

to John. This is the more noticeable in Matthew, for "one thing is most striking, and that is this: that the Gospel of Matthew, claimed to be the first in order of time, and said to have been written by an apostle, so completely ignores the divinity of Jesus that it is called universally the *Somatic* or Unspiritual Gospel; showing to demonstration that the divinity of Jesus was a subsequent development, and was no part of the creed of the Apostle Matthew." These synoptic writings, he thinks, consist of several *Brochures*, written at different times by different authors. And that the monstrous absurdity of tracing the descent of Joseph from David and Adam (if Jesus was the son of the Holy Ghost) was probably introduced into Mathew and Luke after the Arian controversy sprang up in the 4th century; and its object was to prove that Jesus was really a "son of man." Quoting from the chapter on Luke:—"Either, therefore, Jesus was not the Messiah, not being of the line of David; or he was not the Son of God, being the son of Joseph, the carpenter, who was of the line of David, and an offspring of Adam. The Trinitarians would not give up the Messiahship of Jesus, and, therefore, allowed the third chapter to stand; but, in order to carry their point, they foisted in the story about the 'Holy Ghost coming upon Mary, and the Power of the Highest overshadowing her.' This sort of birth is common to all nations and all mythologies. Hercules had a god for his father and a woman for his mother; so had Romulus and Remus. There are half a score similar examples in Chinese history, Persian history, and Indian history. Everybody knows about Odin, in Scandinavian 'history'; Minos, in Cretan 'history'; Manès, son of Ouranos, founder of the Lydian empire; and hundreds of other examples will occur to every reader with even a superficial knowledge of history and mythology; so that a demigod was no startling novelty 2,000 years ago. Even Alexander the Great disclaimed Philip for his father, and stoutly insisted that he was a 'holy thing,' begotten by Jupiter Ammon, whose power overshadowed his mother Olympias." In John he says it is no longer "the Man Christ Jesus," but a divine being that is presented to us—the mysterious Logos. "To understand the first three Gospels nothing is required but to read them. To understand the fourth Gospel ecclesiastical history must be mastered, and we must be familiar with Gnosticism and Platonism. It is no longer the simple biography of a Jew preaching to the Jews, but of a hierophant uttering mysteries hard to be understood—mysteries of the pre-existent state of the incarnate Logos; mysteries about the Holy Ghost, both teacher and comforter; mysteries about eating the flesh and drinking the blood of the incarnate Logos; mysteries about the trinity of the unity and the oneness of the three persons of the divine triad." That from internal evidence, and from the fact that Papias, a friend of Polycarp, who lived in Asia Minor, and inquired diligently about John, was ignorant that he (John) had written anything, it may be concluded that the fourth Gospel was not penned before the close of the second century, at least 100 years after the death of John the Apostle. In the Appendix is shown how Christianity is based on Councils, and not on the Scriptures. How these Councils contradicted, and anathematised each other; how the Council of Laodicea, A.D. 360, excluded the apocryphal writings from the canonical scriptures; and the Council of Carthage, A.D. 307 admitted them. The Church of Rome siding with the latter, and the Church of England with the former. So with the Arian Controversy two Councils condemned Arias as a dangerous heretic, and four maintained he was quite right. "In 589 the Council of Aix-la-Chapelle condemned the Greek Church of shocking heresy—heresy too foul to be burnt and purged away by the purifying fires of purgatory, and fit only to be submerged in the tenth pit of Malébolgè, where Judas Iscariot and Lucifer, Potiphar's wife and the Greek Simon, weep leaden tears world without end. What was the deadly, unpardonable sin of the Greek Church? Simply this: it refused to give credit to a recent forgery introduced surreptitiously into the creed by a king of Spain. The

Western Church wanted to prove the Trinity, so it slyly foisted into the creed the duplex word *filio-que* (and the Son). 'I believe in the Holy Ghost proceeding from the Father [*filio-que*, and the Son].' We will not have it, said the Greek Church; it is not in the bond. You must have it, says the Western Church; and, if it is not in the creed, it ought to be there. We won't have it, say the Greeks. You shall have it, say the Romans. Scissors, says she; knives says he. Scissors, knives; scissors, knives; and the Greek Church separated, shouting, "No interpolation! while the Western Church huzzaed, *filio-que* for ever! And the two Churches have been cat and dog ever since. Now, this *filio-que* was foisted into the creed by Recared, King of the Spanish Visigoths, in the Council of Toledo, in 589. Charlemagne made a law that any who rejected the words from the creed "*salvus esse non potest.*" Leo III., the infallible pope (717-741), said the words were not in the creed, and should not be there, if his voice was of any authority. The Council of Toledo said *filio-que*, or no salvation; the Council of Aix-la-Chapelle voted for *filio-que*; Recared, the Visigoth and Charlemagne the Emperor voted for *filio-que*. The Greek Church cried no *filio-que*! Pope Leo III. cried, No *filio-que*! and ancient creeds, up to the year 579, cried, No *filio-que*! Three against four; so the *filio-ques* carried it; and *filio-que* it is to the present day in the Latin and English creed. The Holy Ghost "proceeds from the Father and the Son" because a Gothic king reigning in Spain had the audacity to make the interpolation, and Charlemagne had the arm of strength to insist that whoever refused to accept the forgery could not be saved." We cannot in a short review do anything like justice to this admirable pamphlet, but would strongly recommend our readers to obtain it.

FREETHOUGHT IN AMERICA.

Charles Dickens, for a time, gave great offence to many people in America by his "American Notes," and by some of the scenes in "Martin Chuzzlewit." Dickens, however, was too magnanimous not to recognise the rule that the next best thing to being infallible is to confess a mistake when you make one. On a subsequent visit to the United States, therefore, "the master of all the great English humourists" confessed that he had frequently erred in his "Notes," but it all had happened through a superficial acquaintance with the American people. And of the characters painted in "Martin Chuzzlewit," an American lady, Kate Field, wrote that she would as soon think of objecting to any discovery in natural history as to deny the existence of Elijah Pogram, Jefferson Brick, Colonel Diver, Mrs. Homing, and Miss Codger. But since the days of Dickens, of course, we are all better acquainted, directly and indirectly, with our American cousins and we have ceased to laugh at what we call many of their conceits and foibles. An English "My Lord" has become quite a common place mortal in the streets of New York; a trip across the "herring pond" is little more thought of than a trip to Paris; and for a literary or other celebrity who has visited America to at once disburden himself of his "impressions" on reaching Home, is considered quite the proper thing to do. Some of these are very amusing, some are very foolish, and many too frequently display that the writer has had more time on his hands than brains in his head. Just the other day it was a prominent member of the British Association, writing to the 'Unitarian Inquirer,' that he thought that in America Free-thought to many meant free living; and immediately following it we have the opinion of a poet, Mr. Robert Buchanan, who inveighs in even more strongly expressed language than this. In an essay entitled "Freethought in America," he speaks of it as "a nation in which the artistic sense is almost dead, which is practically without a literature, which is impatient of all sanctions, and indifferent to all religions, which is corrupt from the highest pinnacle of its public life down to the lowest depths of its primalism, which is at once thin-skinned under criticism, and aggressive to