitis. It is one of the vestigial organs [see] which most clearly bear witness to human evolution. It is

larger and, having a larger orifice, not dangerous in the ape; and, in lower vegetarian mammals, not only larger, but a normal part of the digestive system. That man's appendix is the atrophied remainder of an organ that was actively functioning in some early mammal ancestor is clear. It would not destroy this evolutionary significance if some other purpose were served by the appendix; but though many attempts have been made to show this, all have failed. On the creationist hypothesis the presence in man of a useless structure that causes a great volume of suffering, and frequently death, is so awkward that apologists snatch at every new announcement of a discovery of some use of the organ. The removal of it in such vast numbers of cases to-day ought to disclose its service, if it has any; but all claims fail to convince. See Prof. A. F. Shull, *Evolution*, 1936.

Verworn, Prof. Max, Sc.D., M.D., LL.D. (1863-1921), German physiologist. He was a colleague and friend of Haeckel at Jena for many years; then professor of physiology at Göttingen and Bonn. He earned the repute of being one of the most distinguished physiologists of his time in Germany, and his *Allgemeine Physiologie* was a standard work for years and brought him a large number of international honours. His Agnosticism is best seen in his *Naturwissenschaft und Weltanschauung* (1904). In the course of a cordial tribute to Haeckel, in the memorial volume *Was Wir Ernst Haeckel Verdanken* (II, 329-32), he explains that he discarded the Christian faith while he was a youth at college.

Vesalius, Andreas (1514-64), Flemish anatomist. There is, as in the case of most of the great scientists of the time, no evidence about his views on religion, but his story is of great importance in studying the relation of the mediæval Church to science. He is now always claimed as one of "the great Catholic scientists," but in fact he was bitterly persecuted by the Church all his life and was in the end driven to death by the Inquisition. It is of interest that he incurred this hostility because he practised human dissection, and the apolo-

gists now say that the Church never forbade this. [See *Anatomy*.] He used to steal the bodies of criminals at night from the gibbets and from graves, and he made such progress that his "immortal work," as Holler calls it, *De Corporis Humani Fabrica*, was written before he was thirty. It was the greatest work on its subject yet published, and showed what grievous harm had been done to surgery and medicine by the virtual prohibition of dissection by the mediæval Church. He passed to Italy, but the hostility of the clergy was more bitter than ever, and he went to Spain as physician to Charles V. He was now recognized as the greatest surgeon in Europe, but the Catholic persecution continued, and the Catholic relatives of a nobleman who died charged him with dissecting the body before the man was dead. The Emperor saved him from the Inquisition, but on condition that he made a pilgrimage to Jerusalem, and the hardships of a shipwreck hastened the end of his broken life. The account of this persecution in White's *Warfare*, which is entirely correct, was most unjustly attacked by the Catholic, Dr. J. Walsh, in his *Popes and Science*, a work of scandalous inaccuracy and venom. The notice of Vesalius, in the article on *Anatomy* in the eleventh edition of the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, edited by the Vice-President of the Anatomical Society of Great Britain, told the facts correctly. It is eliminated from the latest edition. The author calls the fate of Vesalius "a lasting example of the barbarism of the times." Though it is not disputed that Vesalius did invaluable work for anatomy, physiology, and medicine, there is no notice of him in either the *Britannica* or the *Americana*.

Vestal Virgins, The. Priestesses of Vesta at Rome, who were compelled to take a vow of celibacy. The superstition doubtless goes back to primitive times when the chiefs' daughters tended the communal fire, but it was fairly widespread in the pre-Christian world. There were celibate priestesses or devotees of the Hittite Ma, the Egyptian Isis, the Greek Artemis, etc., long before there were Christian virgins. At Rome these consecrated virgins were only six in

number and they had a superb palace in the Forum and every luxury except love. The vow was not for life, but for thirty years, and Roman girls of the higher class eagerly sought the honour. For violation of the vow they were liable to be buried alive, and it is a myth of the apologists that they fell into laxity at any period. The fire was ceremoniously extinguished and relit with flint and steel at the Roman New Year, the beginning of March—a reminiscence of pre-civilized life which is observed annually in Holy Week in every Catholic Church. See Sir T. C. Warsford, *History of the Vestal Virgins* (1932).

Vestigial Organs. Atrophied organs or structures in the plant and the animal organism which must have functioned normally in ancestors. Earlier writers called them "rudimentary" organs, but a rudiment is an early stage of something that is growing, while these structures are "vestiges" of a past history. Obvious examples in man are the body-hair, the external ears, the male breasts, and the nictitating membrane (in the inner corner of each eye.) Familiar examples also are the vermiform appendix, the coccyx (base of the vertebral column or vestigial tail), the pineal body, etc. See special notices of most of them. In the embryonic development of man a number—the gill-slits, tail, etc.—appear for a time and gradually disappear. Because early writers on them, like Wildersheim and Haeckel, included one or two, like the thymus and thyroid glands, in a list of more than a hundred at a time when physiology was still imperfectly informed, apologists sometimes claim that the whole list is discredited and unreliable. Such vestigial organs as the male breasts, the hair on arms and chest, and the external ears, have so clear an evolutionary significance that no one with a knowledge of physiology attempts to interpret them in any other way. Such structures are found, as relics of organs which were useful to former ancestors, throughout the higher animal and plant worlds. Prof. A. F. Shull, the best recent writer on evolution (*Evolution*, 1936), says that they run to "hundreds," and lists many

of them (pp. 25-6). There are gill-slits (though no longer open slits as in the fish) "in the embryo of all vertebrate animals" (p. 24). Amphibia have gills in the larvæ stage and, if compelled to remain in water, keep them throughout life. The blood-vessel distribution in the embryo corresponds, and the reminiscence of a fish-ancestor of all the higher vertebrates is indisputable. Hare-lip in higher mammals is a reversion to the reptile stage. Birds have one ovary and oviduct, but vestiges of a second; the reptiles have two. They, and the platypus and some whales, have vestigial teeth in the embryo stage. Their wing-bone structure has vestiges of legs and toes, which in some birds fully develop. Serpents and whales similarly have vestiges of legs, and the degeneration has varying degrees in different species. Some birds—ostrich (as far as flight is concerned), kiwi, dodo, etc.—have vestigial wings. Horses (and other running mammals in which the number of toes is reduced) have vestigial toes. Insects, crustacean parasites, etc., have sometimes vestigial structures, and botanists trace a large number in the plant world. This is only one of half a dozen lines of evidence for evolution [see], yet would more than suffice of itself. H. G. Wells, Julian Huxley, and G. P. Wells have a good summary account in their *Science of Life* (popular ed., 1938, pp. 364-7, illustrated).

Victoria Adelaide Mary Louise (1840-1901), Empress of Germany. The eldest daughter of Queen Victoria, she showed high ability from an early age and was very carefully educated. She married Prince Friedrich Wilhelm of Prussia, who became German Emperor in 1888. She detested Prussian ways and ideas and wanted Constitutional Monarchy and the education of women, and the Germans of the Court retaliated on her. Bismarck had spies watching her. Like her sister Alice [see], she was a serious student of philosophy, science, and letters, a generous patroness of culture, and devoted to social service and philanthropy. The cautious notice of her in the *Dictionary of National Biography* says: "Although she retained her attachment to the Church of England, her religion was undogmatic and

she sympathized with the broad views of Strauss, Renan, Schopenhauer, and Huxley." It is difficult to define what "views" were common to these four except a rejection of the Christian creed and the belief in a personal God and immortality. Gladstone, who must have known her, said in a letter (quoted in the *Literary Guide*, July, 1937): "The Queen seemed to think that she believed hardly anything." Prince von Buelow, who knew her well, confirms this. In his *Memoirs* (1931, III, 97) he says that "the Grand Duchess Alice was as liberal in politics and especially in religion as her sister the Crown Princess," and that Victoria was "an out and out rationalist of the temper of Herbert Spencer and John Stuart Mill" (p. 185). It is interesting that he reports her saying: "My son (the Kaiser) will be the ruin of Germany."

Vigny, Alfred de (1797-1863), French poet. He served in the army for twelve years, but before he was thirty he published a volume of verse and a brilliant historical novel which made his reputation in literature, and he came to be recognized as one of the greatest French poets of the first half of the nineteenth century. In his earlier work he shows a sentimental or romanticist appreciation of Christianity, but in his mature work he is decidedly Agnostic. See especially *Silence* (1862), one of his latest poems.

Villari, Prof. Pasquale (1827-1917), Italian historian and statesman. He fought against the Papacy in the rebellion of 1848 and was compelled to fly to France at the reaction. His *Life of Savonarola* (2 vols., 1859-61) attracted such attention that he was appointed professor at Pisa University, and later at the Instituto de Studi Superiori at Florence. He was a Senator and Minister of Education in the new Italy. His Rationalism is best seen in his *Preface* to Senator Negri's *Julian the Apostate* (1905). Some of his historical works are translated by his English wife.

Vinci, Leonardo da. [See *Leonardo da Vinci*.]

Virchow, Prof. Rudolph, M.D. (1821-1902), German pathologist. He was professor of pathology at Berlin University and one of the highest authorities

in his science. He had been deposed for his share in the rebellion of 1848, but attained such distinction that he was recalled in 1856. For some years he led the Freethinking Liberals in the Reichstag, especially in the attacks on Catholics, but he opposed Bismarck as well as the Catholics and Socialists, and in later years became Conservative. This led to friction with Haeckel (a Liberal), and, as Virchow thought that Darwinism led to Socialism, he opposed it and had sharp conflicts with Haeckel and other scientific men. Darwin wrote to Haeckel: "Virchow's conduct is shameful, and I hope he will some day feel the shame" (*Last Words on Evolution*, 1906, p. 61). Haeckel has a long discussion of Virchow's attitude, which was based upon political interests, in the same book. His opposition to evolution led the Churches, which he had always attacked, to make much of Virchow, and his name still shines in anti-evolutionary literature (which he would have despised). He was an Agnostic all his life. See, especially, his lecture, *The Task of Science* (1871).

Virgin Birth, The. The dogma that Mary conceived Jesus by a miracle, without male contact. It must not be confused with the Immaculate Conception [see], which means that Mary's mother conceived her without transmitting the guilt of Adam's sin, and it does not include any explicit theory of the actual birth of Jesus, though this is assumed to have been miraculous and to have left the virginal membrane intact. Childish as the idea of an embryonic and foetal development of a god-man seems to the modern mind, quite apart from the question of miracle, it was familiar in the ancient world. Egyptians believed that their queens were impregnated by the gods, and the Japanese still believe that the first emperor was born of a goddess—a part of the collusion of kings and priests in order to sustain the power of both. The amorous adventures of Zeus with mortal women were so generally believed in the Greek-Roman world that the apologist Justin, of the second century, appeals to the pagans (*Apology*, Ch. XXII) to see the reasonableness of the Christian belief in the light of their own

belief in the divine impregnation of Leda, Semele, Danae, etc., by Zeus. Diogenes Lærtius ("Life of Plato") says that the Greek philosopher's nephew, Speusippus, claimed that Plato's mother conceived him by a god, and later Buddhist literature says the same of Buddha's mother. Plutarch gives and defends the legend of Plato, and the Christian writer, Lactantius, claims plausibility for the Christian legend by quoting the Roman belief (in Vergil's *Georgics*) that mares can be impregnated by the wind. In collecting these parallel legends we have, if we suggest that they inspired the Christian legend, to consider carefully if they were known to the unlettered Christians of the first century. Justin says, in his *Dialogue*, that the Jews of the second century charged the Christians with having borrowed their legend from the Greeks, and the Greek stories of Zeus and his human offspring would be well known to the followers of Christ when the faith spread beyond Palestine. Other than Greek parallels are irrelevant, and the Greek stories had the effect of causing considerable hesitation in the mind of the early Christians. The evidence suggests that some of the Greek or Hellenizing Jews of the first century applied the pagan story to Jesus on the general ground that he was greater than ordinary men, and found confirmation in their Greek translation of the Old Testament, in which the Hebrew word "girl," or "young woman," in *Isaiah* vii, 14, is mistranslated "virgin." Justin says that very many Christians of his time—the middle of the second century—refuse to admit the Virgin Birth. Paul and *Mark*, the earliest Gospel, and even *John*, know nothing of it, and Biblical theologians (other than Catholic and Fundamentalists) find the story a late interpolation in *Luke*. When the bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church of America tried to enforce the belief in the Virgin Birth, the professors of their chief Theological School (Cambridge) issued a work *Creeds and Loyalties* (1923), in which they pointed out that the legend was a late interpolation in the New Testament, and to be rejected. This interpretation is confirmed by

several references in the Gospels to the "brothers" of Jesus, and the apologetic reply that this means cousins is strained and arbitrary. In several early manuscripts of *Matthew*, moreover, the genealogy (Ch. I) ends: "And Joseph Begat Jesus." See Conybeare's *Myth, Magic, and Morals* (1909, Ch. XII), one of the best discussions of the whole question. A passage in *Judges* (xiii, 2-3) probably helped in the composition of the myth. It is now generally rejected by Modernists and the more liberal members of the Churches, but the overwhelming majority (Catholics, Baptists, Methodists, etc.) strictly adhere to it.

