

The student should learn to avoid even the appearance of literary theft, on personal as well as moral grounds. The placid waters of imitation soon become turbulent to the unwary navigator in the sea of Literature, and he finds, when too late, that they are "bound in shallows and oblivion." Often, again, the skilful writer seizes an idea that for years, for centuries mayhap, has been floating through the minds of men, but has never taken definite form. To this he imparts life and vigor, then clothes it in a garb of richest imagery and surrounds it with a halo of truth. Its advent is welcomed with delight and man recognizes the personalization of an idea for the possession of which he has long been striving, but over which has hitherto been hanging the enshrouding veil of obscurity. True originality in the writer's domain it is difficult to find. Like the gift of song it comes to some men naturally, and with increasing years it gains in strength, while cultivation makes it doubly powerful. To most, however, its attainment necessitates a prolonged search and earnest application.

A critical study of the whole subject makes it evident that this element is a necessity to laborers in the fields of Literature. Original thought tends directly to novel production, and this to popularity. The innate potency of this factor renders it a worthy object of ambition. Though dwelling in the sober regions of fact it has transplanted from the golden land of fancy a wealth of beauteous imagery, and where wisdom rules has ever avoided the deceitful and the visionary. The student whose essay is perfumed with the fresh aroma of native thought, is lighted with the flashes of his own genius, will carry the gleaming banner of originality into his future life. Too often the "native hue" of novelty is marred by the false though dazzling glitter of the odd, the startling, the grotesque. These are but deformities and should be shunned. They neither elevate the writer's thought nor increase his power. They lower the standard, defeating their own end, and tending in no degree to enrich the mind of the reader.

Let the desire of novelty, then, be an important element in all attempts of a literary kind, and, avoiding the errors of imitation and the other attendant evils, let the student, in the strength of his own individuality, and armed with original thought and innate genius, press forward to the farthest limit of his ambition.

A. K. DEB.

IMMORTALITY IN MODERN THOUGHT.

It will be admitted, we think, that the tendency of modern science is materialistic. This is especially true of biology. In fact, to many, the correlation of of vital with physical forces, and the doctrine of deviative origin of species, seem little short of a demonstration of materialism. Thus, materialism has become a fashion of thought; but, like all fashions, it has run into excess, which must be followed by re-action. We believe the re-action has already commenced. Science sees now, more clearly than ever before, its own limits. "It acknowledges its impotence to bridge the chasm between the physical and the psychical. We pass from physical to chemical, and from chemical to vital, without break. All is motion, and nothing more; also, in the origin of the vital, we pass from sense-impression through nerve-thrill to brain changes, and still we find only motions. But when, just here, there emerge consciousness, thought, will, the relation of these to brain-changes is just as unimaginable as the appearance of the genie when Aladdin's lamp is rubbed.

It is impossible to emphasize this point too strongly. Suppose a living brain be exposed to an observer with infinitely perfect senses. Such an observer would see, could see, only molecular movements. But the subject knows nothing of all this. His experiences are of a totally different order; viz., consciousness, thought, &c. Viewed from the *outside*, there is nothing but motions; viewed from the *inside*, nothing but thought, &c.,—from the one side, only material phenomena; from the other, only psychical phenomena. May we not generalize this fact? May we not extend it to nature also? From the *outside* we find nothing but motion. On the *inside* there must be thought, consciousness, &c.: in a word, God. To bridge this chasm, whether in nature or in the brain, Science is impotent. As to what is on the other side of material phenomena, she is agnostic, but cannot be materialistic.

Admitting then in man a world of phenomena, which cannot be construed in terms of motion, and which for convenience we group under the name of "spirit," is the group permanent? Is the spirit immortal? On this subject, Science can say absolutely nothing. The field is, therefore, open for evidence from any quarter, and of any degree. Some of these evidences, though not given by Science, are at least suggested by lines of scientific thought. A few of these we briefly mention.

1. We have said that consciousness and thought lie behind material phenomena, in nature and in the human brain. In the one case we call it God, the Divine Spirit; the other, the spirit of man. Now, does not this identity or similarity of relation to material phenomena, imply, or at least suggest, *similarity of nature*, and therefore immortality for the spirit of man?