

altogether ; both alternatives were distasteful. Accordingly the resident graduates and undergraduates with the hearty co-operation of the faculty of Arts and many of the old graduates determined not to give up the old tradition, but to make the following change—viz., that the dinner should embrace the Arts' faculty, graduates, and undergraduates. This year, owing to the short time at our disposal, we have been unable to call a general meeting of graduates or to send out circulars to all. We have had to confine them to Toronto and its environs. This has been unavoidable, but next year we hope that all our graduates in Arts will meet together in the Halls of Trinity, recalling old associations and making new ones. It is our hope that as the resuscitation of Convocation will form a bond of strength, so this will be the occasion of many bonds of friendship. We trust that no one will take offence at not having been notified. Time has not permitted us to act in this matter as we should have wished.

LITERARY NOTES.

[Our readers will see that this is a new departure in our columns. By drawing attention to articles in reviews and new books we hope to bring them to the notice of those who would not read them of their own accord. If any of our subscribers meet with any interesting matter of this kind we would gladly welcome it from them.]

The September number of the "Nineteenth Century" contains a remarkable article on the Irish question, entitled "A German view of Mr. Gladstone," by Theodor Von Bunsen. After noting several considerations which in his opinion account for the sympathy in Germany with the Parnellites, he asks why notwithstanding these considerations public opinion in Germany has been even quicker than in Great Britain to range itself on the side of the Liberal Unionists versus the Home Rulers? A two-fold cause he thinks has worked this change, a consciousness of (1) the analogy of the position of both great powers in respect of sedition at home, and (2) the identity of the danger that threatens them from abroad. Among the German dependencies where a strong imperial policy has been adopted, order and patriotism have resulted, where Home Rule has been tried chaos and ingratitude prevail. The capacity for self-government among the Celts he questions, and sees in Home Rule the first step in disintegration of the British Empire.

Among the nations of modern Europe marching in the van of civilization we can least spare that one which has shown some capability of uniting liberty with order. Unless the unionist cause is triumphant Germany must give up the hope of standing back to back with England in the tremendous struggle against Panslavism and French Chauvanism. Thus the Irish question is put in the pro-

vince of world-politics, and on its solution the destinies of nations are seen to hang.

The appearance of Wong Chin Foo, the Chinese lecturer, in Toronto, calls our attention to his startling indictment of Christianity published in the August number of the "North American Review." "Why am I a heathen?" contains the statement that modern Christianity falls in point of morality below heathenism. "There is," he maintains, "more heart breaking and suicides in the single State of New York in a year than in all China." Though facts may rebut such a charge, yet even a caricature must have some ground of truth. He fails to notice the difference between a religion which is voluntary and a moral system which is all but compulsory. Is New York State ruled by Christian ideas? Can Confucianism produce a *Christian*? If average morality is lower in New York than in China (which we doubt) it only proves, as his opponent Yan Phou Lee maintains, that men in New York have a greater capacity for crime than men in China.

An inferior system acted upon by all will produce better results than an ideal system professed by all but in fact disregarded by most. If there be an indictment, it is against our school system, which, while disregarding ethics, transforms the untutored dwarf into an undisciplined giant. Such signs of our century the Christian philosopher will hail with delight as placing the issues between Christianity and other systems in sharp contrast.

There is an interesting article for Bible students in the September number of the *Contemporary Review*, dealing with the destructive criticism of the Old Testament that has been lately in vogue. The new school of critics place the date of the main portion of the Law of Moses after the Babylonish captivity, and in fact assert that the giving to it the authority of Moses at all, was merely a pious fraud. Deuteronomy they date in the reign of Josiah, while the earlier books were written according to their theory during the conflict with Assyria.

But to uphold this system of dates, it was necessary to cast out so many passages contained in the books placed in the first period, which clearly referred to facts mentioned in those relegated to later periods, under the plea that they were interpolations, that virtually all value in such a system of chronology is destroyed.

The very same internal evidence that gives the critics fancied ground for other and later dates, is the evidence that destroys such hypothesis altogether.

No doubt the books of the Old Testament bear some of the marks of re-writing and revision, at dates long after their composition, but their consistent agreement not only among themselves, but also in a wonderful degree, with the facts of contemporary history—as is witnessed by discoveries yearly being made—will form a strong bulwark of protection against successive attacks of hostile criticism.