Visigoths, The. The "Western Goths," who settled in Spain (and formed the first Spanish Christian civilization). Their settlement is of interest in contrast to that of the Ostrogoths [see], who made a noble attempt to preserve or restore the old civilization in Italy. The latter were Arians, and very independent of the Popes, who, in conjunction with the Greeks, destroyed their work. The kingdom founded by the Visigoths, who became Trinitarians in communion with Rome and were very priest-ridden, was corrupt and unprogressive. It is enough that in the eighth century a force of about 10,000 Arabs and Berbers crossed from Africa and conquered the entire peninsula, except a narrow fringe on the shore of the Bay of Biscay, in a few years.

Vitalism. The theory that there is in living organisms a force or principle which is distinct from the physical and chemical energies in the organism. "Vital force" was at one time the expression generally used by the Vitalists—hence G. B. Shaw's conservative retention of that word—but as this was an improper use of the physical term "force," and the attempts to make its operation plausible were futile, other words ("principle," "entelechy," etc.) were preferred, and some tried to substitute the word "Neo-Vitalism" [see] for "Vitalism," though the fundamental principle is the same. Like myths in theology, the theory belongs essentially to an earlier age in which the scantiness of scientific knowledge and the common practice of using phrases for the un-

known or obscure realities made it more or less plausible. Aristotle, rejecting the idea of spirit (something that can exist apart from matter) which Plato had borrowed from the Pythagoreans, yet realizing the inadequacy of early Materialism, invented the middle term, the "immaterial," or something that was not material but could not exist apart from matter. The chief "form" of this nature was the energizing principle in organisms. The Schoolmen, as usual, coarsened his ideas and distinguished a vegetative and an animal "soul." Man has both—the persistence of the vegetative soul in the corpse was supposed to explain a growth of hair after death—in addition to his spiritual soul or mind. Descartes, in the seventeenth century, while believing in the spirituality of the mind, led the modern development by contending that there is nothing immaterial in the subhuman animal, or that it is a machine. In the second half of the nineteenth century, science made rapid progress in the mechanistic interpretation of life, and, with the founding of biochemistry and the discovery of enzymes and hormones [see], the progress has been more rapid than ever in the last forty years. What apologists say on the subject is negligible, but even scientific men with a mystic vein often mislead. In *The Earth Speaks to Bryan* (1925) the late Dr. H. F. Osborn gave the names of less than a dozen distinguished Vitalists. He must have known that one (Rathenau) was a business-man, one (Millikan) a physicist, and one (Eucken) a theologian with no knowledge whatever of science. In the latest attempt to defend the theory, L. R. Wheeler's *Vitalism* (1939), we are offered the names of Driesch, A. Thompson, Lloyd Morgan, J. S. Haldane—all four dead—Dr. J. Gray, and Sir F. Gowland Hopkins. The latter is not quite properly put in the category, as he is content to point out that a good deal of vital activity is not yet explained on mechanist lines. It is one of the fundamental fallacies of Vitalism that if there are functions which we cannot explain in physical terms, in the present condition of science, we must recognize a non-physical principle in them. The second is to

suppose that it affords any explanation whatever of vital functions to say that there is an immaterial principle at work in them. It is an attempt to explain the obscure by something more obscure. Even a Materialist—and a man is not a Materialist simply because he rejects the vital principle—does not pretend to explain everything in terms of matter. However, not one biologist or physiologist in a hundred now adheres to Vitalism. Many of the names suggested by apologists—Bishop Barnes, Prof. Whitehead, etc.—are those of men with no authority on the subject. It is, therefore, like Emergent Evolution, an expiring theory and does not need lengthy discussion; but in the article **Life, the Nature of**, we give a summary of the advances of science which have discredited the theory, and a selection of literature. Read especially, T. R. Savory's *Mechanistic Biology and Animal Behaviour* (1936). Dr. Grey (and N. M. Blich) defends his position in *The Origin of Living Matter* (1933).

Vivian, Philip. Pseudonym of Vivian Phelps [see].

Viviani, René Raphael (1863–1925), French statesman. A Parisian lawyer who entered radical politics and was Minister of Labour under Clemenceau. He secured the opening of the legal profession to women in France and other reforms. In his first speech as Minister he created a sensation by saying that we have “slain the religious chimæra” and “extinguished stars in the firmament which will never shine again.” He was described as superficial, but he was a very scholarly man and an uncompromising Agnostic.

Vogt, Prof. Karl (1817–95), Swiss geologist and physiologist. Vogt is commonly described as one of the less profound scientific men of the last century who called themselves Materialists. He was, on the contrary, one of the most widely informed men of science of his time and an idealist of high integrity and ardent humanitarianism; and he never called himself a Materialist. He had had university courses of anatomy, physiology, medicine, and zoology, and he taught zoology at Giessen University until he was driven from Germany for taking part in the

democratic revolution of 1848. He was then naturalized in Switzerland, taught geology at Geneva University, and was a member of the Grand Council. L. Büchner has a chapter on him in his *Last Words on Materialism* (Engl. trans., 1901) and quotes him saying that “thought bears the same relation to the brain as bile does to the liver,” and that Christians “brought the hypocrisy of humility into the world.” His Atheism is chiefly found in his *Superstition and Science* (1855), a work of great service to Rationalism.

Volney, Count Constantine François Chasselbois de (1757–1820), French writer. Volney was commonly quoted in the apologetic literature of the last century as a superficial sceptic on account of his anti-Christian work, but he had in youth a thorough training in medicine and Oriental languages and he travelled extensively in the East. He adopted the ideas of the Encyclopædists and the Revolution of 1789, and sat in the National Assembly. He was imprisoned for protesting against the tyranny of Robespierre, and he became professor at the École Normale at the death of that leader. He preferred to travel, however, and wrote his famous *Ruins (Ruines, ou méditations sur les révolutions des empires)*, 1811, a profound Deistic attack on Christianity which had a very wide influence in the last century. His works fill eight volumes. Napoleon, who had a high regard for him, made him a Count; though he freely scolded the Emperor for re-establishing the Church.

Voltaire (1694–1778). François Marie Arouet—his pen-name, “Voltaire,” seems to be a rough anagram of his real name—is probably the second most famous (after Shakespeare) writer in the world, and incomparably the greatest Rationalist writer. Son of a notary, he was educated by the Jesuits and by one of the many sceptical abbés of the time. His father compelled him to study law, but he neglected it in favour of literature, and in 1716 he suffered his first penalty (exile) for freedom of speech—for a lampoon on the disreputable Prince d'Orléans. In the following year he was sent to the Bastille, and he then adopted the name Voltaire. He was

exiled again in 1719, and once more in the Bastille in 1726. Christian writers who deplore his gaiety at this period do not seem to know that even the highest Catholic prelates (Dillon, de Brienne, de Rohan, etc.) made an open parade of immorality. In England, to which he was sent, Voltaire turned to more serious matters, and on his return to France, three years later, he wrote his *Philosophic Letters on the English*, which rendered great social service and was burned by the hangman (1733). He had again to leave Paris. He returned, but was soon once more in exile. The "arch-mocker," as the clergy like to call him, spent nearly the whole of his life, after 1722, in exile from Paris, which he loved, because he was determined to tell the truth. He spent some years at the Court of Frederic the Great, where, although Frederic was almost more French than German, Voltaire did not fit into the environment, and in 1758 he settled at Ferney, just inside the French frontier and convenient for flight in case of need. Here, in a graceful leisure, he wrote most of the caustic criticisms of Christianity with which his name is particularly associated, and the enormous influence they had in the whole of Europe—some sold as many as 300,000 copies—testifies to the success of his method of irony and ridicule. The suggestion, however, that he was "merely destructive" betrays a complete ignorance of his work. From first to last it is instinct with social and humanitarian idealism. "Crush the Infamous Thing" (*Écrasez l'infâme*), which is described as his motto, refers to the Church of Rome as a corrupt and tyrannical institution, as he explains in a letter to D'Alembert, and no one who is familiar with his work can doubt. He was the most eloquent pleader in Europe for justice, toleration (*Treatise on Tolerance*, 1776, etc.), and the reform of the criminal law (*Commentary on the Criminal Law*, 1768). He inspired statesmen throughout the Latin world to initiate the liberalism which Rome, putting his successive works on the "Index," hated. As far as his personal influence went he, Lanson says, "chased misery out of France," while the higher clergy

continued to support the vicious regime which was driving the people to revolution. Withal he wrote the most brilliant tragedies and historical works that appeared in the France of his time, and made a very considerable study of science.

Voltaire was a Deist, with no belief in immortality or free will (*Il faut choisir*, 1772), all his life. His career just precedes the age when European scepticism was passing from the Bible and Christianity to a scrutiny of fundamental religious beliefs, and in any case the world needed exactly the work he did and the way in which he did it. The transition to Atheism is, however, reflected in his work. He satirized (*Candide*) the smug and superficial optimism of Rousseau's Deism—the statement that he would nevertheless "fight to the death for your right to say it" is not from Voltaire's writings or letters, but an illustration of his attitude—and his belief in God clearly wavers in the poem he wrote (1756) on the great Lisbon earthquake. "It is only charlatans who are certain," he once said. Even at the end, when he was tempted to visit Paris in extreme old age and fell ill, the profession of faith he wrote in order to secure a decent funeral said only that he "worshipped God" and "detested superstition." The Catholic libel that he died shrieking for a priest was authoritatively rejected by Professor Sainsbury in the *Encyclopædia Britannica*—Voltaire had courteously declined the offer of a priest—yet is still often repeated. The clergy tried to prevent the decent interment of his remains, and Catholic fanatics, at the fall of Napoleon, tore his bones from the Pantheon and buried them in waste land outside Paris. For these details, and a general appreciation, see J. M. Robertson's short *Voltaire* (1922). Tallentyre's *Life of Voltaire* (3 ed., 1905) is, perhaps, still the best, but a new study of medium length would be useful. The work of the Catholic poet, A Noyes (*Voltaire*, 1936), proceeds on the idea that, as the greatness of Voltaire cannot any longer be buried under libels, it is better partially to admit it and to claim that it was due to his religious faith, and so that Rationalist

admiration of him is misplaced. A translation of a short selection of Voltaire's works, rather illustrating

their serious side, was published by the present writer (*Selected Works of Voltaire*, 1911).

W.

Wagner, Wilhelm Richard (1813-83), composer. There has been a good deal of controversy about the attitude to religion of the great composer, especially as Nietzsche bitterly attacked him for, he said, reverting to Christianity. It is admitted that he held advanced views in his youth. He took part in the democratic revolution of 1848, when he had already produced *Tannhäuser* and *Lohengrin*, and had to fly from Germany. The *Ring* was composed between 1853 and 1874, and it was chiefly the later composition of *Parsifal* that brought a charge of reaction against Wagner. Most experts on Wagner, however, say that *Parsifal* is rather based upon the philosophy of Schopenhauer than upon Christianity. Where Christian teaching coincided with his own he admired it, but he was never a Christian. One of the chief writers on the matter, Otto Hartwich, says that Wagner was "a Christian in a large sense, but not a man of the Church," and he had "little taste for the otherworldly speculations of dogmatic theology" (*R. Wagner und das Christentum*, 1903, p. 135). Ernest Newman (*A Study of Wagner*, 1899) shows that in his early years he adopted Feuerbach's Atheistic views, but drifted into a sentimental and vague religious mood when his intellectual power decayed. His finest work was achieved while he was an Atheist.

Waite, Judge Charles Burling Lane, A.M. (1824-95), American jurist. A Chicago lawyer of distinction whom Lincoln appointed Associate Justice of the Utah Supreme Court. He was later District Attorney for Idaho. Waite worked zealously in the Abolitionist and other reform-movements and was an advanced Rationalist (*History of the Christian Religion in the Year A.D. 200*, 1881). There is a lengthy notice of him in Putnam's *Four Hundred Years of Freethought* (1894, pp. 815-17).

