

THE OPEN COURT.

A WEEKLY JOURNAL

DEVOTED TO THE RELIGION OF SCIENCE.

No. 341. (VOL. VIII.—10.)

CHICAGO, MARCH 8, 1894.

Two Dollars per Year.
Single Copies, 5 Cents.

COPYRIGHT BY THE OPEN COURT PUBLISHING CO.—Reprints are permitted only on condition of giving full credit to Author and Publisher.

MYRA BRADWELL.

BY M. M. TRUMBULL.

THE death of Mrs. Myra Bradwell, late editor of the *Chicago Legal News*, brings to memory again some ancient history wherein she appears heroic. I say ancient history, because it really seems as if the legal statutes that made her "ineligible" to certain offices and occupations were of the old world and of the thirteenth century. We can hardly believe that they prevailed in Illinois not more than thirty years ago.

It was Mrs. Bradwell's fortune in early life to marry a lawyer, and a part of her dowry was an opportunity to study law. She improved this advantage, and after a few years became herself a lawyer, but the statutes of Illinois being all of the masculine gender, she was forbidden to exercise her profession, for the magnanimous reason that she was a woman; and this was the ruling of the Supreme Court of Illinois. I use the word "lawyer" with due deliberation, because, after Mrs. Bradwell had passed with credit the examination prescribed as a qualification for the bar, she was to all intents and purposes a lawyer, whether admitted to the bar or not. Mrs. Bradwell was not forbidden to practise law because she was not a lawyer, but because she was a woman.

Hopeful and brave, conscious that her cause was just, Mrs. Bradwell carried the case on a writ of error to the Supreme Court of the United States, and there also the decision was against her, Chief Justice Chase alone deciding in her favor. A comical anachronism in the nineteenth century was the spectacle of six or seven motherly old gentlemen in Washington, dressed in black frocks, poring over feudal precedents, and deciding that because of the 21. Edward the Third, or the 15. Henry the Eighth, a woman must not be permitted to practise law in Illinois.

Afterwards, an application was made by sixty prominent lawyers of Chicago for the appointment of Mrs. Bradwell to the exalted and illustrious office of Notary Public, but the Governor gravely decided that a married woman was not eligible to such a high position, because, being absorbed into the Nirvâna of wedlock, her identity was lost in her husband, and therefore she could not give a bond; and the ludicrous part of it was that the Governor apologised for his action and

threw the blame upon the law. "There is no one," he said, "whom I would more cheerfully appoint, if the matter were within the limits of my official discretion."

It is not so much by abstract reasoning as by visible examples that reformations come, and Mrs. Bradwell offered herself as a living example of the injustice of the law. A woman of learning, genius, industry, and high character, editor of the first law journal in the West, forbidden by law to practise law, was too much for the public conscience, tough as that conscience is; the Tory barriers that excluded Mrs. Bradwell were broken down, and now, because of her labors and sacrifices, women may practise law and engage in many other profitable employments to which they were not "eligible" then; and, what is a very important matter, they may, because of her exertions, own their earnings, too.

Mrs. Bradwell chose as the motto for her paper the words "*Lex Vincit*," but these express merely the physical power of the law, and not its moral qualities. The law conquers by force, whether it be right or wrong, but Mrs. Bradwell's own victory over it gives us a comforting assurance that where the law is wrong it may itself be conquered. The laws of nature are indeed invincible, but the laws of men are not, and the glory of Mrs. Bradwell's political work is that she conquered some bad laws and abolished them.

There was nothing theatrical or spectacular in Mrs. Bradwell's work, but with the courage of a soldier and the strategy of a general she went about it and did it. For thirty years she was an active officer in various associations advocating and advancing social and political reforms and especially those that interested women. She was a member of the Board of Lady Managers of the World's Fair, and Chairman of the Committee on Law Reform in the Auxiliary Congress. She read a paper before the Congress last May, and that was her last appearance on the platform.

Mrs. Bradwell's public labors gave an added lustre to her private virtues, and instead of contracting, they expanded the horizon of home. She proved that the sphere of woman was not only at home, but in the lawyer's office, or in the editor's office, or wherever she could do something to make home happier. Her

domestic life was bright with duties done, and none of them the less well done because of other duties in another field.

HUMAN SACRIFICE.

BY DR. W. H. GARDNER.

[CONCLUDED.]

At the time of the migration of the Israelites from Egypt (*circa* 1320 B. C.) all of the tribes that occupied the land of Canaan, as well as the Amalekites, Midianites, and Moabites, whose territories they traversed, were worshippers of the sun-god in some of his forms. And whether their tribal god was appealed to as Baal, Chemosh, Milcom, Ashtoreth, or Moloch, it was the same deity, only under a different aspect. Indeed, if it were possible to turn back in the history of the race to the earliest age of human thought, when man first was able to formulate an idea of a deity, we would doubtless find that the only idea he had of a god was the sun. To him, naked, unarmed, helpless, ignorant even of the art of producing fire at will, the sun was the source of light and warmth and life and all good; what wonder that he should bow in reverence and kiss his hand when he beheld the face of his god in the morning, and silent and sorrowful seek his bed of leaves and rushes as the departing glories of his lord sunk into the western deeps or faded away over the glowing mountain-tops.

