

development of the subject of which it treats. But with the author's "New Language Lessons," in either its improved literary or mechanical features, we are not now concerned. This is a matter of which the profession have now an opportunity of judging for themselves. It was otherwise with the "Miller Swinton," as, when it appeared comparatively few teachers were so intimately acquainted with the edition from which it was reprinted as to be able to discover the character of the editing to which the work, in Mr. Macmillan's hands, had been subjected. And in the interest of the schools, as well as in justice to Prof. Swinton, it is this work we have here attempted, viz. : to apply to one book, of the many that require it among our authorized school books, those tests of criticism by which faulty work is distinguished from honest work, and to bring to the bar of public opinion the too common but objectionable practices of publishers who are responsible for the issue of such a work as the one we have been examining. Criticism, it must be remembered, exacts from school manuals the same regard for honest, honour-

able performance, in author or editor, as it exacts from other literary work ; and it is an educational misfortune, if, instigated by professional arrogance, or at the bidding of indiscreet publishers, the responsibilities of editing are undertaken without regard to the pre-requisites of the art, or in indifference to what ought to be the desirable results of its exercise. Too often, unfortunately, such work is thoughtlessly undertaken, at the solicitation of importunate and self-interested publishers,—and it seems so easy to edit a book, or to attain, at least, to the rank of an "appendix-author,"—but those who heedlessly fall into the trap sometimes live to repent it. If it be any consolation to such as have become victims to this enticement, we may say that literature is most often the severer sufferer.

Our remarks having grown to such length we have thought it better, rather than extend them here, or return to the subject next month, to throw the criticism upon Dr. McLellan's work we had designed appending to this, into the form of a book review, in which department it will be found in the present number.

WHAT IS RELIGION?—In the course of the Muir lectures on "Science and Religion," in the University of Edinburgh, the Rev. Principal Fairbairn, of Bradford, thus answers the question, What is religion?—Religion, they might say provisionally, was a consciously realised relation—the relation of man to God, and God to man. It was neither knowledge, whether described as intuition or thought, nor feeling, whether of dependence or of admiration, nor as if it were an external conscience, nor conduct. It was none of these, yet it was all of these. No one of these included it, yet all entered into its nature and its essence. There could not be religion without knowledge, for faith was knowledge ; man must believe or know an object was, before he could sustain any

relation to it ; to the unknown he could stand in no relation or conscious relation whatever. There could be no religion without thought, for to conceive was to think, and an object believed was an object conceived. Nor could it exist without feeling, for feeling implied thought. To be conscious of feeling was to be conscious first of ourselves as its subject, and second, of something not ourselves as its cause or object. Nor could it be apart from conscience, which was at once knowledge and feeling—a knowledge of the difference between acts and the feeling of obligation to do acts of a certain kind ; and so a relation such as was realized in religion was eminently fruitful of the acts judged and enjoined by conscience.