Wakefield, Edward (1774-1854), philanthropist. A prosperous London estate-agent who co-operated with Bentham and Place in the cause of education and shared their views. His father had been a Quaker, but had become a Rationalist and educated Edward as such. He was a man of great ability and was sometimes consulted by the Government on Irish affairs. His son, **Edward Gibbon Wakefield** (1796-1862), was a standard authority on colonization and had a good deal to do with founding the colonies of South Australia and New Zealand (*A View of the Art of Colonization*, 1849). He served as adviser to Lord Durham in Canada, and later as Acting Governor of New Zealand. Dr. R. Garnett, in a biography of him (*Edward Gibbon Wakefield*, 1892), quotes Lord Lyttelton saying that Wakefield is "the man in these days beyond comparison of the most genius and the widest influence in the great science of colonization." Garnett says: "His sympathies were by no means ecclesiastical: his creed appears to have been a masculine Theism" (p. 300).

Wakefield, Gilbert, B.A. (1756-1801), writer. A clergyman, son of a clergyman, who resigned and devoted himself to teaching. For a time he was classical professor at Hackney seminary, but he again found the creed impossible and took to literature. His translations of Latin and Greek classics and his own numerous works, including one on Lucretius (3 vols., 1796-9), gave him "a distinct position in the history of English scholarship" (*Dict. Nat. Biog.*). As he wrote an attack on Paine, he is sometimes described as a Christian; but he was not even a Unitarian. In 1798 he was sent to prison for two years for a criticism of the Bishop of Llandaff. He never went to church (*Chalmers's Biographical Dictionary*), but was a simple Theist of high character and idealism.

Wakeman, Thaddeus Barr (1834-1913), American writer. A New York lawyer who was very prominent in the Rationalist and humanitarian movement. He was President of the National Liberal League, the New York State Freethinkers Association, and the Liberal University of Kansas City. He was a Positivist, but an aggressive Rationalist of high ideals and respected character.

Waldensians, The. A body of heretics of France, North Italy, and Switzerland in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries who are often coupled with the Albigensians or the Cathari. The only point in common is that they were victims of the persecuting fury of the Papacy. They were early Protestants or Evangelicals, followers of Peter Waldo of Lyons, who, in protest against the corruption of the Church, lived and preached in voluntary poverty nearly a century before the Franciscan friars. The "Poor Men of Lyons," as they were called, spread their mission to Italy, but the Church scented heresy in their appeal to the Gospels and particularly their remarks on the luxury and vice of the higher clergy. They were condemned by the Lateran Council (1215), driven out of France by the Inquisitors, and settled in Italy, Switzerland, and Austria. They are of interest as showing, as did the Albigensians [see], that the supposed docility of Europe to the Roman See in the Middle Ages is a myth, and that insurgent movements against it—compare the Lollards and Hussites at a later date—swept over Europe so rapidly that the Popes retained their power only by the most truculent persecution. As in the case of the Albigensians, there is no estimate of the number of the Church's victims, but we are reliably informed that in the Italian persecution 9,000 were put to death, and 12,000 (of whom all but 3,000 died) committed to dungeons, in one year. Rome could not crush them, however. In the fourteenth century there were 80,000 of them in Austria. In Bohemia they merged with the Hussites, and they supported the Reformers in the sixteenth century. They persisted even in Italy, though the Church continued to oppress them—Milton has a fine sonnet on the martyrs

—and were said still to number about 25,000 ten years ago.

Walker, Ernest, M.A., D.Mus. (b. 1870), composer. He remained at Balliol as Director of Music, later Chorus and Lecturer in Harmony, after graduating in that college; and he edited the *Musical Gazette* and wrote a number of works on music. He made a profession of advanced Rationalism in an article in the *Almanacco del Coenobium* (1913) and was for years a member of the R.P.A.

Walker, John, M.D. (1759-1830), physician. A remarkable man who, beginning life in a blacksmith's shop, became an engraver, then a teacher, and at the age of 35 took up the study of medicine. He graduated at Leyden, travelled for two years in Italy and Egypt and settled in practice in London, where he was admitted to the Royal College of Physicians. An ardent humanitarian, he professed a high admiration of the Quaker religion, but the Friends declined to receive him into the Society as he was a well-known Deist and friend of Paine. See Munk's *Roll*, Vol. II.

Wallace, Alfred Russel, O.M., LL.D., D.C.L., F.R.S. (1823-1913), naturalist. He was at first a land surveyor and architect, then a teacher, but extensive travel on the Amazon (1848-52) made his reputation as a naturalist. In 1855 he pleaded for the general truth of evolution in an essay, *On the Law Which Has Regulated the Introduction of New Species*, and later, in a paper published by the Linnæan Society, he argued that natural selection—though that expression was coined by Darwin—was the chief agency. Though the theory was little more than a guess on Wallace's part, and would probably have been little noticed, Darwin generously associated him with its discovery. Wallace was universally esteemed for his high character and social zeal, but he fell an easy victim to the crudest tricks of Spiritualist mediums, and to the end of his life denied the evolution of the mind because of his Spiritualist creed. His later Theistic works (*Man's Place in the Universe*, 1903, etc.) are pathetic, but he remained outside the Churches and took a sympathetic interest in the

growth of the Rationalist Press Association (Gould's *Pioneers of Johnson's Court*, 2nd ed., 1935).

Wallace, Prof. William, M.A. (1844-97), Scottish philosopher. He was Whyte professor of moral philosophy at Oxford and a Hegelian Theist. He translated Hegel's *Logic* and *Phenomenology of the Mind* and wrote a number of works on philosophy and ethics. In his *Lectures and Essays on Natural Theology* (1898) he rejects supernaturalism and the belief in personal immortality.

Walpole, Sir Robert, first Earl of Orford (1676-1745), statesman. One of the greatest statesmen of the eighteenth century and one of the first half-dozen in British history. He is counted the first "Prime Minister," and he dominated the House of Commons for twenty years. The King used to say that he was so able that he could turn stone into gold. Walpole took a cynical advantage of the political corruption of his time, but it is not true that he said: "Every man has his price"—he said this of the men of a particular party—and in an age when honesty in public life was not common he was not himself guilty of corrupt practices and never accepted presents from the King. The notice of him in the *Dictionary of National Biography*, which tells this, says that, while he called himself "a sincere member of the Church of England," he was generally known to be a sceptic. His chief biographer, A. C. Eward, says that he "was a man whose life reflects a genial paganism, who regarded all creeds with the impartiality of indifference, and who looked upon all religion as a local accident and as the result of hereditary influences" (*Sir R. Walpole*, 1878, p. 40). Later he calls him a sceptic as regards religion" (p. 446). His views were so notorious that Desmaiseux dedicated his translation of Bayle's *Dictionary* to him, though the translator violently denounced superstition in the Preface. Horace Walpole tells us that his father refused to read Butler's *Analogy* when the Queen urged him to do so. When Queen Caroline [see] was dying, and she refused the ministrations of the Archbishop of Canterbury, Walpole said:

"Let this farce be played out: the Archbishop will act it very well. . . . It will do the queen no hurt, no more than any good" (Lord Hervey's *Memoirs*, II, 528). His son Horatio, or Horace Walpole (1717-97), fourth Earl of Orford, was one of the leading literary men of his time and is well known to later generations by his caustic and elegant letters, the latest edition of which (1905) runs to 16 volumes. While the father seems to have been what was later called an Agnostic, Horace was a Deist and very friendly with the French Encyclopædists. In a letter to a clergyman, in 1783, he ridicules the Christian heaven, or "the absurd idea of the beatified sitting on golden thrones and chanting eternal allelujahs to golden harps" (Letters, XIII, 78-82).

War and Rationalism. Since aggressive war is the worst of crimes, the respective attitude of the Churches and of Rationalists to it is of deep interest, and there can here be no dispute about the facts. The early Church had no concern with social or collective problems and opposed military service before the year 300 chiefly because it involved a profession of paganism. From the time of Constantine onward the opposition relented, and for a thousand years after the fall of Rome there was no Christian pacifism. Individual saints condemned violence; local Churches tried to temper it by a generally futile truce of God [see]; and some Popes condemned wars and fighting in Europe at a time when they wanted all to fight the Saracens. The greatest of the Popes, Gregory VII and Innocent III, ordered wars as freely as most princes did, and the Papacy had its own army, often led by cardinals and sometimes by the Popes themselves, down to the middle of the nineteenth century. The Church further held that war upon infidels and heretics was holy work, and that war upon any prince they excommunicated was more than just; and they blessed the banners of any prince (William the Conqueror, etc.) who promised them docility. In his scholarly and impartial Introduction to his translation of Kant's *Perpetual Peace* Mr. Campbell Smith shows how

the Church, instead of denouncing war, made it worse than ever. The Church of Rome, he says, was "in some respects a more warlike institution than the states of Greece and Rome" (17) and "the history of the Middle Ages came nearer to a realization of the idea of perpetual war than was possible in ancient times" (20). It was not until the Reformation that important protests were heard: the *Complaint of Peace*, of Erasmus—a rebel against Rome and a sceptic in some unknown degree—and the work of Grotius (*On the Laws of War and Peace*, 1625), a Protestant. In the eighteenth century a French priest, St. Pierre, published a fantastic *Project of Peace* which was received with general disdain. But, since neither Catholic nor Protestant Church supported these individual utterances, they have little or no significance as far as the growth of a world-feeling against war is concerned. This began with the great age of scepticism, that opened with Rousseau, Voltaire, and the Encyclopædists. Rousseau's indirect influence was immense, and Kant, whose *Perpetual Peace* (1795) was the first direct attack, stood apart from the Churches. The British jurist Bentham, an Atheist, author of the phrase "International Law," had meantime opened the humanitarian campaign in England, and the influence in that direction of the Atheist Shelley (*Prometheus Unbound*) must be borne in mind. Robert Owen (Atheist) took it up, and for the first time urged the arbitration ideal upon the mass of the people. The Quakers were now encouraged to step out, and the first Peace Society was founded in London in 1816. No Church gave the weight of its support; yet, while it was still the fashion to sneer at infidels as a few eccentric individuals, the number of Rationalists on the roll of honour, until the time came when the Churches were compelled in their own interest to co-operate, was the same as in connection with every other great reform. It is enough here to point out the significance of the peace awards of the Nobel Prize [see]. Apart from paid officials and politicians, who were certainly not entitled to the award on a ground of

trying to abolish war—Roosevelt, Root, Austen Chamberlain, Dawes, Henderson, etc.—we find that, of 26 individuals who attacked war in principle and worked for the substitution of arbitration, 13 were Rationalists, 3 avowed Christians, and 10 of unknown attitude as far as any documents available to the present writer go. The recent share of the Churches in this and other humanitarian movements—after, in the case of Protestants, four, and in that of Catholics fifteen centuries of indifference—is obviously a step taken in their own interest, while from the first the Rationalist (Owenite) body in Britain and the Freethought movement in America supplied the chief workers in the cause of peace.

Wars of Religion. [See Religion, Wars of.]

Ward, Prof. Lester, A.M., LL.B. (1841–1913), the American Herbert Spencer. After some years in the U.S. Treasury, he passed to the Geological Survey and wrote several works on geology and paleontology. His interest in social and general scientific problems deepened, and in 1883 he published his *Dynamic Sociology*, following Spencer in regard to evolution, but strongly opposing his Individualism. A list of his papers and books runs to 600 items. Some of his books were translated into European languages and brought him many academic honours. He was recognized as America's greatest sociologist and had the chair of sociology at Brown University. In his chief work *Glimpses of the Cosmos and A Mental Autobiography* (8 vols., 1912–5) he is entirely Agnostic. See also the study, by his friend and pupil Emily P. Cape, *Lester F. Ward* (1922).

Warwick, Frances Evelyn, Countess of (1861–1938), humanitarian. She was a daughter of Colonel Maynard who married the Earl of Warwick and became widely known for her Socialist and generally advanced views and high character. She disliked the name "philanthropist," but used her means to found several institutions and was extremely generous and zealous for progress. In an article on "The New Religion," in the *Hibbert Journal* (July, 1917), she called for "a religion of

humanity" without theology, ritual, or priests, and pronounced the Church of England "bankrupt." She was a Theist.