But not always was the sun a beneficent, life-giving deity, whose genial beams fructified the receptive earth and nourished and sustained all animate nature. At times he became jealous and angry, and then he was a cruel and bloodthirsty monster, whose fierce heat withered the fruits and grain, drank up the water in the rivers and fountains, consumed the blood in the veins of man and beast, and spread famine and pestilence throughout the whole land. Then instead of being worshipped with offerings of fruits and flowers, and festive songs and dances, his altars were glutted with the blood of human victims poured out to appease his anger.

In the sacred chronicle of the Hebrews, instances of human sacrifice among the Canaanites are so frequently mentioned, that it is scarcely necessary to call attention to them. We must, however, note especially one instance—that of Mesha, King of Moab, sacrificing by fire his eldest son, who should have reigned in his stead, after his disastrous defeat in the valley of Edom by the armies of the three kings.¹

Encompassed, as the Israelites were, by tribes and nations whose conceptions of a deity were so cruel and bloodthirsty, it cannot be wondered at that, despite the teaching of their prophets, the mass of the people

and many of their kings, frequently forsook the purer worship of Jehovah, followed after other gods, and passed their children through the fire to Moloch. From many passages in the Old Testament, it is not at all improbable that the primitive idea of the Israelites regarding Jehovah was not materially different from those of the nations about them regarding *their* gods. It is not the place here, however, to discuss the evolution of the monotheistic conception of the God of Israel, but, as the following passages occur to me, I cannot refrain from quoting them, since they seem to indicate that at least in the earliest thought of the Israelites, Jehovah was an apotheosis of the sun and manifested his presence by light and heat, or its earthly symbol—fire: First, "Jehovah spake to Moses out of a burning bush, and the bush burned with fire and was not consumed."² Next, he gave the Israelites, as their pilot through the mazes of the desert, "a pillar of cloud by day, and a pillar of fire by night."³ "And the sight of the glory of the Lord was like devouring fire on the top of the mount in the eyes of the children of Israel."⁴ "The Lord thy God is a consuming fire."⁴ "He made darkness pavilions round about him, dark waters and thick clouds of the skies. Through the brightness before him were coals of fire kindled. The Lord thundered from heaven, and the Most High uttered his voice."⁵ "At the brightness that was before him his thick clouds passed, hailstones and coals of fire. The Lord also thundered in the heavens, and the Highest gave his voice; hailstones and coals of fire."⁶ Other passages will readily suggest themselves to those conversant with the books of the Old Testament.

With these crude conceptions of their deity, differing so little from the gods of the tribes about them, it is only natural that the God of the Israelites should have been worshipped by similar rites as were Baal, Moloch, Chemosh, or Ashtoreth, and that in his worship human beings were not unfrequently sacrificed to him. The *nonchalance* with which Abraham obeyed what he thought to be the will of Jehovah in attempting to offer up his only son Isaac,⁷ indicates not only that the practice of human sacrifice was common in the land of "Ur of the Chaldees" from which he had migrated, and among the tribes by which he was surrounded, but it also shows that in the mind of Abraham and the recorder of the incident, that the sacrifice of an only son was a perfectly natural and legitimate demand for a God to make upon his worshipper. It would seem from the curse laid by Joshua, the war-

¹ *Exodus*, iii, 2.

² *Idem*, xiii, 21-22.

³ *Idem*, xxiv, 17.

⁴ *Deuteronomy*, iv, 24.

⁵ *1 Samuel*, xii, 12, 13, 14.

⁶ *Psalms*, xviii, 12-13.

⁷ *Genesis*, xxii, 2-10.

¹¹ *Kings*, iii, 27; Conf. also *Ibid.*, xxiii, 13; xiv, 3; *Leviticus*, xviii, 21; *Ibid.*, xx, 2-5; *Deuteronomy*, xii, 31. Many other citations will occur to those familiar with the books of the Old Testament.

like captain of the Israelites, upon any one who should rebuild the city of Jericho, after he had captured it and razed its walls to the ground, that it was the custom in that age to propitiate the deity by the immolation of human victims upon the founding of a city.¹ We also read in II Samuel, that King David, to avert the distress caused by a famine in the land, delivered two sons and five grandsons of Saul to the Gibeonites, who sacrificed them all in the beginning of the barley harvest.² And in Judges where Jephtha sacrificed his only daughter to his God in fulfilment of the rash vow he had made when he went out to attack the Ammonites.³ In so many other places in the sacred chronicle of the Israelites are allusions made to human sacrifice that the conviction is forced upon us that this cruel rite was practised as commonly among the Israelites as it was among the other tribes occupying Canaan.⁴

One especial modification of human sacrifice could only be consummated by the king or ruler sacrificing his own son (or daughter) to turn away the wrath of the deity from his people. This was called *the great* or "*mystic sacrifice.*" One case is cited in the "Preparatio Evangelica" of Eusebius from "Sanchoiathon's History of Phœnicia" as follows: "And when a great plague and mortality happened, Kronos offered up his only son as a sacrifice to his father Ouranos, and circumcised himself and compelled his allies to do the same; and not long afterward he consecrated, after his death, another son named Muth, whom he had by Rhea."⁵ It is quite possible that this is only another version of the similar legend regarding the attempted sacrifice by Abraham of his only son Isaac, but in later times the sacrifice of the two sons and five grandsons of Saul by King David, the sacrifice of his son by Idomenius, King of Crete, and similar instances in the Phœnician and Carthaginian annals abundantly show that, among the peoples of those times, the sacrifice of the son or sons of a king was considered to have especial merit in the eyes of their gods and to be very potent in securing their favor. And I ask especial attention to these cases as I believe the idea involved in them had great influence on the religious conceptions of the early Christians.

