

you. But we really have some concern for your morals. You might learn a lesson as to strict adherence to truth. You evidently and without a blush prevaricate and misrepresent. You take three sentences—dismember and ridicule them, and say that they are exponents of the rest. O tempora, O Mores! There is a pretty little scene in Henry IV, by Shakespeare.

Glend.—Why I can teach you cousin to command the devil.

Hot.—And I can teach thee coz to shame the devil. By telling truth; tell truth and shame the devil.

But then you are to be pitied as well as blamed. Alas, you have no religious influences there at your Provincial University! Not even a Lear to say.

"An you lie Sirrah, we'll have you whipped."

But the sentence that excited the most wonderful acuteness and unparalleled display of critical acumen and irony was that figure which attributed to language the power of throwing over the mind a fragrance. Now Nuncle you do steer clear of all figurative language and your style is barren and bald. Stick to it. Ape Swift. You know how unwise it would be for a snail to attempt to fly. No doubt metaphor is distasteful to you. But do you think it is any more ridiculous to call a beautiful description of perennial-blooming isles and scented groves etc. odoriferous-fragrant than to call another style glowing-burning? They are terms used on the same principle founded on resemblance of relations. If a word wafts perfume to my mental sense have I not a right to say that it flings odour over me. And if I use "Sabeau," etc. in an accommodated sense where pray is the impropriety? Nay but such contemptible sophistry can only have one intent that of distortion.

Thus much in conclusion. Novalis says—"The significance of this world is Reason; for her sake the world is here." If this be true the writer of that critique may safely set himself down for a cypher, an infinitesimal increment of the aggregate which derives its only significance from Reason. Let him become a child if not one already—and humbly cultivate common understanding—he may become an appreciable quantity.

WHAT has an eye in the middle of it and yet is always blind?

THE PROSPERITY OF COLLEGES CONTINGENT UPON DENOMINATIONAL EFFORT.

A WRITER in a late number of "Scribner's Monthly," in narrating the history of a prominent college, very truthfully remarks that nearly all such institutions owe their origin to denominational enterprise. It may with equal truth be affirmed that the perpetuity of collegiate institutions is dependent upon continued denominational support.

In maintenance of this statement the *a priori* considerations are numerous and striking. The mere existence of the several large denominations is convincing evidence that men are not all cast in the same mould. They naturally hold various opinions on questions of Church Organizations and Doctrine, and as naturally fraternize with those whose opinions coincide with their own. The religious bodies thus formed will desire for their young men an education that recognizes their moral and spiritual natures and provides for the harmonious development of mind and soul, and this result they can obtain only by having such control over the colleges they patronize as will secure the appointment of Professors in whom they have confidence. Institutions of learning owing their origin to this laudable motive have been termed "Denominational," though some prefer the term "Independent," to denote their freedom from State control. They are usually owned and controlled by Denominations, but that they are therefore necessarily Sectarian has been disproved repeatedly during the present University discussion. They are devoted to the work of higher education, and in proportion to their income usually do more and better work than State colleges. What they propose to do that State Colleges do not, is to shield the Student during his formative years from the scepticism so unhappily prevalent in the scientific world.

It is childish to affirm that the arguments that are used in favor of free, unsectarian common schools apply with equal force to higher education. Children attending common schools are under parental control, with all that that implies—wise counsel and religious instruction at home and at church. Young men at college leave all these influences behind them and, as a rule, accommodate themselves to the moral atmosphere they breathe. That the danger is not imaginary is only too well proved. The great German Universities are nurseries of Atheism, and that of London is following in their wake. Two-thirds of its students hold materialistic views, and with scarcely an exception, as stated in a recent letter from London, they study on the Sabbath as on other days. Two of

the holders of the Gilchrist Scholarships from Canada at this Institution are avowed Materialists. The wide-spread moral evil that will result from this general adoption of Materialism by those who are to be the leaders of thought is simply incalculable. The seed is now being sown which will in a few years produce a fearful harvest of unbelief.

The question then that faces those of us who accept Christianity is this: Shall we abandon our colleges and thereby subject our young men to influences adverse to it, to which two-thirds of them will yield, or shall we continue those safeguards which have been found so efficacious in the past. In a word is Christianity worth preserving and perpetuating, or shall we exchange it for the comfortless doubtings of Materialism? To this question there can be but one answer.

That Denominational Colleges possess more *inherent vitality* than those supported by the State can be demonstrated by an overwhelming array of facts. Denominations always live; in their principles and practices they change but little and what they have done well in the past they will, with increasing means, do better in the future. Governments are liable to sudden overthrow, and a Legislative Assembly favorable to State Colleges may at any time be succeeded by one opposed to them. When an Institution supported by the State exists, a yearly appropriation must be made for its support and the occasion is usually an annual wrangle between conflicting policies. The President or Chancellor of such Institution is compelled to enter the field every year in defence of the appropriation without which he and his colleagues would be suddenly and summarily compelled to resign their situations. It was this abnormal condition of belligerency that induced the late Chancellor of Michigan University to retire from his responsible post.

In this connection a brief survey of the leading colleges of the continent will be found instructive. Harvard began as a State Institution, but it has always been denominational, there being at that time practically but one denomination in Mass. The Rev. Henry Dunster one of its ablest Presidents was compelled to resign for avowing Baptist Principles. The College was afterwards severed from state control and became in succession the property of the Congregational and Unitarian bodies. The other colleges in the State are also denominational. In Rhode Island there is one excellent University, Brown—which though receiving State aid is the property of the Baptists. Yale, like Harvard, began as a state college when congregationalism was nearly universal in Conn. and the Government was much more paternal than would be tolerated in these