Washington, George, First President of the United States (1732-99). In spite of the authoritative statements of Jefferson, Gouveneur Morris, and others who knew him, that he was not a Christian, orthodox American writers continue to assert that he was. Jefferson [see] says that Morris, who was intimate with Washington, "often told me that General Washington believed no more of that system (Christianity) than he himself did" (*Memoir and Correspondence of T. Jefferson*, IV, p. 512). He adds, on the authority of a chaplain to Congress, that when the clergy presented an address to Washington, at his retirement, they pointed out that in his reply to them he did not say a single word that identified him with Christianity, and "the old fox" (Jefferson says—same reference) evaded that point, but satisfied them on all others. The *Albany Daily Advertiser* of October 29, 1831, reported a sermon by one of the chief ministers of the city, Dr. Wilson, who said that "among all our Presidents, from Washington downward, not one was a professor of religion" (quoted by R. D. Owen in his debate with Bachelor 1831). He used, while he was President, to attend the Episcopal Church at Washington, and the Rector, Dr. Abercrombie, told Wilson that he used to leave before the Communion, and, when Abercrombie complained, declined any longer to attend a service that was followed by Communion. Further, the course of events at his death is not disputed by apologists. Although he had ample warning that the end was near, he did not send for a clergyman. It may surely be assumed that the religious members of his family were eager that he should have a clergyman, and that the clergy were just as eager to send one, so that Washington must have refused. Near the end he asked all to leave the room so that he might "spend his last hour with his Maker," but no one disputes that he was a Theist or Deist. The apologists blandly give us the prayers he said while he was thus left alone! Finally, he said in his will: "It is my express desire

that my corpse may be interred in a private manner, without parade or funeral oration." Against this consistent body of authoritative evidence the apologists pit the evidence of Gared Sparks, a religious man who edited Washington's *Writings* (12 vols., 1837) nearly forty years after his death. To allege as evidence the fact that Washington copied out a hymn when he was a boy of thirteen is trifling with the subject, and, since Washington was admittedly a Deist, we are not surprised that in his writings he repeatedly refers to God or "the Author of the Universe" (a familiar expression of the Deists). In the whole twelve volumes Sparks claims only two phrases as definitely Christian, and says nothing about the letter to Lafayette on August 15, 1787, in which Washington plainly dissociates himself from "the professors of Christianity in the Churches" (Sparks edition of the *Letters*, p. 404) or (in the same volume) the letter in which Bishop White, Rector of a church which the President attended, said, when asked if Washington used to kneel during the prayers, "I never saw him in that attitude," and adds that he never heard the President give any clue to his opinions about religion. Sparks does not mention these letters when discussing Washington's religion (*Life of George Washington*—the standard biography), yet we must obviously construe the two apparently Christian phrases (in twelve volumes) in the light of them. The third proof of this leading witness of the orthodox is that a granddaughter, who was still a child in Washington's later years, thought that, as the President spent some time alone in his library before breakfast and before retiring, he was praying! The evidence is overwhelming that Washington was, like Franklin, Adams, Jefferson, Morris, and Hamilton, a Rationalist. See Rensburg's *Six Historic Americans*, and Rupert Hughes's candid biography, *George Washington* (1930).

Watson, James (1799-1874), publisher. Early Freethought in England owed a heavy debt to Watson. He was a boy in domestic service at the age of twelve, but he read much, became a Rationalist, and when Richard Carlile [see] was sent

to prison he went to assist in the sale of his heretical publications. He himself went to prison for a year, and he was later threatened for organizing a feast on a day on which the Government ordered a fast. He, with the aid of Julian Hibbert [see], and in spite of a new term of imprisonment, set up as a publisher, printing and binding, with his own hands, shilling copies of Paine, Volney, etc. He was again in jail in 1834. Watson was a very sober and earnest man, a follower of Robert Owen, a zealous worker in all the reform movements of that perilous time.

Watson, Sir William, LL.D. (1858-1935), poet. Son of a Yorkshire merchant, he wrote poetry for many years before gaining recognition with *Wordsworth's Grave* (1892) and *Lachrymae Musarum* (1893). He was knighted in 1917 in token of his commanding position in the ranks of British poets, but some of his later poems (published in America) on certain members of high political families gave great offence to the authorities. He is Agnostic, and rejects the idea of immortality, in his fine poems "The Unknown God" and "The Hope of the World" (*The Hope of the World and Other Poems*, 1897).

Watt, James, LL.D., F.R.S., F.R.S.E. (1736-1819), inventor. The inventor of—strictly speaking, inventor of a radical improvement in—the steam engine was not only an engineer, but a good chemist and general scholar. He knew Greek, Latin, French, German, and Italian, was a corresponding member of the French Institut, a foreign associate of the Academie des sciences, and an intimate friend of Lavoisier and Berthollet [see]. He so far accepted the ideas of the French Revolution that he refused the offer of a baronetcy though "his many and most valuable inventions must always place him among the leading benefactors of mankind" (*Dict. Nat. Biog.*). One of his earlier biographers, Williamson, a Christian, says that it would be interesting to know more about his "disposition to the supreme truths of revelation," but Andrew Carnegie shows, in his *Life of James Watt* (1905), that there was no obscurity about it. He was a Deist, and never attended church.

Watts, Charles (1836-1906), lecturer. He was the son of a Wesleyan minister, but was at an early age converted to Secularism by Southwell and Holyoake. He settled in London and joined Bradlaugh. In 1864 he and his brother John formed the printing business which is now Watts & Co. He was assistant editor of the *National Reformer* until 1877, when he left Bradlaugh and acquired the *Secular Review* from Holyoake. From 1886 to 1891 he worked for Secularism in Canada, and on his return to England he was associated with Foote on the *Freethinker* and on the Secularist platform. In his later years he co-operated with the Rationalist Press. He wrote one or two books and a number of pamphlets.

Watts, Charles Albert (1858-1946), son of Charles Watts, started as a compositor, under Austin Holyoake, at the age of twelve, and at thirteen was apprenticed to him as a letterpress printer. Charles Watts acquired the business at the death of Austin Holyoake, in 1876, and in 1882 it passed to C. A. Watts, who in 1885 inaugurated *The Literary Guide*, and later *The Agnostic Annual* (now *The Rationalist Annual*). The founding and the steady growth of the Rationalist Press Association [see] were preponderantly his work. His son and daughter, Frederick C. C. Watts and Gladys Watts, began to work with their father as soon as their scholastic career was over. The former is the Chairman and Managing Director both of the R.P.A. and C. A. Watts & Co., Ltd., as well as Editor of *The Literary Guide* and *The Rationalist Annual*. Gladys Watts (now Mrs. Dixon) is the Secretary and a Director of C. A. Watts & Co., Ltd.. The fourth generation of the family is represented by the two daughters of F. C. C. Watts, Doreen and Marion.

Watts, George Frederick, R.A., A.M., D.C.L., LL.D. (1817-1904), painter. Of poor family and little general education, he worked his way through the Royal Academy Schools, and as early as 1837 had three paintings in the Academy exhibition. He was in great demand for frescoes and portraits, but is best known by his symbolic pictures of an ethical and humanitarian character.

Mrs. Russell Barrington, who knew him, grudgingly says: "No formalities of any Church appealed personally to Watts's feelings" (*G. F. Watts*, 1905-9) and "he did not feel so definitely the sense of the reality of the spiritual life as he did the sense of moral obligation." He was an Agnostic, but deprecated criticism of religion. He left his pictures—now the Watts Collection in the National Gallery—to the nation.

Watts-Dunton, Walter Theodore (1832-1914), poet. A London solicitor who deserted the law for letters. He was for years the leading critic on the *Athenæum* and published several volumes of poems, and he became widely known as author of the very fine novel, *Aylwin* (1898). Swinburne lived in his house for thirty years and, though he offended many by giving the great rebel-poet Christian burial, he was himself a Rationalist. In *The Literary Guide* for July 1914 a letter of his is quoted in which he speaks of his "great respect" for the work of the R.P.A. and regrets that his age prevents him from joining it.

Weismann, Prof. August, M.D., Ph.D., Bot.D., D.C.L. (1834-1914), German zoologist. He was professor of Zoology at Freiburg University, and by the end of the last century almost as well known as Darwin or Haeckel for his writings on evolution. He gave a very restricted place to Natural Selection and began the stress on heredity (*The Germ Plasm*, 1893), which opened the development of genetics. Weismann avoided the topic of religion, but in the translation of his works the mystic-minded Sir A. Thompson has taken the liberty of mistranslating some of his expressions so as to conceal his materialistic views.

Wellhausen, Prof. Julius (1844-1918), leading Biblical Critic. He was professor of theology at Greifswald University, but, adopting a broad Rationalism, he abandoned theology for Oriental languages, which he taught at Göttingen. His learned works on Jewish history and the Old Testament had a very large share in securing the triumph of the Higher Criticism in the last century. He wrote also on Arabic and Syriac literature and applied his methods to the New Testament. Wellhausen was a Theist, but excluded the supernatural

from the Bible and the history of Christianity.

Wells, Herbert George (1866-1946). He took first-class honours in Zoology at the London Royal College of Science before he devoted himself to literature, and his early stories commonly had a scientific interest. Broader problems, especially social problems, gradually absorbed him, and he won so much attention by his forecasts of human development that he was invited to lecture on "The Discovery of the Future," at the Royal Institution (1902). In 1909 he began the series of social novels which made his name familiar in every country. It is commonly considered in America and Europe that Shaw and he are the highest representatives of British literature. Although he had occasionally used caustic language in his earlier works about the Christian idea of God, he had a broad belief—he told this to the present writer before 1914—in some sort of "divine will," but, as he later explained in his *Autobiography* (1934), and elsewhere, the attempt he made for a year or two to spread a belief in God as a sort of Great Captain (*God the Invisible King*, 1917, etc.) was chiefly due to a feeling, inspired by the world-troubles, that the race would benefit by some such leading ideal. On the title-page of a copy of *The Soul of a Bishop* (1917), one of the books advocating it (with the motto "Man's true Environment is God"), which he sent to the present writer, he wrote "from his co-religionist." It was a social experiment that failed, and he genially disowned it in his *Autobiography*. In his later years he became decidedly Agnostic and aggressive. In a speech to the British Association in September, 1941, he boldly spoke of the "dead religions that cumber the world" and said that "a dead religion is like a dead cat—the stiffer and more rotten it is, the better it is as a missile weapon" (*News-Chronicle*, September 29). The range of his works, the fluency and suppleness of his style, and the fearlessness of the expression of his opinions, made him a very valuable agent in public education.

Westbury, Lord. [See Bethell, Richard.]

Westermarck, Prof. Edward Alexander, Ph.D., LL.D. (1862-1939), sociologist. A Finn by birth and education, for some years he taught sociology, and later philosophy, at Helsingfors University. From 1907, until he died, he had the chair of sociology at London University, and his remarkable command of anthropology gave a unique value to his works. His *History of Human Marriage* (1891) was translated into German, Swedish, Italian, French, Spanish, Russian, and Japanese, and his *Origin and Development of the Moral Ideas* (2 vols., 1906) is the standard work on the subject. Westermarck was an Agnostic (personal knowledge) and an Honorary Associate of the R.P.A. until his death.

Westlake, Prof. John, B.A., LL.D., D.C.L., K.C. (1828-1913), jurist. He was professor of international law at Cambridge from 1888 to 1908 and one of the highest authorities on his subject. He was a member of the International Court of Arbitration, Honorary President of the Institute of International Law, and the recipient of many international honours. In *Memories of John Westlake* (1914), by some of his colleagues, he is quoted saying, apropos of his earlier support of Bishop Colenso: "I at that time desired to see a wider comprehension in the Church of England than I now believe to be possible in any religious communion, established or voluntary" (p. 11). He took a keen interest in the London Sunday Lecture Society and especially the Rationalist lectures it used to give in the later years of the last century (personal knowledge).

Whale, George (1849-1925), solicitor. He held various public appointments besides his practice of law, and was at one time Mayor of Woolwich. He wrote works on the history of London and was one of the founders of the Omar Khayyam and the Pepys Clubs. Whale was an Agnostic and Chairman of the R.P.A. 1922-5.

Wheeler, Joseph Mazzini (1850-98), writer. For twenty years he wrote industriously for the National Secular Society, co-operating with Foote in writing *The Crimes of Christianity* and contributing to the *Freethinker*. His *small Biographical Dictionary of Freethinkers* (1889) is of value in preserving

details about many workers in the Freethought Movement.