In reviewing the subject of human sacrifice we cannot fail to be impressed by the following curious facts:

First: The widely-spread prevalence, and the persistence of this cruel rite.

Second: The degraded and bloodthirsty concep-

tion all the nations of antiquity had formed of the Deity.

Third: The similarity of their conceptions of a vicarious sacrifice—shedding the blood of an innocent person in order that the guilty might escape.

In the instances of human sacrifice here cited; to which many more could be added if deemed necessary, it is not intended to assume that they are all incidents of veritable history, many of them are doubtless legends or traditions handed down orally by sire to son from the earliest ages, but they are not on this account less useful for the purpose of generalisation, since they show as unmistakably the prevailing tone of thought at the (alleged) time of their occurrence, as if they were properly authenticated. So much of the actual history of the early nations of the earth has been lost to us by the ravages of time, or has come down to us through ambiguous sources, that many of their manners and customs are still but imperfectly known, for though the cuneiform characters of Assyria and the hieroglyphs of Egypt were in use two or three thousand years B. C., yet we have derived the greater part of our knowledge of these subjects from Greek or Roman sources, and we must recollect that the sacred gift of Cadmus has borne but scanty fruit upon the soil of Hellas up to the time of Solon (638 B. C.). The less civilised tribes were entirely ignorant of the art of writing or any other means of preserving their records save by oral teaching, and similar rude mementos to the pile of stones Joshua set up at Gilgal to commemorate the crossing of the Jordan.¹ Hence much of the history of the past must ever remain to us a sealed book, though with all of these obstructions in our way, there is yet enough of authentic history left, to show us that, at the Christian era, the idea of human sacrifice was not only a widely spread but deeply rooted idea in the ancient world; and throughout the length and breadth of the Roman empire from the rugged fastnesses of Britannia Secunda (Wales) to the reedy banks of the Euphrates and Tigris, the altars of the gods were constantly crimsoned with the blood of human victims.

Nor was the persistence of this custom less remarkable than its widely spread prevalence. Davies informs us that in some parts of Caledonia and Wales, human sacrifice among the Druids was not finally suppressed until the close of the sixth century A. D.² In some parts of India the custom has survived almost to our own day. In the transactions of the Asiatic Society, for 1841, there is an account of the religion of the Khonds of Orissa, given by Lieut. McPherson, in which he says:

"Among the Khonds of Orissa, one of the ancient kingdoms

¹ Joshua, vi, 26. It is also probable that the slaying of Remus by his brother Romulus had a similar significance. *Livy*, I, 7.

² II Samuel, xxi, 610.

³ Judges, xi, 34-39.

⁴ I Samuel, xv, 32, 33; II Kings, xxi, 6; *Ibid.* xxiii, 10; *Psalms*, cvi, 36-38; *Jeremiah*, vii, 31. Many citations showing a survival of this custom in recent times will be found in Tylor's *Primitive Culture*, Vol. I, pp. 103-108.

⁵ See *Cory's Ancient Fragments*, Sanchoiathon, pp. 16 et seq.

¹ Joshua, iv, 6, 7, 20.

² Davies, *British Druids*, pp. 462-466.

of Hindustan, human sacrifice was constantly practised up to the year 1836, A. D., when the attention of the British government, having been directed to it by one of its agents, took the most strenuous means to break it up. The victims were of all ages and both sexes; male adults, however, being held in the greatest esteem, as being most acceptable to the goddess. In some cases the victims were purchased from families of their own tribe who had become impoverished. In other cases they were captured from the plains tribes. The victims were called 'Meriah,' and were sacrificed to propitiate the earth's goddess, 'Kali,' and obtain through her favor an abundant harvest."

We scarcely need call attention to the sacrifice of Hindu widows upon the funeral pyres of their dead husbands. In 1823, A. D., there were 575 Hindu widows burned to death in Bengal Presidency alone; and as late as 1877 several of the wives of Jung Bahadur were sacrificed at his funeral obsequies.¹

The rivers of human blood that were poured out before the shrine of the Aztec god Huitzilopochtli by his fierce priests would be incredible, were it not abundantly substantiated by eye-witnesses. Prescott says:

"Human Sacrifices have been practised by many nations, not excepting the most polished nations of antiquity, but never by any on a scale to be compared with those in Anahuac. The amount of victims immolated on its accursed altars would stagger the faith of the least scrupulous believer. Scarcely any author pretends to estimate the yearly sacrifices throughout the empire at less than twenty thousand, and some carry the number as high as fifty."¹

Admiral Wilkes, in his exploring expedition around the world (1842 to 1845), found many of the South Sea Islanders at that time practising human sacrifice and cannibalism; and even to this day, in some of those islands and among the ruder tribes of Africa, these savage customs still continue.

