

lips, and enforced by living influence and example; yet it might not be without use. The materials for such ethical instruction are perhaps being prepared in a quarter where we should hardly have looked for them. France in general seems to be divided between two violent extremes, the Ultramontanists and the Atheists, waging internecine war. But there is also a remarkable school of French writers on philosophy and ethics at once Liberal and religious, the existence of which is one of the pleasantest and most cheering phenomena of the intellectual world at the present day. If its local origin were traced we should perhaps find in it affinities to the religion of Pascal and Port Royal, and the Protestantism of modern France, as well as a reaction against the creed and morality of the Jacobins. Jules Simon is one of the eminent writers of this school. Another is Paul Janet, whose position is truly described by his American translator as that of a religious moralist, and whose "Elements of Morals" deals with conduct in all the lines and relations of life, professional as well as general, in a thoroughly practical way, and without a shadow of sectarianism, yet in perfect harmony with religion. The "Elements of Morality" is fitted for a University or a High School, not for an elementary school; but it may supply materials and strike the key-note for something of a more elementary kind.

"PUBLIC benefit must have precedence over individual right" are the words, if the report may be trusted, of a prominent advocate of the Scott Act. This, if an equally summary, is at all events a less offensive way of cutting the moral knot than saying that Licensed Victuallers are to be treated as dynamiters or vermin. Yet it is language which cannot safely be allowed to pass unchallenged while so many theories of public rapine are afloat. We delude ourselves, like the school philosophers of old, with abstract terms which are taken for realities. We are always talking of the State as though it were a personage of itself, with rights and duties of its own apart from and above the individual citizens who compose it. "The Public Good" is another phrase of the same kind and liable, in like manner, to perversion. It becomes enthroned in the imagination as something entirely distinct from the good of individuals, and infinitely more sacred, so sacred as to afford a warrant for that which would otherwise be iniquity. But as the State is nothing but the aggregate of individual citizens, so the Public Good is nothing but the aggregate of individual interests, for the preservation of which every community is formed. Wrong is not less wrong, nor less subversive of the social union, when it is done by a majority to a minority or even by all the other members of the community to one man. To expropriate is sometimes necessary, and when necessary is consistent with public morality, but there ought always to be reasonable compensation. It is said, and probably with truth, that the chief agencies at work in this crusade are those of the preachers and the ladies; and in both those quarters we should expect rather high sentiments and aspirations than a strict regard for common justice.

THE "Bystander" has to thank his friends in the *Globe* for an attestation of his political neutrality, which perhaps was not altogether needless. Having had to rank himself among the opponents of the Government on great issues, such as those of the Senate and Protection, as well as on several special questions, such as that of Section B, he was in some danger of being taken for a partisan of the Opposition. But the *Globe* has set him right by assuring its readers that regarded from the Opposition point of view he is a partisan of the Government. Not only partisans of the Government, but some who are its bitter enemies, and faithful adherents of the *Globe*, are saying, like the "Bystander," that if the Opposition wishes to find its way back to power, it must have a definite policy, and that the people must have this policy kept constantly before their minds, and not be sent to look for it in the back files of newspapers. How can the masses be expected to remain deeply impressed by a brief and cursory allusion, or to preserve a strong recollection of a silent vote given for a motion of reform two or three years ago? On one rather important occasion the "Bystander" was allowed to have the function of Opposition pretty much to himself. Under evil pressure, as it is charitable to suppose, an appointment was made to the judiciary from motives manifestly improper, and the most vital part of our institutions was threatened with corruption. The "Bystander" spoke as loudly as he could. Why were the leading organs of the Opposition press silent? Certainly not because the subject was unimportant, because the offence of the Government was slight, or because habitual delicacy restrained the censor's pen. Here again reason is given us for doubting whether a change of ministers would bring with it a great change of policy. Apparently we should be just as much as ever under the influence of the Catholic vote. But if this is the case, how can Orangemen be upbraided with a dereliction of their principles because they support the Government? What would their cause gain by the transfer of power to the Opposition?