Whistler, James McNeill (1833-1903), painter. His father was a major in the American Army, and he was himself educated at West Point; but he went to Paris to study art, and while he was there became an aggressive Atheist. Armstrong says, in his *Reminiscences*, that Whistler was notorious for ridiculing the Bible and singing blasphemous songs. Settling in London, his unique art gradually won recognition in spite of the attacks of Ruskin, against whom he won—but with only nominal damages—an action for libel. He was an Officer of the Legion of Honour and Commander of the Order of the Crown of Italy, and had many other honours.

White, Prof. Andrew Dickson, M.A., LL.D., Ph.D., L.H.D., D.C.L. (1832-1918), American writer. After a brilliant academic career in France and Germany, as well as America, he became professor of history and English literature at Michigan University. In 1866 he was appointed professor of history at Cornell and was the first President of that University. He presented the University with \$300,000 and 40,000 volumes. Re-entering the Diplomatic Service, which he had left for teaching, he served as American Minister in Germany, Russia, and other countries, and received a large number of the highest international honours. He was one of the most respected Americans of his time, and it was bold for a man in his position to write his famous *History of the Warfare of Science with Theology in Christendom* (3 vols., 1876), and it is a work of impressive scholarship which Catholic writers quite ridiculously assailed. He was a Theist (*Autobiography*, 1905), but rejected Christianity and immortality, and was an Honorary Associate of the R.P.A.

White Terror, The. [See *Terror, the White.*]

Whitman, Walt (1819-92), American poet. After a few years as teacher and journalist, though he had had little schooling, he took to rambling and manual labour, but some of his friends say that he had not the intimate knowledge of the workers that is implied in his

writings. *Leaves of Grass* (1855) attracted a good deal of ridicule, though the next generation agreed with Emerson that it contains "incomparable things incomparably said." He served as a nurse in the Civil War, but was stricken with paralysis and spent the next twenty years in poverty. In his chief work he disdains to notice religion apart from a beautiful apostrophe to "Sister Death," in which he rejects the belief in immortality. The Massachusetts authorities condemned the work as immoral, but Whitman is now counted one of America's greatest writers.

Whittaker, Thomas, B.A. (1856–1935), writer. He was assistant editor of and frequent contributor to *Mind* (1885–1891) and collaborated with Prof. Bain in editing Croom Robertson's *Philosophical Remains* (1894). He wrote *The Neo-Platonists* (1901), *The Origins of Christianity* (1904), and a few other works, and was a Director of the R.P.A.

Whyte, Adam Gowans, B.Sc. (b. 1875), writer. After graduating at Glasgow University he took to journalism and was sub-editor of the *Glasgow Weekly Citizen*. He settled in London in 1898, and for some time edited *Electrical Industries*. Besides a few novels, he has written *The Religion of the Open Mind* (1913), *The Natural History of Evil* (1920), and a few other works. He was one of the original directors of the R.P.A. and is now its Literary Adviser.

Wieland, Christoph Martin (1733–1813), German writer. At the age of sixteen he had read the whole of Latin literature as well as Voltaire and Bayle, who shook his faith. For a time he returned to Christianity, but a study of Shaftesbury, D'Alembert, and other great Rationalists, made him a Deist (without belief in immortality). Wieland was second only to Goethe in German letters, and a scholar of extraordinary erudition. He edited a German translation of Shakespeare (1762–6). His description of an ideal State (*Der Goldene Spiegel*, 1772) led the Duchess of Weimar to engage him as tutor to her sons, and at Weimar he was a close friend of Goethe. His chief work, *Aristippus und seine Zeitgenossen*

(4 vols., 180–8), reveals him as a sober Epicurean, though a Deist. He never returned to belief in a future life.

Wilberforce, William (1759–1833), abolitionist. Church of England writers always refer to Wilberforce and Shaftesbury [see], the only prominent reformers they can claim in the early and dangerous days of reform, in a entirely misleading fashion. Wilberforce learned his zeal against slavery from the French Rationalists, while he was at school, and he was then himself a sceptic. His father died while he was young, and an aunt sent him to a strictly religious school, but his mother transferred him to a school "where the religious impressions he had received were soon dissipated by a life of gaiety" (*Chambers's Encyclopædia*); yet from this school he sent, to a York paper, a protest against "the odious traffic in human flesh." These facts are confirmed in the *Life of Wilberforce* by his pious sons, who claim that he remained a sceptic until he was nearly thirty. While he took a noble part in the abolition of whatism, left of slavery in England and possessions, we must remember that every other social respect he was a rank reactionary. He was one of Pitt's strongest supporters in the harsh measures which he adopted in his reaction to the French Revolution.

Wilcox, Ella Wheeler (1855–1919), American poet. She had an immense popularity in America in the last century and the first two decades of this, and, though literary critics generally disliked the quality of her verse, some of her Rationalist lines almost became proverbial ("So many gods, so many creeds," etc.). Her own creed, a rather vague Pantheism, as is the way of poets, is best given in her prose work *New Thought Common Sense* (1908). She said that she was "neither a Roman Catholic nor a Protestant" (p. 136), but believed in "the Divinity which dwells in us" (139).

Wilkes, John, F.R.S. (1727–97), politician. References in modern literature to the "great demagogue" of the eighteenth century, or the "gay spark" of Medmenham Abbey, are misleading. Wilkes had had a thorough education, completed at Leyden University, and

he was engaged on a translation of Anacreon. Baron D'Holbach was a fellow-student at Leyden and brought him into close association with the Encyclopædists. He was admitted to the Royal Society at the age of twenty-two. He entered Parliament as a reformer and democrat, but one of his writings was burned by the hangman (1763) and he fled to Paris, where he was welcomed by Diderot. Returning to the House of Commons, he incurred a sentence of imprisonment and was expelled from the House, but made and eventually won a spirited fight for his right to sit. He was the idol of the people of London, and in 1774 was Lord Mayor, the king declaring that he was one of the best who ever held the office. At that time Christians affected great scorn of his morals and irreligion, yet they now claim him (H. Bleackley, *Life of John Wilkes*, 1907—though he admitted that Wilkes once said that the word "Courtship" would be as ridiculous on the lips of the word "liberty" as the word "law" would be of Dr. Johnson). It is very natural if he was even a Deist.

John H. The. One of the most flagrant instances of the complete anachronism of the advance of science in general (and religious and philosophical) literature is the continued use of the word "will." It is a discredited relic of the faculty-stage in the development of psychology. In the psychology of to-day only a few reactionary writers like Dr. Joad, who cling to the old theory that the mind is a reality and spiritual, use the word or think it more than a term of some convenience, like "mind." Half the scientific manuals of the last ten years do not even mention the word (Profs. Bulter and Karwaski's *Human Psychology*, 1937; Prof. A. D. Ritchie, *The Natural History of Mind*, 1936; Prof. G. D. Higginson, *Psychology*, 1936; Prof. J. H. Griffiths, *The Psychology of Human Behaviour*, 1935; etc.). Prof. J. P. Guilford (*General Psychology*, 1939) calls it a commonsense expression, not a scientific term. Dr. K. Dunlap (*Psychology*, 1936) says that the term is better avoided by psychologists. Prof. Hoisington (*Psychology*, 1935) thinks the word might be kept for "a type of response integration," a con-

tinuation of "the thought-series." Prof. Young (*The Motivation of Behaviour*, 1936) has the best treatment of the subject. He describes several series of experiments that were conducted in order to test the common belief that the pupil who puts his "will" into his work does better than other pupils. The experiments, he says, disclose "no definite factor which could be called will." The real driving force is a complex motivation: exhortation and encouragement from teachers, rivalry, love of the reward of success, etc., or a blend of intellectual and emotional motives. What some call the "will to believe" is in most cases clearly a complex of emotions and interests; just as the will to believe in will (or free will) is due to the influence of the belief in a spiritual soul. The problem of "freedom" [see] vanished when our inner experience was carefully analysed. It is the same with "will" according to the great majority of modern psychologists. It has been realized that there are "sets" or "postural adjustments" of the organism analogous to the visible set of an athlete waiting for the signal to run. A "strong will" is such a set. It has been noticed that a group of young men will take up a task or game and soon drop it from lack of interest, but if a motive is lodged in consciousness—a prize, an audience, reporter or photographer, rivalry, a bet, etc.—the "will" is quickened. In short, it is resolved into elements of thought and emotion. The ultimate dynamic element is sought in the fundamental urges of the organism (hunger, sex, rage, etc.) or organic attraction and repulsion. These are definite physiological qualities or operations and are described in any modern manual of psychology; while vital force, libido, psychic energy, and will are just words, like soul, mind, or instinct.

Williams, Sir Charles Hanbury (1708–59), diplomat. Entering politics, he was Paymaster to the Marine Forces (1739–42) and Lord Lieutenant of Herefordshire (1742–7). He was a more prominent figure in society, where his wit and light verse gave him a reputation for blasphemy. Appointed Envoy-Extraordinary to Berlin, he became an

intimate friend of Voltaire, and he was later a distinguished diplomat at Dresden and St. Petersburg. In London he was a close friend of Lord Hervey [see] and Lord Holland [see], and he was known in the brilliant sceptical circle at Holland House as "the Atheist." When his writings were published in three volumes in 1822, the *Quarterly* was outraged by their "horrible blasphemies." He lived loosely and died by his own hand, and he was buried with great honour in Westminster Abbey.

Williams, David (1738–1816), Welsh writer. A Calvinist minister who shed his theology and founded a Deistic Church, which failed. Franklin lived for a time at his house and collaborated with him in drafting a form of worship for Deists. Frederic the Great and Voltaire thought highly of him. He had a chapel in London, while supporting himself by teaching and writing. He wrote several Deistic works, translated Voltaire's *Treatise on Toleration*, and was enrolled a citizen of the French Republic.

Wilson, Andrew, Ph.D., M.B., F.R.S.E., F.L.S. (1852–1912), Scottish physician and lecturer. After graduating at Edinburgh he was appointed university lecturer in zoology and comparative anatomy. He was regarded as one of the most brilliant popular lecturers on science of his time, and he occasionally lectured at South Place Chapel. In the published lecture, *What is Religion?* (1884), he is a Spencerian Agnostic and rejects "the petty conceptions which theologies in their anthropomorphism have devised."

Wilson, David Alex (1864–1930), Scottish writer. He was called to the Scottish Bar, but entered the Indian Service in Burma and served the full term of office as a judge. On his return to Scotland, in 1912, he devoted himself to research on Carlyle and wrote the leading biography of him (6 vols., 1923–9). He had already written *Mr. Froude and Carlyle* (1898) and *The Truth about Carlyle* (1913). In earlier works he professed belief in an "eternal unchanging Spirit of the Universe," but in his later years he was a complete Agnostic (personal knowledge).

Wilson, Sir Roland Knyvet of Delhi, baronet, M.A., LL.M. (died 1919),

jurist. Son of Rear-Admiral G. K. Wilson, he became a barrister and journalist and was appointed Reader in Law to Cambridge University. He wrote several works of great authority on law. In his later years he made a thorough study of religion, and said (*Hibbert Journal*, October 1912) that he had hitherto believed, like Francis Newman, in God, though not immortality, but "I have of late felt myself less and less able to affirm with any confidence the existence of any supreme mind behind the visible universe" (p. 28). Such a being ought in any case to be "ignored in practice," and religion should be a humanitarian ethical culture.

Wise, John Richard de Capel (1831–90), naturalist. He was a high authority on birds and natural history in general (*The New Forest*, 1862, etc.) and also an authority on Shakespeare. He followed Spencer and J. S. Mill in their Agnosticism and was a close friend of Lewes and George Eliot. It was he who converted Walter Crane to Rationalism, and Crane tells us (*Reminiscences*, p. 69) that Wise's parents had wanted him to train for the ministry, and they quarrelled over religion.