When we look back to the dark and savage past and remember the cruel and bloody rites practised, and the oceans of human blood poured out by our ancestors in the name of religion, we stand appalled and shrink with horror from the mental conceptions they had formed of the Deity. No idea we can now form of "The Prince of Devils" could be more *studiously and intentionally maleficent and ferocious* than were their ideas of their gods; and yet the concurring testimony of history teaches unmistakably that such were their conceptions, and that in *their* thought the blood of the lower animals and human beings was always necessary to purchase their favor and assistance.¹ The reason for this is not hard to discover. The mind of yet primitive man was in its infancy. It had not yet reached that stage of development when it could ap-

preciate any greater or higher power than the prince or chief who ruled over him. His chief's subtle brain and strong arm protected his tribe and punished his enemies. To him they all owed allegiance; and over them all he held absolute control—even to the power of life and death. When he died, his wives, slaves, horses, and dogs were buried in his tomb or were burned on his funeral pyre, to attend him in the other world. After his death he was deified, and then he became more powerful for good and evil than he was when alive, and his tomb became a shrine where supplicants came to offer sacrifices and pray for his protection and assistance.

Some of the later Hebrew prophets and heathen philosophers had a higher and nobler conception of the Deity; but to the great mass of the people, their gods were the deified ancestors of the tribe—anthropomorphic, sensuous, and possessed of the same attributes and desires as their worshippers. In the conception of the compilers of the Pentateuch, Jehovah was as truly an anthropomorphic and tribal god, as Osiris, Baal, Moloch, or Huitzilopochtli. And though there is extant no legend beyond that given in the first chapter of Genesis to indicate that, in the thought of the Israelites, Jehovah was the actual progenitor and ancestor of their tribe, yet the covenants made between him and Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and their descendants, abundantly show that he was the especial and particular god of their tribe, and that even by their enemies the Israelites were regarded as his children. Passages in the Old Testament alluding to this fact are too numerous to require citation, but I ask the critical inquirer to *reread* the book of Joshua, where the warlike captain of the Israelites recounts with the utmost naïveté how he captured the cities of Jericho, Ai, Makkedah, Libnah, Lachish, Eglon, Debir, and the other cities of the Canaanites, and massacred every man, woman, and child, and says that those wholesale butcheries were not only committed by the *order* of Jehovah, but with his *connivance and assistance*. Nor does the sacred chronicle indicate that these Canaanites had incurred the displeasure of Jehovah in any other way than in warring against the Israelites, who were trying to drive them out of their homes.

There is no doubt but that the theological ideas of the Jews underwent some changes during their long captivity among the Babylonians and Persians, from contact with the disciples of Zoroaster. Their Devil became spiritualised and dignified as he was more assimilated to Ahriman, the Persian embodiment of darkness and evil; and Jehovah became less anthropomorphic, and more the apotheosis of power and life and light and good. Yet in Jewish thought Jehovah was never the indulgent "father that pitieth his children," but rather "a jealous God, who visited the

¹ Vide article "Suttee" in *Chamber's Encyclopedia*, last edition.

² Prescott's *Conquest of Mexico*, Vol. I, Chap. 3. As I have neither Claviger nor Torquemada at hand to consult, I quote from Prescott.

³ See an article by Mr. Poley in *The Journal of Philology*, No. 1, for June, 1868, entitled *Clithonian Worship*, in which the author shows that the propitiation of the malignant powers, rather than the adoration of the supreme good, seemed to have formed the basis of the early religions of the world; and hence streams of human blood was the only effectual means of purchasing their favor.

sins of the fathers upon the children, even to the third and fourth generation." Every infraction of his law must be atoned by blood, and his altars were always reeking with the blood of animals sacrificed to obtain his favor. After the crucifixion of Christ and the rise of Christianity, the conception of Jehovah became still more ambiguous and contradictory, one class of his (alleged) attributes being perfect antitheses to the other.

In his *benign* aspect he teaches the doctrine of humility, charity, and the forgiveness of offences, "even to seventy times seven."

In his *malignant* aspect,¹ all mankind had sinned and done evil in his sight, the nursling at its mother's breast, as well as the gray-haired worker of iniquity. Through Adam they had all partaken of the forbidden fruit and their crime must be expiated, all the human race were doomed—Jehovah demanded their blood—to satisfy his *justice*, Jehovah must borrow the idea of ignorant, cruel humanity, and sacrifice by an ignominious and cruel death, his son begotten of a Jewish virgin by means of the Holy Ghost.

It is very hard for the people of one age and race to understand the ideas of another race, differing widely from them in time, locality, institutions, laws, and modes of thought. And it is only possible for us at this epoch to appreciate the ideas the early Christians had conceived of the Deity, when we remember that not only among the Jews, but among all the nations at the commencement of the Christian era, the sacrifice of animal or human life was one of the essential elements of worship.