M. RENOUF's treatise on the "Ancient Religions of Egypt" leads to the same conclusion with regard to the origin and growth of religion as M. Réville's on the "Ancient Religions of Mexico and Peru." Not ghosts, either of ancestors or of chiefs, but the sun and the other great powers of Nature were the original objects of adoration in that country, which, with its historical records stretching back for two thousand years before Christ, presents a peculiarly instructive field of inquiry. The religious sentiment, in short, was awakened in the breast of the Egyptian in the same way in which it was awakened in the breast of the Indo-European races and those of Central America. In each case, apparently, the sentiment must have existed, in however rudimentary a form, as an element of human nature, or it could not have been evoked. Ra, the great god of Egypt, is the sun, He crosses the sky in a boat, as the sun-god of other mythologies crosses it in a chariot. Thoth is the moon, which he wears upon his head either as crescent or as full disk. The struggle between Light and Darkness, the succession of the Seasons, are the elements out of which the mythology is woven. There seems reason, according to M. Renouf, to believe that the sublimer forms of Egyptian religion were the earlier, and that the observed uniformity of celestial phenomena led the higher minds, at all events, to belief in a Universal Power, the service of which was righteousness. The animal worship, which has been the object of so much ridicule, seems not to have been primæval. Nor does it appear to have had its origin in fetichism, as has been taken for granted, but in symbolism. The Bull was naturally regarded as an emblem of strength and dominion; but from being an emblem and associated with the divinity in that character, he became himself divine in the eyes of the vulgar, and the result was the worship of Apis. The striking qualities and movements of the hawk, in the same way, led first to its adoption as an emblem and afterwards to its canonization. Egypt therefore affords us proof that its original deity was a fetish. The prodigious number of Egyptian deities in later times seem to have arisen from the grossness of the popular fancy, which took each separate aspect and appellation of a God for a separate God. Ra had seventy different aspects and appellations. Local worship also multiplied the deities, one of whom each place took for its special patron, as the Virgin and patron Saints were multiplied by local worship in the Middle Ages: Our Lady of Loretto or St. James of Compostella being in the popular imagination a different divinity from the Virgin or the St. James of other places. Both in regard to this and in regard to the perversion of emblems, the vulgarizing and degrading process which Christianity underwent in the Dark Ages may, in some measure, afford a key to the religious history of ages still darker. Archæology might have mistaken the crowd of Saints for a Polytheist Pantheon and the materialized symbols, perhaps even the Host, for Fetishes. Evolutionists indeed seem inclined to connect the emblematic Dove with fetichism, and they might with equal reason extend the interpretation to the emblematic Lamb, Pelican and Fish. The Egyptians made offerings and burned incense to the shades of their ancestors; but this was quite a subordinate part of their religion; and there seems to be no sort of reason for supposing that it preceded, or at all affected, the worship of the sun. Perhaps, if the truth were known, what the people paid to their ancestors was rather veneration than the worship which they paid to a God: as a Roman Catholic distinguishes between the worship which he pays to God and the worship which he pays to the Saints. The Egyptian had also, like the Roman, his Genius, or spiritual double and guardian, but his Genius was not his God. A belief in ghosts, doubles and wraiths is, as we can almost tell from our own experience in childhood, a growth from a root totally distinct from the religious sentiment. The ghost theory of the origin of religion is drawn from an exclusive observation of savages, the accounts of whose beliefs and traditions, as Sir Henry Maine has remarked, are often most untrustworthy, and whom we can no more identify with primæval man than we can identify the dwarf horse of the Shetlands, or the blind insect of the Mammoth Cave in Kentucky, with the original type of the horse or of the insect. M. Renouf is explicit as to the absence of any confirmation of Mr. Spencer's hypothesis, so far as the Egyptians are concerned. Yet that hypothesis, based on Mr. Tylor's observation of savages and nothing else, has been put forward as incontestable fact, decisive at once as to the past and as to the future of religion. Surely this is not science.

A BYSTANDER.

AN Exeter (Eng.) hairdresser has discovered three works of J. W. M. Turner. Mr. Ruskin having been consulted as to the pictures has intimated that he has not the least doubt that the three paintings are the works of Turner, and he congratulates the owner on his good fortune. Each picture is 36 in. by 24 in. One represents the north transept of Exeter Cathedral; the second gives a view of the west end, the Cathedral yard beyond; the third is a painting of the central portion of the building.