Witchcraft. There are few subjects in the history of religion on which our ideas have been so completely altered as in regard to witchcraft. Although Joan of Arc, a girl of seventeen, was seriously charged with witchcraft, and her brilliant friend the Marshal Gilles de Rais was generally admitted to have been a witch, almost every writer continued to repeat the theory that witches were morbid, isolated, and repulsive old women. This theory was gravely advanced as late as 1876 in *Chambers's Encyclopædia* (now altered), though the writer accepted Sprenger's estimate that about 9,000,000 of them were put to death by Christians! It is another instance of the looseness with which facts of religious history are manipulated in the interest of the Church that, while the Witches' Sabbaths were held to be occasions for sexual debauch, the old woman theory was maintained. Even to-day the leading encyclopædias are generally unsatisfactory in the articles on it, and the confusion in other

literature is deplorable. Witchcraft—it probably means “wisdom-craft” or secret wisdom—was an organized religion, bitterly antagonistic to Christianity, in which the Devil was worshipped as the real friend of man and rather a Prince of Light than of Darkness. Chiefly on account of his theoretical ban on sensual pleasure, the Christian God was held to be an enemy of the human race, and on that account the secret meetings by night of the votaries culminated in sexual orgies. That it was, however, an organized cult like any other, with members of both sexes and all ages—mothers enrolling even their babies as members—is shown in so many documents that the lingering, in serious literature, of the absurd older theory is remarkable. White reproduces, in his *Warfare of Science with Theology* (1876), a letter written in 1629 by the Chancellor of the Bishop of Warzburg. This grave authority, writing about what is taking place in his own city at the moment of writing, says that 400 men, including “clerics, councillors, city officials, and court assessors,” are to be arrested as witches. Fourteen out of forty students in the theological seminary are charged. A dean has been arrested, and two others have fled. The notary of the Church Consistory, “a very learned man,” has been arrested and tortured. A beautiful girl of nineteen, with an exceptional reputation for modesty and purity, has been executed, and seven or eight similar girls are to follow. “There are three hundred children of three or four years of age who are said to have had intercourse with the Devil, and I have seen put to death children of ten and promising students of ten, twelve, fourteen, and fifteen.” It is estimated that a third of the population of the city are involved. In three months of one year, in the sixteenth century, 600 were burned in the bishopric of Bamberg, and 900 in the bishopric of Wurtzburg. A thousand were burned in a year in the diocese of Como. One judge in Lorraine condemned 900 in fifteen years, and it is estimated that 30,000 witches were burned in France under Henri III. In the first decade of the seventeenth century, French judges found the cult

almost universal (including many of the priests) in many districts of the south, as described by Pierre de L'Ancre, a judge of high character and ability, in his *L'incrédulité et mescréance du sortilège pleinement convaincu* (1622). That many innocent people were executed, especially after torture, may be assumed, but the accounts of the trials repeatedly tell how the witches boasted of their cult in court, in exactly the same language as the early Christian martyrs, and willingly died for it. Sprenger's figure of 9,000,000 victims in a few centuries seems to be an exaggeration, but the number of genuine “martyrs” of the cult was certainly hundreds, if not thousands, of times as large as that of the Christian martyrs [see] in the same stretch of time. And that they were of both sexes, and all ages and conditions, is shown in all the documents, which fill several volumes. An Irish lady of rank, Alice Kyteler (probably Kettle), was an early victim. Marshal Gilles de Rais, “one of the finest intelligences of the time” (*Grande Encyclopédie*) and suspiciously attached to Joan [see], is admitted to have been a witch. Earl Bothwell is gravely suspected, and there is serious evidence against the Duc d'Alençon and other high nobles. [See *Black Mass* and *Satanism* for developments at Paris under Louis XIV.]

The modern authorities generally connect the cult with survivals of the pre-Christian nature-religions of Europe, especially the world-wide cult of the spirit of fertility. The metamorphosis of earlier good spirits into bad, when the priests of a new religion triumphed over the old, led in many places to secret “dealings with the Devil.” The Protestant witch-hunters could appeal to the Old Testament, and the early Fathers often denounce such dealings. The conversion of the older European gods into devils—a few local deities had the good fortune to become saints—by the Christians from the fifth century onward would have the same effect, and we find references to witches in Charlemagne in the eighth century, Abbot Regino in the tenth, and a few others, but these references are not numerous until the twelfth century. To whatever

extent old pagan practices lingered—writers of the Dark Age speak of women still worshipping Diana by moonlight—the great development of witchcraft in the later (and less densely ignorant) Middle Age points to an entirely new influence, especially as so many educated or noble men and women were involved. Some see this in the spread of Neo-Manichæan [see *Albigensians*] ideas, but the Manichæans, following Zoroastrian theology, were Puritans, and loathed the Devil above all for creating the flesh. The mediæval organization of witchcraft, moreover, was entirely new. A “coven” (possibly corruption of “convene”) of witches was usually a local group of twelve, with a man, a representative or priest of “the Spirit,” in charge. He was naturally secretive, and is sometimes described as dressed in black and making sudden appearances or disappearances, and he summoned them to the nocturnal secret meetings, which lasted from midnight to dawn. They took food and drink, often handing in reports and initiating new members—mothers are described as taking babies for initiation—sang and danced for hours (much as in the early Christian *agape*, or love-feasts [see], which would be more likely models than Manichæan services). Sometimes there was a Black Mass with a stolen host. There were never human sacrifices, for the dominant note was joyousness. Sex-indulgence was probably the chief attraction, and it is clear that the “priests” were in such demand (probably on a semi-religious ground) that they used artificial phalli. The full details must be read in the works listed below. Protestant authorities were as zealous against them as Catholic; but, while Aquinas and the Schoolmen had endorsed all the popular superstitions about them, criticism of the crude procedure, which certainly led to the destruction of large numbers of innocent lives, began with Protestants (Johann Weier, Reginald Scott, etc.) a century before any Catholics attacked it. In spite of the efforts of recent authorities to trace the cult to earlier practices, one may regard the whole mediæval movement, from the twelfth to the seventeenth century, as an emphatic reaction against

the ascetic doctrines of the Christian religion. It is otherwise difficult to understand the large proportion of clerics (even nuns are named) and educated men and women in it. The age, it is true, was farther from asceticism in practice than any other, but witchcraft defied the doctrine of the Church instead of paying it lip-homage. Most of the modern research is available to English readers in Miss (now Professor) M. A. Murray's admirable *Witch-Cult in Western Europe* (1921), though she leaves too many quotations untranslated. For a mass of documents covering the whole period see H. C. Lea's *Materials Toward a History of Witchcraft* (3 vols., 1939). The author did not live to weave his material into a history. P. W. Sergeant's *Witches and Warlocks* (1936) is not serious history, and M. Summer's *Popular History of Witchcraft* (1937) is a ludicrous defence of the Catholic Church, claiming that the cult is as active as ever and “a definite factor in politics to-day.” Miss Murray's scholarly study is fully supported by Dr. W. G. Söldan's *Geschichte der Hexenprozesse* (1911).

Wollstonecraft, Mary. [See Godwin, Mary Wollstonecraft.]

Woman and Christianity. Five of the six broad and fundamental claims that are made for the moral or social service of Christianity—that it “gave the world schools,” “broke the fetters of the slave,” “taught men charity” (hospitals, etc.), purified morals, secured justice for the workers, and “uplifted woman,” are considered in many articles of this work. The sixth, which is discussed here, is not merely as unsound, but, soberly speaking, as ridiculously opposed to the historical truth, as the other five. In the large literature about woman which began to appear in the feminist struggle of the first quarter of the present century it is not disputed that in the Egyptian and Babylonian civilizations woman was, legally and socially—neither sex had political rights—the equal of man, and the scanty evidence clearly suggests that she had a similar equality amongst the Hittites and the Cretans, since their chief deity was female. It is not seriously disputed, in the face of the evidence of

the Old Testament, that the Jews were in this respect below the level of contemporary civilization. Although the best part of the Mosaic legislation was borrowed from the Hammurabi Code [see], the clauses which gave woman equal justice were not adopted. The Greeks began their history, like the Aryans generally, with a marked inequality of the sexes; but woman began to find powerful champions (Euripides, Plato, etc.) at Athens, and, as Epicurus stood for equality, the general influence of the Epicureans on the later Greek world relieved woman's disabilities until Christianity was established and the Byzantine civilization relapsed into the old injustice. The Romans in turn opened their historical career with woman in a position of profound inequality [see **Marriage; Romans;** etc.], but the women conducted an organized revolt as early as the second century B.C., and by the end of the pre-Christian era were generally free from the tyranny of the men and admitted to social equality. The first empress, Livia, a woman of strong and high character—as were half a dozen of the pagan empresses (Fundana, Plotina, Sabina, Julia Donna, etc.), and none of their Christian successors—was in many respects an ancient Queen Victoria, and in the following two centuries the Stoic-Epicurean lawyers removed all the disabilities of women from Roman law. Sir Henry Maine says: "Led by their theory of Natural Law, the jurists had evidently at this time assumed the equality of the sexes as a principle of their code of equity" (*Ancient Law*, p. 154). The apologist is, in fact—especially as he rarely knows anything about Roman law or history—obliged to content himself with a claim that the Church "elevated" women by making marriage a sacrament. How many modern women would consider it a gain to be bound for life, whatever the character of the husband, need not be considered, as the Church had no control of marriage until centuries later; and the plea of the more ignorant apologists, that the Church, by purifying the morals of the Romans, lifted woman from the position of "playing" of man is absurdly at variance

with the social history of the time. [For authorities see **Divorce; Marriage; Romans, Morals of the.**] The claim of the apologist is seen to be quite reckless when we recall the broadest fact of the history of the time, that the attainment of power by the Christian religion was at once followed by the fall of Rome (410) and the setting-in of the Dark Age [see], during which for five or six centuries at least four-fifths of the women of Europe were serfs [see] living in squalid subjection, and the women of the Teutonic ruling class were very disorderly. [See **Franks.**] The apologist would have us admire the Church for creating such positions as abbess for women; but there was a widespread corruption of the nunneries [see **Boniface**], and there had been no need in later pagan years to adopt a life that was either cruel or hypocritical in order to gain respect.

During the Dark Age it might almost be said that woman was equal to man because all were sunk in a common degradation and subjection. In the second part of the Middle Age her position is much misunderstood, and the guilt of the Church is greater. Very few writers on the subject seem to appreciate the fact that what they say about the position of woman from the fifth century to the nineteenth applies only to women of the middle class (which was very small until the later Middle Age) and the wealthy, or noble class. The less said the better about four-fifths (earlier more) of the women of Europe during that period. But the peculiar disservice of the Church to woman was that when she began to rise with the general rise of European civilization, after 1050, the Church thrust her down into a position of deeper injustice than ever. For a century or two the women of the knightly and noble class enjoyed a remarkable freedom. In no civilized age were these women so aggressively immoral and so far removed from what is called the ideal of womanhood as during the Age of Chivalry. See article on that period for the facts and the authorities, who are unanimous. The licence, cruelty, and unscrupulousness of the women of the new Teutonic nobility had generally continued throughout the Dark Age

[see Rule of the Whores for Rome], and in the eleventh century, reinforced by the Normans who had settled in France, they greedily seized upon the new luxury and adventurousness. The shrinking maid and the tender matron of romantic literature concerning this period are grotesque fiction. It was an age of what are called "masculine" women, entirely shameless in their pursuit of men, and extraordinarily callous to the sufferings of the mass of the people. The Church was bound to react on so gross a defiance of Christian principles; but under the lead of the Schoolmen, who are now represented as quite modern in sentiment, the reaction went so far that it put woman in the state of injustice from which she had to be redeemed in modern times. The Schoolmen followed the early Fathers, almost all of whom had, in their zeal against sins of the flesh, used contemptuous language about women. Broadly they followed the legend of *Genesis*, that it was woman who caused the fall of man. As most of the feminist writers before 1910—before the Churches were compelled in their own interest to take up the feminist cause—were sceptics, they freely reproduce the misogynous passages of Clement, Alexandria, Tertullian, Origen, Gregory of Nazianzum, Ambrose, and Augustine. About the same time the Canon Law was elaborated, based upon the same ascetic sentiments of Paul and the Fathers, and there is no dispute amongst jurists about the fact that its influence on civil law was profoundly injurious to women. "It was the policy of the Church to keep women in a subordinate position," says one of the more Christian of the modern feminist writers, Mrs. G. Hill (*Women in English Life*, p. vii). And, as if history sought to emphasize in every chapter the truth that otherworldly religions cannot of their nature be expected to be of social service, it records how, while woman in a generally advancing Christendom sank lower and lower, she at the same time rose to her old position of equality and justice in the new sceptical civilization, that of the Spanish Arabs (McCabe's *Splendour of Moorish Spain*, 1935).