In the epistle to the Hebrews ascribed to Paul,² where the writer says: "Almost all things are by the law purged with blood, and without shedding of blood is no remission." He enunciated no new doctrine to Jew, Gentile, or Christian, he merely epitomised the religious belief of the whole world at the date of his letter (perhaps about 50 A.D.).

When, or by whom, the doctrine was first promulgated, that Jesus, the son of the Jewish carpenter's wife, Mary, was the veritable son of Jehovah, and that by his torturing death as a malefactor Jehovah had consummated the *mystic sacrifice*, must remain unknown, all we now know is that as early as the first century after Christ, it had become the fundamental dogma of the Christian belief. What was the conception Christ himself had of the Deity it is not possible to state with certainty, since he has left us no word

written by his own hand, and his life, teaching, and system of ethics, are so obscured by the interpretations of his followers that there is scarcely one truth or precept that he tried to inculcate, but what has been tortured into a meaning most probably, widely different from what he intended.

It is interesting to note the unanimity with which all the nations of antiquity accepted the doctrine of *vicarious atonement*. And still more wonderful is it that such an idea of justice should have survived to our day and be still accepted by rational, intelligent human beings not only as logical reasoning, but as the reasoning of the divine mind of the Deity himself. Nor does it matter, so far as the principle of justice is involved, whether Jesus Christ was actually the incarnated son of Jehovah or the natural son of Mary, the wife of the Jewish carpenter; in either case his sacrifice was not only unwarrantable, unjust, and cruel, but could not upon any principle of law or equity have atoned for the crimes of guilty man.

There is no doubt that Christ was a veritable sacrifice, though not a sacrifice to the bloodthirsty appetite of a ferocious Deity who claimed the blood of an innocent being for the sins of the guilty, but on the contrary, if the alleged accounts of his execution are worthy of acceptance, we must believe that he was a sacrifice to the jealousy and malignity of the Jewish priesthood.

The birth and early life of Jesus is so obscured by myth and legend that but little that is really authentic has come down to us, but it is certain that he was kind and humane and merciful, that he taught and practised the doctrine of humility, charity, and brotherly love. As Greg truly says: "We regard him not as the perfection of the intellectual or philosophic mind, but as the perfection of the spiritual character—as surpassing all men of all times in the closeness and depth of his communion with the Father. In reading his sayings we feel that we are holding converse with the wisest, purest, noblest Being that ever clothed thought in the poor language of humanity. In studying his life, we feel that we are following the footsteps of the highest ideal yet presented to us upon earth."¹ And it seems like the irony of fate that one so gentle and pure and merciful, and so permeated with the wisdom of the divine mind, should have been executed at the mandate of a malignant priesthood as a malefactor and blasphemer.

Looking backward to the commencement of ecclesiastical history, and the ridiculous word-quibbling of the early Christians, and the vials of wrath and ink that were poured out upon each other by the "Homo-ousions" and the "Homo-i-ousions," it is singular that no one of either sect has considered that the real ques-

¹ We cannot fail to see in this conception of the *dual* nature of the Deity, a mental reversion to the earliest conceptions of the Israelites, when their tribal god was the Sun in his *benign* or *malignant* aspect. See Kuenen, *Religion of Israel*, Vol. I, Chap. IV.

² The author of this epistle is anonymous, though it is almost certain that Paul never wrote it. I quote it here, however, because it seems to embody succinctly the Jewish idea of the law of Jehovah regarding sin and the necessity of its atonement by the sacrifice of animal life.

¹ Greg, *Creed of Christendom*, pp. 300-301.

THE OPEN COURT.

tion at issue should have been *not* whether *Christ* was of the same substance of the *Deity*, but whether he was of the substance of guilty *man*, in whose stead he was believed to have been sacrificed. And before closing, I must ask attention to this peculiar aspect of *human sacrifice*, the identification and unification of the victim with the god to whom he was devoted. In some tribes his apotheosis commenced as soon as the victim was selected; and though he was held as a prisoner with no hope of escape, except by death; yet his prison was the temple of the god; he was apparelled in sacerdotal vestments, feasted with choicest food, attended by subservient priests, and provided with beautiful damsels to solace and comfort him in his captivity. When the sacrifice was consummated, some portion of the body of the victim—usually the heart—was eaten and his blood drunk by the ruler and priests. Among the ruder tribes, notably the Scythians and Aztecs, the sacrificial rite was closed by a cannibal feast upon the quivering body of the victim. Under the Levitical law,¹ the fat and blood of the victim were forbidden to be eaten by the Israelites, these portions being sacred to Jehovah, though the officiating priest was instructed to place some of the blood of the victim upon the right ear, the right thumb, and the right great toe of the worshipper, to identify him with the victim.

For more than fifteen centuries the Christian hierarchy has held human thought in leash in every land its priests have invaded. It has opposed every advancement in civilisation and refinement, combated with fire and stake and prison-cell every induction of science, and so construed the history of the past that even such a fact as the brutal custom of animal and human sacrifice has been made to appear as not only pleasing to the Deity and the sure means of purchasing his favor, but as the foreshadowing and archetype of that *mystic sacrifice* of his own son which in priestly thought, he had ordained from the foundation of the world, as the *only* means of saving the human race from the fatal effects of Adam's fall.

But despite the anathemas of priests and the bulls of popes, one after another the savage customs of our ignorant ancestors have been abolished, before the studious examination and critical thought of unprejudiced minds; and I hope the day is not far distant when reasoning beings will relegate to the limbo of the past the ideas so long held of the sacrifice of Christ and the debasing conception they have been taught of a Deity that could consent and connive at such a cruel injustice.

"Will the Lord be pleased with thousands of rams, or with ten thousands of rivers of oil? Shall I give my firstborn for my transgression, the fruit of my body for the sin of my soul?"

¹ *Leviticus*, iii, 17.

"He has showed thee, O man, what is good; and what doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God."¹

VALOR.

BY VIROE.

They said, How brave he was;
He held for death such scorn,
Leading the hope forlorn;
But 'twas not bravery;
He did not fear because
To live was slavery.

See, how he shrinks from strife!
Was e'er such craven born?
Yet in the van forlorn
They marked his palor.
Loving, he gave his life,—
Ah, that was valor.

GOETHE AND SCHILLER'S XENIONS.²

BY E. F. L. GAUSS.

THE SOURCE OF LIFE.

But by the climax of life, by the flower, all new life is kindled
In the organical world and in the world of the soul.

CORRECTNESS.

Blameless in all things to be is the lowest degree and the highest,
For, besides impotence, leads greatness alone to this end.

CURRUS VIRUM MIRATUR INANES.

How they are cracking the whips! May good heaven defend us!
such wagons

Creacking with books of all kinds. Paper *en masse*, but no worth.

THE LITERARY AGE.

Every one writes, aye the boy writes, the silver-haired man and
the matron,

Give us, ye gods, now a race which for the writers shall write.

THE UNEQUAL RELATION.

Truly our poets are light, but we could perhaps hide the misfortune,
tune,

Were not the critics themselves, oh! so exceedingly smart.

THE CRITICAL WOLVES.

When they have scented the man and are hungrily howling around
you,

Wanderer, fire your gun; quickly they'll take to their heels.

TO A PACK OF CRITICS.

Gathered in packs, like the wolves, you imagine that more you accomplish;
tune,

Worse 'tis for you, for the more beggars, the fouler the air.

LITERATURE FOR LADIES AND CHILDREN.

Always for women and children! for men should the authors be
writing,

Leaving for women the care and for the children to men.

THE REJUVENATING FOUNTAIN.

Fable, ye say, is the fountain of youth; oh believe me! unceasing
Floweth its genuine flood. Where? In the poet's domain.

DOMESTIC AUTHORITY.

Fault I find not with the gardener when he the sparrows is chasing;
Yet but a gardener is he, nature the sparrows brought forth.

¹ *Micah*, vi, 7-8.

² Prompted by the publication of the *Xenia* in Nos. 333, 334, 335, and 336 of *The Open Court*, and by the idea of bringing forcibly home to the American mind the worth of Goethe and Schiller's philosophic thought, Mr. E. F. L. Gauss, of Chicago, sends us the above additional *Xenia* in his own translation.

THE SUBJECT.

Truly the art is important and hard of one's proper comportment,
Harder however it is from one's own nature to flee.

THE GREATER VICTORY.

Who so doth conquer his heart, he is great, I admire the brave
one,

But who *through his heart* conquers, of him I think more.

EXCEPTION.

"Why do you censure not every one publicly?" Friend do I call
him,

Like mine own heart, thus I silently censure my friend.

WIT AND SENSE.

Sense is too timid and wit is too bold; it is genius only
That in its soberness bold, pious in freedom can be.

A SOLVED RIDDLE.

Out is the secret at last, why it is that thus Hamlet attracts us,
Mark ye the reason—because quite to despair he leads us.

THE MODERN PRIESTS OF BAAL.

Liberty, holy, sublime! thou great longing of man for the better!
Truly thou couldst not have worse priests for thy heavenly cause.

CURRENT TOPICS.

AN ANGRY colored woman on the South Side, vehemently scolding her disobedient boy for some delinquency, called a passing policeman to her assistance, and said, "I wish you'd take dat good-fur-nuffin Abram Lincum an' lock him up in de calaboose, I can't do nuffin wif him." The *Chicago Herald* is in a similar frame of mind. Having labored for ten or a dozen years to overthrow the Republican party, and having succeeded at last in getting a Congress "Democratic in both Houses," it wishes all the members were in the calaboose, for it "can't do nuffin wif 'em." It flatters the Senate as "a convocation of doddering idiots," and the House as "a gang of brawling blatherskites." With delicate sarcasm the *Herald* says that if the fathers of the republic "can look down from Jerusalem the golden, they must be highly gratified at the result of their labors." If the fathers of the Republic are in Jerusalem the golden, as probably some of them are, and if they care anything about what goes on in Congress, as probably they do not, they will see that the sons of the republic are acting very much like the fathers; a little better perhaps in the matter of manners, and they debate less with knuckles and pistols than the fathers did. They shoot with their mouths now, and they aim remarkably well. I have a valued friend who was a member of the House of Representatives forty years ago, and it revives me like a camp-fire to hear him tell of the fistic battles they used to have in Congress when he was in his prime. The personalities now indulged in may be rather coarse, but they give useful information to the people, and they teach us what sort of statesmen our members of Congress are.