Feminist writers who try to mitigate

this reflection on the Church can do little more than point out how, after the Reformation, many women were conspicuous and honoured in English, French, and German public life, as some had been during the Italian Renaissance. They lack a sense of proportion. Certainly not one woman in 10,000 had any such power or distinction, and the basis of it was not always very Christian. But it is superfluous to argue. In her standard *History of Women's Suffrage* (III, 290) Mrs. Cady Stanton has a lengthy statement of women's legal and social position at the beginning of the nineteenth century. The husband was permitted by law to beat her with a stick or sell her—this was still done in England a hundred years ago—take all her property or remove her children from her. Few careers were open to her, and those who wanted the professions opened to them, or political rights, or a redress of their legal grievances, were drenched with obloquy. There is no greater mistake than to suppose that the spirited feminist fight of the last two generations was just for the right to vote. Woman, in both Catholic and Protestant countries, was "not a person," says Mrs. Cady Stanton. What the Nazis did to woman in Germany was to restore part of the injustice which was inflicted on her by Christian influence; what Russia has done for her is a repetition of the work of sceptical periods of history. And, significantly, it was from the ferment of French thought created by the atheistic Encyclopædists that the cry for redress arose. The Condorcets formulated the demand in France, but it had not had time to soften the traditional opposition when the Napoleonic compromise, and then the period of reaction, paralysed it. Meantime it had passed to England, where Godwin, Mary Wollstonecraft, and Shelley voiced it; and while the clergy continued to sneer, Robert Owen, Bentham, J. S. Mill, and Holyoake, lent all their influence in support. Not until the cause was within sight of political victory, and had won considerable legal and social redress, did the Church move. It was the same in America. Frances Wright [see], a

follower of Owen, took the agitation there from Scotland, and in the difficult years that followed throughout the nineteenth century it was mainly rebels against the Churches who sustained the fight for justice. Of fourteen leaders after Frances Wright, indicated as such in Mrs. Cady Stanton's large history, four were Quakers, one a Deist, and the remainder nearly all Agnostics or Atheists. It was the same in every country. It was the atheistic German Socialist leaders in Germany, and Ibsen, Björnson, and Ellen Key in Scandinavia, who led the demand, while notoriously the cause made least progress, and was most opposed by the clergy, in Catholic countries. [For literature see **Feminism** and the articles to which reference is made in the text.]

Woman and Religion. While the attempt to retain the loyalty of women to the Churches on the ground that Christianity has been "her best friend" was discredited, as far as educated women are concerned, by the large historical literature which the modern feminist agitation evoked, many imagine that the Churches can still rely on it because woman is from her "nature," or psychological endowment, "more religious than man." This is one of those facile generalizations which exact inquiry discredits. Modern psychology [see] increasingly rejects the idea of a fixed "nature" of either man or woman, and, although psychologists discreetly avoid inquiries which might be distasteful to religious folk, the laboratory experiments conducted in America have destroyed much of the basis of the belief in a special feminine "nature" from the psychological point of view. It has been proved, for instance, that woman is not more sensitive than man, and that faculties especially claimed for her (intuition, clairvoyance, etc.) do not exist. Glandular differences, and the larger extent of her sympathetic (abdominal) nervous system and adipose deposits, tend to give her more emotional instability—this does not necessarily mean attachment to religion as such—but the idea that she has less brain than man (in proportion to total weight of active body) is exposed in all manuals of

physiology. The fundamental fallacy is, however, the generalization itself, and the idea becomes preposterous when the women of different countries or historical periods are considered. The average woman of the Age of Chivalry was the exact opposite of the alleged feminine type (gentle, clinging, and modest). All authorities admit that she was quite generally, in the knights and noble class, brazen in her sexual aggressiveness, callous, "hard," and noisily self-assertive. Havelock Ellis, in reference to men and women of this period in his *Psychology of Sex*, is led astray by the conventional version of Chivalry. Dr. R. Briffault (*The Mothers*, 3 vols., 1927) has several sound chapters on the women of the time, with full references. On the other hand, Havelock Ellis has an admirable chapter on this subject in his *Man and Woman* (8th ed., 1934). He points out that, of 600 founders of religions or sects, only seven (including the founders of Spiritualism, Theosophy, and Christian Science) were women, and that women are as enthusiastic as men in modern Left Wing movements. The truth is that the common idea that women are the "main support of the Churches" is greatly exaggerated. The only exact statistics are those of the census of church-goers taken in London in 1902-3 (R. Mudie-Smith, *The Religious Life of London*, 1904). The total of church-goers was 372,264 men and 607,267 women, whereas writers had said that there were three women to one man. But the figures in detail showed that environment and the artistic quality of the Church counted more than "nature." In the wealthy Catholic churches there were three or four women to one man; in the poorer districts and Protestant churches there was little disproportion of the sexes. In a normal social order, with complete equality, there is no greater religiosity in the female sex, but the narrower environment of the domestic woman on six days of the week makes her more ready to welcome the change on Sunday.

Wood, Sir Henry Joseph (1869-1944), musician. In his earlier years he gave organ recitals and conducted at opera and concerts. He began as conductor of the Queen's Hall Promenade Con-

certs in 1895, and two years later became conductor of the Queen's Hall Symphony Concerts; he also conducted at several musical Festivals. Sir Henry was an Honorary Associate of the R.P.A.

Woolner, Thomas, B.A. (1875-92), sculptor. He exhibited his work at the age of eighteen, at twenty won the medal of the Society of Arts, and in the following year exhibited at the Academy. He became a friend of Rossetti, Carlyle, and Tennyson, but he made so little money that he went to the American goldfields. After his return to England he was one of the most prosperous and most distinguished sculptors in the country. The statue of J. S. Mill on the Embankment, is due to him. He was a friend of G. J. Holyoake and shared his Agnosticism.

Woolston, Thomas, B.A., B.D. (1669-1731), writer. He graduated in divinity at Cambridge and became a Fellow of his college, but was deposed for writing an heretical pamphlet. He did not profess to be a Deist, and in pamphlets he attacked "the hireling clergy" and rejected the miracles of the Bible, yet claimed to be a Christian. He was sentenced to a year in prison and a fine of £100 for blasphemy, and as he could not pay the fine he was detained in the Debtor's Prison until he died. He paid the fines incurred by his publishers.

Workers, The Churches and the. It was one of the inevitable results of modern developments, until the Vatican felt it safe to turn to Fascism, that apologists of the Church of Rome, confronted with an advancing Socialism, should claim that the Church had in all ages secured justice to the workers, and Protestant writers (for the workers), being mostly in anti-Fascist countries, continue to make the claim. Since one of the outstanding events of the last hundred years, if not since the outbreak of the French Revolution, has been the world-struggle of the workers to get rid of an age-old injustice, just in the time when Church influence decayed and the great majority of the leaders of the workers were strongly opposed to the Churches, the claim seems paradoxical. It would, indeed, be repudiated with disdain by the workers if the history of

the last century and a-half were truthfully told in our schools and general literature. It is not; and, as is shown in so many articles of this work, historical education has in our time so far departed from the comparative candour of the last century that these long-discredited claims to have succoured the slaves, the workers, the women, or the children, circulate in all their vigour in the church-going community and are too often regarded with respect by others. In serious history the claim is as preposterous as that of the astrologer. At the time when, in the fourth century, the Church first obtained any power to influence the social situation, the workers of the Roman world had a remarkable position. In Rome, and the other cities, they had, as every classical dictionary tells, free food (bread, and at different periods other grants), free schools for the children of all free workers, princely free entertainments (theatre, amphitheatre, and circus), palatial public baths at about one farthing each admittance, free medical service, trade unions (*Colleges*) and club-rooms, holidays on about 200 out of 365 days, and moderate hours of work. There were no "labour movements," and the Christian Church did not dream of doing or needing to do anything for the workers. It is difficult to compare the position of modern workers on account of the comprehensive changes of the conditions of life, but it is safe to say that in no part of the world except Arab Spain did the workers obtain conditions as good as those of the Greek-Roman worker of the fourth century until the latter part of the nineteenth century; and of the men who are named as leaders, in any history of the rise of the working class, four-fifths were Atheists or Agnostics. This historical truth is as little open to serious controversy as the truth in regard to the claim that Christianity abolished slavery, first founded schools or hospitals, improved the morals of Europe, or helped woman.

The condition of the workers in the earlier ancient world does not concern us here, though we may recall that they had remarkable protection under the Hammurabi Code [see] in ancient Babylon, and that Egyptologists find

their condition favourable in Egypt at the period in the second millennium B.C., which we know best (or 1500-1300). It is in the Roman world of the latter part of the fourth century of the Christian era that the social influence of the Church, if there was any, must be sought. Slavery [see] was now very greatly reduced, and mild in the cities, and, as the above description of the situation of the workers is not disputed, and there was certainly no improvement after A.D. 50, or any concern whatever of the Church leaders with the lot of the workers, we need not linger at this starting-point. Still less open to dispute is the collapse of the Empire and its institutions that speedily followed owing to the barbaric invasions, so that at least four-fifths of the people of Europe became serfs [see], which was a new form of slavery, living in universal dense ignorance and squalor. Our distinction between slaves and serfs has, in fact, no foundation in the literature of the Dark Age. Before Christianity triumphed, only one-third or one-fourth of the workers were *servi*, and these were generally foreign war-captives or their offspring; but, from about 600 to 1100, probably nine-tenths of the people of Europe were *servi* in the Latin literature of the time. In the course of the next two or three centuries, after 1100, the serfs were for the most part emancipated, and we saw [Serfdom] that this change is admitted to have been overwhelmingly due to political and economic developments. From this date the religious writer on the subject conveniently forgets that four-fifths of the workers remained agricultural, and he pays no attention to them. There was little or no improvement of their condition, and the knights and lords of the new civilization treated them with contemptuous brutality. [See Chivalry, the Age of, and Justice.] During war, which was almost chronic, the artisans of the towns were treated with the same brutality, and the Guilds [see], which in some ways protected them, were founded by them in defiance of the Church, and in so far as they did for some time help the workers owed nothing to the Church or churchmen. The profound injustices

which inspired the peasants' wars of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries were no more attacked by the Catholic Church than those of the sixteenth century were denounced by Luther. Both Churches stood with the rich. The men who wanted to help the workers were heretics like Arnold of Brescia, Wyclif, some of the Hussites, and the Anabaptists. It is the consistent teaching of experts on the subject, especially of the highest authority, Thorold Rogers, *Six Centuries of Work and Wages*, 2 vols., 1884, that the injustice to the workers was worse after the Reformation. In England the Anti-Combination laws savagely prevented the workers from formulating their demands and forcing concessions, and they had no fair share of the rapidly increasing wealth of the country. Little more than a hundred years ago the average wage was about ten shillings a week (for 14 to 16 hour's work a day on 6 days); and this was not due to the new Industrial Revolution, for, although the rush to the towns had made rural labour scarcer, agricultural workers got less than ten shillings a week and were still generally despised as clods or clowns. The chief writer on the development in Germany, Eccardus (*Geschichte des Niederen Volks*, 1907), tells the same story. After the Reformation, he says, "the arm of the prince and the noble everywhere became longer, swifter, and firmer," and the mass of the people then passed into the hell of the religious Thirty Years War. The chief writer on the development in France, P. Brisson (*Histoire du travail*, 1906), has, naturally, to agree, for the condition of the French workers on the eve of the Revolution is well known. Everywhere, after the sixteenth century, prices rose and wages did not. At the very time when Louis XIV was guilty of the colossal expenditure on his Court and capitals, which makes his reign shine in the eyes of superficial writers, there was almost unparalleled misery over vast stretches of rural France. See the documents in Martin's *Histoire de France* (appendix to Vol. XIII). The King's officers relentlessly pursued the starving people for taxes, and the Church was silent and corrupt; but because one

Catholic, Vincent de Paul, was moved to pity, Catholic writers ask us to admire what the Church did for the poor workers and suppress the horrors and the callous corruption of the prelates.

The workers, who were still four-fifths of every nation, were at their lowest level since the Dark Age, and more cruelly treated, in the latter part of the eighteenth century, after Christianity had held supreme power for fifteen centuries, than in the ancient civilizations. In the French Revolution, and its echoes in every country, began the fight for freedom and justice which continues in our time. That the leaders in France were overwhelmingly sceptics to our own time is not in dispute; nor is it open to question that the German leaders, after the futile liberal revolution of 1848, were the atheistic Socialists. In Great Britain, historians of the struggle give as leaders in the eighteenth century: Wilkes, Priestley, Godwin, Paine, Tooke, Mary Wollstonecraft, Holcroft, and Hardy—seven Deists or Atheists and one Unitarian (and he the least important to the workers). Wilberforce [see] was a sceptic when he took up a single reform (slavery), and in later years was a bitter opponent of the workers. The work was taken up in the years of reaction by Owen, Bentham, Shelley, Place, Cobbett, Mill, Ricardo, Burdett, Grote, and Brougham—nearly all Atheists—until it passed to the workers themselves in the (futile) Chartist movement. One clergyman, Raynor Stephens (who was unfrocked), was prominent in the movement until Kingsley raised the cry that it was necessary to save Christianity by co-operating in securing justice; though no one questions that Kingsley and the Christian Socialists sincerely sought justice. During all this period the Church of England sternly opposed the “radicals”—see *The Bishops as Legislators*, by the English (now Roman) Catholic J. Clayton (1906)—and the large progress from about 1870 onward was notoriously due to Trade Union pressure and the play of political interests. But the record of the Church of England, disgraceful as it is, does not approach, in injustice to the mass of the people, that of the Church of Rome.