* * *

When you assail a man "in the heat of debate," or out of it, whatever is true of your censure will stick to him, whatever is false in it will stick to you; and this is a maxim that may well be heeded in Congress. Last Tuesday, Mr. Pence, a member from Colorado, fired skittle-balls of accusation at some of his fellow-members with as much unconcern as if they were wooden pins. He had great sport while they tumbled right and left, but the next morning he came into the House drooping and offered apologies to the crowd in that "regardless of expense" manner in which a Colorado man orders drinks. He had an excellent opportunity to do so, because, fortunately for him, the newspapers had incorrectly reported him as charging that Mr. Hainer, the member from Nebraska, was "fuller of beer than comprehension," when in fact, said Mr. Pence, "what I said was, that he was 'fuller of beard than of ideas.'"

Why a man who is long of beard should be considered short of brains, I never could understand, but such is the opinion of many beardless men, especially "in the heat of debate." Of other members, Mr. Pence had said harsher things, but he threw all his accusations into a jack-pot in Colorado style and made a sweeping apology for them all. He was like Tim Clancy of Marbletown who went to confession and then wanted to avoid giving a detailed catalogue of his sins. "Yer riverince," he said, "I've done everything but murder; now give me the absolution and make the penance light." Imitating Clancy, Mr. Pence pleaded thus: "In other utterances I have gone beyond the language that should be used in a parliamentary body. For such of them as might by any construction be deemed unparliamentary I cheerfully and gladly apologise." And, more fortunate than Tim, Mr. Pence got his absolution.

* * *

One of the most dramatic spectacles ever seen in the House of Commons was presented on the evening of March 1st, when Mr. Gladstone made that revolutionary speech which many persons regarded as a farewell to leadership in that House where he had sat as a member for more than sixty-one years. There, intellectually, and even physically strong, stood the Prime Minister of England, representing in his own person sixty-one years of English history, and sixty-one years of political evolution; a picturesque panorama stretching from the Toryism that opposed the Reform Bill and the Abolition of slavery in the West Indies, down to the Democratic Declaration of war against the House of Lords. Such a bundle of nerves and intellectuality with such opportunities for action, such a personality, with such a career, is not possible except in England, and even there it is not likely that such a prodigy will ever be seen again. I may not approve of Mr. Gladstone's measures here or there, and I may fancy that in some of them I see statescraft instead of statesmanship, but yesterday he stood conspicuous in the sight of all the world, the type and model of a Briton, laying down the government of a great empire, not because he was eighty-four years old, not from indolence, or lack of courage, or intellectual decay, but because of an unfortunate affection of the eyes which might easily have come to a younger man. Again, let us all stop quarrelling with his politics for the present, and look at his example. A member of Parliament for sixty-one years and a cabinet minister most of the time, he has never yielded to mean temptations, corruption has never tainted him; personally his private life and his public life are alike without a stain.

* * *

From patrician Toryism to plebeian democracy is a long course, but Mr. Gladstone went the distance. Like Wolsey, he was "fashioned to much honor from his cradle." Great as a boy at Eton, he was greater as a youth at Oxford, and greatest of all in the senate. He graduated as a "double first" at Oxford in his twenty-second year, first in classics and first in mathematics, a distinction rarely achieved at that university, or any other. When he was twenty-three years old, the Duke of Newcastle gave him a seat in Parliament, for in those days dukes owned constituencies and voted them as they pleased. Early in his parliamentary career, Mr. Gladstone made a speech which Greville in his diary, written at the time, says was a promising performance and something of a sensation. It opened the gates of office to Gladstone, and the young politician saw in bright perspective the highest honors of the Government his own. The Tories at once perceived that his debating powers would be a great acquisition to their party, and Sir Robert Peel, himself an Oxford man, and a double first class too, put Gladstone in the line of political promotion by appointing him one of the lords of the treasury, a great position for a man of twenty-five. He went out of office with his party in 1835, and staid out until Sir Robert Peel came back to power in 1841, when Gladstone was appointed Master of the Mint and Vice President of the Board of Trade. In all the stages of the Free-Trade revolution begun and carried on

by Peel, Gladstone stood loyally by his chief; and when Peel died, his mantle, if it fell upon anybody, fell upon Gladstone. Although Peel made many changes in the laws of England, he was by nature, education, and interest, a conservative, and it is not likely that he ever could have become a radical and a democrat. He yielded to the pressure of public opinion, and it is only fair to say, to new convictions, too; and in that policy Gladstone has closely imitated Peel.

* * *

I have read of a lawyer in Boston who died much lamented—by his friends, but not by his enemies; and one of these being asked by another lawyer if he was going to the funeral, said, "No, but I approve it," thus leaving his actual feelings in perplexing doubt. In like manner the current theology relating to a future life sometimes leads to a discordant mingling of sorrow and congratulation at the departure of our neighbors from this world, as, for instance, when some society resolves that, "Whereas it has pleased our Heavenly Father to remove our departed brother from this world of sorrow to the realms of eternal joy, therefore we offer our condolence to his wife and family in this their hour of sad bereavement." The expressions are kindly, although they appear to be irreconcilable, and they spring from a humane sentiment that seems easy to understand; and yet see what may come of them when they are not understood, as occasionally happens in Kentucky. The editor of the Mount Sterling *Times* recently published an obituary notice of a departed citizen and remarked in a purely sentimental way at the end of it, "he is gone to a happier home." The meaning of that appears to be plain enough, but the widow has begun a libel suit against the editor for insinuating that her husband had gone to a happier home in heaven than she made for him here on earth. The sympathy of the people down there is on the side of the widow, not only on grounds of chivalry but also because of State pride. There is a good deal of local feeling against the editor for suggesting that heaven is a more agreeable place to live in than Kentucky.

M. M. TRUMBULL.

BOOK REVIEWS.

THE RAILROAD QUESTION. A Historical and Practical Treatise on Railroads, and Remedies for Their Abuses. By *William Larrabee*, Late Governor of Iowa. Chicago: The Schulte Publishing Company. 1893. 450 pp.

This is by far the best work on the Anti-Railroad side of the "Railroad Question" that we have seen as yet. The author was Governor of Iowa for four years, and for about sixteen years he was a member of the State Senate, and in both capacities he had a great deal to do with the Railroad Question. Besides, as he informs us in the preface, "he has had experience as a shipper and as a railroad promoter, owner, and stockholder, and has even had thrust upon him for a short time the responsibility of a director, president, and manager of a railroad company."

Governor Larrabee's personal experience with railroads, their management and their mismanagement, is very interesting and instructive reading, but in addition to that he seems to have read all the railroad literature extant, and he has made excellent use of his materials. The conclusion he draws from his experience and his reading is that the abuses of the railroad system are almost incurable under present conditions. He believes that the corporate power of railroads, especially where they are in combination, is too strong for the statesmanship or the virtue of such legislators as we are likely to get either in the State Legislatures or in Congress, and that the most effectual protection against railroad abuses is to be found in government control.

Whatever may be the merits or the defects of Governor Larrabee's proposed remedy for the abuses practised by the railroads, he proves by startling facts that the abuses are very grave, and

his condemnation of them is well justified. He shows that the power of discrimination possessed by the railroads amounts in many cases to a social tyranny; light and easy rates to favorite localities and firms, with extortionate rates for the oppression of their competitors; "developing" the business of certain people or certain towns at the expense and for the oppression of others, and on this point Governor Larrabee rather tenderly says: "Moreover, to tax one branch of commerce for the benefits bestowed upon another is a practice of extremely doubtful propriety, and the power to do so should never be conferred upon a private corporation."

Will Governor Larrabee give a moral glance for a moment at that last proposition and then say whether or not it is ethically and politically lawful for a public corporation to do that which it is unjust for a private corporation to do? If the Government may tax one branch of industry for the benefit of another, why may not a railroad corporation do the same thing?

"Railroads in Politics" is one of the best chapters in the book, and it would make a most excellent magazine article. It is withering in its exposure of the insidious bribery, open and covert, direct and indirect, practised by the railroad corporations on the courts, legislatures, and the press. Under the scorching sarcasm of Governor Larrabee, the judge with a railroad-pass in his pocket loses much of his dignity, and his judicial integrity appears to be constantly under temptation. Those apologetic persons who see nothing sinister in a judge's pass ought to read what Governor Larrabee says about it. No doubt, a judge, when he accepts a pass, determines that it shall not influence his judgment on the bench, but as soon as he puts it into his pocket, he is under obligations to the railroad company, not as a private citizen, but as a judge.

Governor Larrabee has arranged the facts of his case with evident care, and the argument he builds upon them is logical and strong. The chapters on "Railroad Literature" are very entertaining, both in matter and in style, and they show with admirable clearness the literary methods of the railroad corporations. Governor Larrabee's book is an important contribution to the popular side of the "Transportation Question."

M. M. T.

THE OPEN COURT.

"THE MONON," 324 DEARBORN STREET.

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS, Post Office Drawer F.

E. C. HEGELER, PUBLISHER.

DR. PAUL CARUS, EDITOR.

TERMS THROUGHOUT THE POSTAL UNION:

\$2.00 PER YEAR.

\$1.00 FOR SIX MONTHS.

N. B. Binding Cases for single yearly volumes of THE OPEN COURT will be supplied on order. Price, 75 cents each.

CONTENTS OF NO. 341.

MYRA BRADWELL. GEN. M. M. TRUMBULL.....	3999
HUMAN SACRIFICE: (Concluded.) DR. W. H. GARDNER	4000
POETRY.	
Valor. VIREO.....	4004
GOETHE AND SCHILLER'S XENIONS. E. F. L. GAUSS	4004
CURRENT TOPICS: The Perversity of Congress. In-	
sults and Apologies. The Retirement of Gladstone.	
Happier Homes in Heaven. GEN. M. M. TRUMBULL..	4005
BOOK NOTICES.....	4006