The condition of the workers in Italy, Spain, and Portugal was the lowest of all—it was almost at its lowest in the Papal States [see]—yet here the Church co-operated intimately with the oppressors in so bloody a persecution that about 400,000 unarmed men, women, and children were done to death in little more than half a century. [See *Democracy and Justice*.] Since Italy emancipated itself from the Papal yoke, and France became a Republic, and Spain and Portugal had powerful Liberal parties by 1870, it would not be surprising if the Roman Church had reconsidered its position after that date. But the Catholic apologist's boasts of the share of recent Popes are seriously untruthful. Leo XIII still waited thirteen years after his accession before he would say a word about social justice, and, in the famous Encyclical *Rerum Novarum* (1891), his most radical demand was that the worker must have a “decent wage”; but he refused to define this when pressed to do so, and virtually retracted his encyclical before he died. His successors avoided the subject until they saw the rise of a powerful Nazi-Fascist movement which promised to overwhelm the democracies and restore reaction. Then, in 1931, Pius XI—or, more probably, his Secretary of State, now Pius XII—issued an Encyclical (*Quadragesimo Anno*) expressly recalling the Encyclical of Leo XIII and now calling upon all Catholic countries to set up the Fascist or Corporative State—a lead promptly followed by Spain, Portugal, Slovakia, and Vichy France, and the more Catholic Spanish-American Republics. Under the Papal-Fascist alliance everywhere the workers have returned to the serfdom of the Middle Ages, while in Great Britain and America, where the Catholic authorities refused to translate the Encyclical *Quadragesimo Anno* and gravely deceive the workers, the apologists continue to claim that their Church is, and always has been, the champion of justice to the workers. Further literature on each phase is recommended in the articles quoted in the text. For a summary survey of the entire history, with ample authorities, see McCabe's *Social Record of Christianity* (Thinker's

Library, 1935), and for the recent phase the third edition of the same author's *Papacy in Politics To-day* (1942).

Wright, Elizur (1804–85), American reformer. He is described by Ingersoll, in one of his speeches, as “one of the Titans who attacked the monsters, the gods, of his time.” All reforms had the service of his tongue and pen. He was secretary of the Anti-Slavery Society, editor of *The Abolitionist*, and President of the National Liberal League of America. Wright was an Atheist, and contributed to the *Boston Investigator* and the *Freethinker's Magazine*.

Wright, Frances. [See D'Arusmont, Francis.]

Wundt, Prof. Wilhelm Max, M.D., Ph.D., Jur.D. (1832–1920), German psychologist. A professor of physio-

logy, later of philosophy at Leipzig University, who founded an Institute for Experimental Psychology, one of the first laboratories of its kind in history, and became one of the leading psychologists of Europe. With his thorough command of physiology Wundt was able to do more than any other man in the task of ridding psychology of its mediæval entanglements and making it a science. He detested metaphysics and mysticism, was an evolutionist in psychology and ethics, rejected the belief in immortality, accepted God only as “a divine world-power,” and discarded Christianity as a clot of superstitions (*System der Philosophie*, 1889, pp. 649–51). His *Grundzüge der Physiologischen Psychologie* (1874) revolutionized his science.

X.

Ximenes, the Marquis Augustin Louis (1726–1817), French poet. Son of Marshal Ximenes, of Spain, he settled in France and was an important intermediary in inspiring Spain with French thought. He was in the French Army

for some years, but retired to devote himself to poetry and tragedy (*Œuvres*, 1772). Voltaire, whom he knew, esteemed him, and he joined in Voltaire's polemic against Rousseau's optimistic Deism.

Y.

Yahgans, The. One of the three racial types in Tierra del Fuego, and at the lowest level of human culture, as Darwin pointed out. They have no religious or ethical ideas (Hyades and Deniker, *Mission scientifique du Cap Horn*, 1891, Vol. VII), and what seemed to some a superstitious awe is fear of their more advanced neighbours. They are, however, now recognized as degenerate Amerindians, living in a very bleak environment—not a fragment of the primitive human race, like the Negritos.

Yeats, William Butler (1865–1939), Irish poet. He studied painting, but was diverted to letters by the success of a volume of poems, and for many years lived in London, where he was intimate

with literary Rationalists like Morris, Henley, and A. Symonds. Returning to Ireland, he helped to found the Irish Theatre and was the most respected figure in the Irish literary movement. He was not, as is generally supposed, a Catholic, and the *Catholic Encyclopædia* does not claim him. In his *Ideas of Good and Evil* (1903) he speaks of the “divine love in sexual passion” and says that “the great passions are angels of God.” He seems akin to Blake, but was less mystical. He criticizes Christianity, but believes in a “supersensible world” (p. 214). In the poem, “A boat” (in *Collected Poems*), he protests that he would rather be naked than wear garments from “mythologies.”

Youmans, Edward Livingston, M.D. (1821–87), American chemist. He had a very poor education and was blind for some years as a boy, but studied chemistry and physics, and, when he recovered, qualified in medicine. He was very popular as a lecturer on science and rendered great service by lecturing on evolution and the correlation of forces, in which he did pioneer work. He was an ardent Spencerian,

founder of *Popular Science Monthly*, and designer of The International Science Series. His brother, **William Jay Youmans, M.D.** (1838–1901), shared his early struggles and his ideals. He studied physiology at London under Huxley, but quit medical practice to join his brother on *Popular Science Monthly*. See Duncan's *Life and Letters of Herbert Spencer* (1908).

Z.

Zangwill, Israel, B.A. (1864–1926), writer. He used to call himself "practically self-educated," though in fact he had graduated with honours at London University and became a teacher, but deserted that profession for literature and journalism. His *Children of the Ghetto* (1892), and other stories, made his reputation, and he was Vice-President of the League of World-Friendship and President of the International Jewish Territorial Organization. The Rationalism in his play *The Next Religion* (1912) was so pronounced that the Lord Chamberlain refused it a licence. Speaking at an R.P.A. annual dinner, he said that he was "too much of a Maccabæan to be a McCabean," and whispered to the present writer, as he sat down, "but it would be difficult to say where we differ."

Zarathustra, the Persian prophet whose name is modified, in Greek writings, to "Zoroaster." We know the religion he is said to have founded almost entirely from Greek sources, and this has led to much controversy. Some have held that Zarathustra is a fictitious general name, like Homer, but the prevailing opinion is that it denotes an historical person. There is almost as much dispute about his date—the most favoured date at present is 660 to 583 B.C.—and what he actually taught is almost a matter of conjecture. Even the Avesta, the Persian sacred book, says little about him, although in its present form it was compiled in the Christian era. All that can be considered settled is that, some time

between 1000 and 500 B.C., a monotheistic reform of the old Aryan polytheism, with Ahura Mazda as the one God and creator of light and spirit, and Angra Mainyu as the supreme devil and creator of darkness and matter, appeared on the Persian hills north of Babylonia. Ahura Mazda is obviously a sublimation of the Sky-God or Father in Heaven of the Aryans (Dyaus-Pitar, Zeus, Jupiter, etc.), but the other ideas point rather to the demonology of the Babylonians and Assyrians. The antithesis of light and darkness, spirit and matter, had a profound influence on later religious and ethical development, but the evolution of the theory is hopelessly obscure. That one individual, amongst the very primitive Persians or Medes, worked out the religion is hardly likely. See A. V. W. Jackson, *Zoroastrianism* (1899), and J. H. Moulton, *Early Zoroastrianism* (1913). Nietzsche's selection of the prophet, in *Thus Spake Zarathustra*, was a piece of very bold irony for so anti-ethical a work. [See also *Avesta* and *Persian Religion*.]

Zeller, Prof. Edward (1814–1908), German philosopher. He was at first a professor of theology at Tübingen University, but the clerical authorities deprived him of the chair for his Rationalism, and he was invited to Berne, then Marburg. He called himself a liberal Protestant, but followed Hegel's philosophy and was a close friend of D. F. Strauss. In the end, he abandoned all theology and won a European reputation as an historian of

Greek philosophy (*Greek Thinkers*, 3 vols., Engl trans., 1844-52). He taught philosophy at Berlin and was a Privy Councillor.

Zeno (336-254 B.C.). The conventional idea of Stoicism is very misleading in regard to both the system itself and its founder. Zeno, either half Greek and half Phœnician, or, as Bevan calls him "a Hellenised Phœnician," came to Athens—very few of the philosophers who taught at Athens were Athenians—from Cyprus, and this suggests the influence of the Ionic School [see]. He wandered from one teacher to another in Athens, but was particularly attracted to the Cynics. Their excesses displeased him, however, and he became an independent teacher in the Painted Colonnade (or *Stoa*; hence Stoics) in the central square. Epicurus was a contemporary, and the bitter opposition of the Stoics to the Epicureans, at the time, gives a wrong impression that Zeno was a very spiritual, religious, ascetic man. All philosophers know that he was one of the most dogmatic of Materialists—see Gilbert Murray's *Stoic Philosophy* (1915, p. 23)—and did not found a religion, but they are not so candid about his personality. The ancient Greek biographer of the philosophers, Diogenes Laertius, says (*Lives of the Philosophers*, Bk. VII, Ch. I, 13) that Zeno "rarely used boys and he had recourse to young women only occasionally, and only in order to show that he had no prejudice against women." In other words, his ethic did not include the sex-clause. R. D. Hicks, in his English translation of Diogenes, renders this: "He rarely employed men-servants: once or twice indeed he *might* have a young girl to wait on him in order not to seem a misogynist." The words italicized are not in the Greek text, and falsify the sense. See the Latin translation in Cobet's standard edition of Diogenes. Zeno's chief ideas were the brotherhood of man—from Lydia [see] through Ionia—and the Law of Nature. He seems to have been an Atheist, and the religious wing which later developed in Stoicism was very restricted. The main body of the Stoics blended with the Epicureans [see], and it was this coal-

tion that had so beneficent an influence for the next four centuries in the Greek-Roman world.

Zeus. The chief of the Greek Pantheon and the chief deity of the Aryan peoples: Jupiter to the Romans, Dyaus-Ditar to the Aryan Hindus, etc. A Sanscrit word for "radiate" or "bright" suggests the derivation, and, as *piter*, or *pitar*, is the common word for "father," we see that Sky-Father, or Father in Heaven, was the chief European deity long before 1000 B.C. The original consort of Zeus was Gaia (probably Earth), possibly the Mother-Earth goddess subordinated to a masculine god.

Zimmern, Helen (1846-1934), writer. She was brought as a child to England, but went to Italy and won a high literary reputation by her studies of Lessing, Schopenhauer, Sir Joshua Reynolds, etc. She wrote also several historical works and translated Nietzsche and a few Italian writers into English. She followed Nietzsche in his Rationalism.

Zola, Émile Édouard Charles Antoine (1840-1902), French novelist. He was the son of an Italian engineer who settled in France. Working as a clerk in a publishing house at Paris, he very laboriously and slowly won recognition as a writer. His great career as a novelist opened with the Rougon-Macquart series, in 1871. His later novels, in some of which he attacks Catholicism, and in all disdains religion—in *La Terre* he gives the nickname Jésus-Christ to a very unpleasant character—had an immense circulation. Contrary to a view prevalent in religious circles, Zola was an idealist, and no contemporary fought more strenuously for justice than he did in the Dreyfus case, while the Church supported the injustice. Vizetelly, his English friend and biographer, says that he was baptized a Catholic, became a Voltairean in youth, and was an Atheist all his mature life. He was an Honorary Associate of the R.P.A.

Zorrilla, Manuel Ruiz (1834-1895), Spanish statesman. A Madrid lawyer who was banished for his opposition to feudalism and the Church. On his return to Spain he became, in succes-

sion, Minister of Trade, of Public Instruction, of Public Works, and of Justice. In 1870 he was President of the Cortes, and later Premier. In 1872 he was again exiled and condemned to

death in his absence. He was amnestied, though still an Atheist and Republican, and took a keen interest in the International Freethought Congress at Madrid in 1892.

