

getic opponents of Greek are just those who have too little acquaintance with the object of their resentment to have sustained any serious injury from it. It is a case of mistrust of the unknown." As for the charge of uselessness, if Greek was useless it was a uselessness in which he gloried as a protest against that philistine utilitarianism, that deemed nothing valuable that could not be turned into money. But, in truth, it was impossible to get away from the Greeks. All great achievement in the world was traced back to Greece as its fruitful source. The thoughts, and even the words of that wondrous people were wrought into whatever was most ennobling, most inspiring in the thought of to-day. Thus, as John Addington Symonds says, "All civilized nations are colonies of Hellas," and it is this relationship that "has made Greek so indispensable in modern education." Prof. McNaughton's lecture is published in the March and April numbers of the *Educational Monthly*.

### A SEVENTEENTH CENTURY TEMPERANCE MOVEMENT.

Of the great reforms that have changed the face, and, to some extent, the heart, of civilization during the last fifty years or more, not the least important is the temperance movement. How far-reaching and thorough its influence has been we realize when we contrast the ordinary social usages of sixty or seventy years ago with the rule of the present day. Whether we read history, biography or fiction, we cannot but recognize the sweeping change that has taken place. When we ask to what causes this transformation is to be attributed, we receive various answers. According to some authorities, it is the altered attitude of the physician, while others ascribe it to the total abstinence societies, and others again assure us that it results from the general improvement in morals and manners. Those who have placed on record the doings of temperance organizations seldom assign an earlier date for the inauguration of the work than the beginning of the century. Dr. Lyman Beecher and Dr. B. J. Clark, moved by the study of Dr. Rush's book on the effect of ardent spirits on the human frame, are said to have led the way by forming in Greenfield, New York, a temperance society which still exists. Dr. Rush, though he died and purged after the fashion of his time, was in many ways in advance of it. He was a humane reformer in the treatment of the insane, and his treatise on the effect of alcohol may still be studied with advantage.

Nevertheless, there is hardly a point on which he dwells in his war with the destroyer that had not already been used in a controversy that raged in Canada a hundred years before. To Canada really belongs the initiation of the temperance reform. It is an American writer—an honour to his calling—who tells us that the first temperance meeting held on this continent took place at the mission of Sillery, near Quebec, in the year 1648—a hundred years before Dr. Rush was born. "The drum beat after Mass," writes Dr. Parkman, "and the Indians gathered at the summons." The first speaker was an Algonquin chief, who, after citing a recent edict of the Governor, threatened all who should violate it by drinking to excess with merited punishment, and exhorted the people to avoid disgrace and set a good example. That there was need for remonstrance and exhortation we have ample evidence from contemporary

writers. The state of degradation to which the liquor traffic—for, as soon as the fur traders became aware of the weakness of the Indians, they made brandy the chief article of barter—had reduced some of the tribes, was a disgrace to civilization and a sore grief to the missionaries. Hence arose a dispute which lasted for more than fifty years, as between the clergy and the civil power, but which, in one form or another, as far as it touches the Indians, has continued till the present moment.

The eau de vie controversy, or the brandy quarrel (as Mr. Parkman calls it), was complicated by rivalries and jealousies which sometimes caused the central evil to be lost sight of. But no person can read the story of the conflict without being convinced that the temperance party had right and reason and Christianity on its side. The policy of denying liquor to the Indians has, in fact, been sanctioned long since by every government in North America. But what is especially noteworthy in this temperance movement of two centuries ago is that, on the total abstinence side were marshalled all the arguments which Drs. Rush, Richardson, Oswald, and other medical reformers, have since adduced against the use of intoxicants. One document, more particularly, entitled "Histoire de l'Eau de Vie en Canada," prepared, it is supposed, about the year 1705, by some of the missionaries, might still serve to coach a temperance lecturer. It is true that when the author describes so vividly the effects of spirituous liquors on the human system, it is the *corpus vile* of the unsophisticated and unseasoned Indian that he has in his mind's eye. In Britain, in Germany, "drunkenness is magnificence, good cheer, one of the bonds of society, a source of wholesome delight, and, moreover, the fashion from time immemorial." The magistrates could hardly be expected, therefore, to deal very severely with it, whatever condemnation the laws of God might pronounce on it. But if people chose to look upon intemperance in Europe as a venial offence, those who had witnessed its fruits among the Indians of Canada could not most assuredly regard it as a trivial matter. Having anticipated looked for objections by this distinction, the unknown author of this woful history proceeds to demonstrate that brandy (which, like rum in our day, stood for liquor in general), though it might be a remedy, was not an aliment, that, though administered in small quantities under proper direction, it might be salutary to the patient, it was ruinous to body and mind when taken in excess. He then gives numerous instances of the fearful effects of brandy-drinking among the Indians—murders, maimings, massacres, like that of Lachine, surprise by enemies, as at La Prairie de la Magdelaine (though there Valrennes ultimately won the day), assaults on women, deaths by exposure, fires, famine, madness. But it is not the Indians alone who sin and suffer in this way. The tavern-keepers waste their evil gains in riot and debauchery. The merchants of Montreal share in the depression of an impoverished community, and parents bewail the corruption of their children. No temperance lecture, in fact, could be more forcible, more pathetic, more convincing than this stray leaf from the record of the 17th century. To Canadians it is of unusual interest as the testimony of a contemporary to the priority of the temperance movement in Canada and to the antiquity of arguments, of which we are wont to give the credit to our own enlightened age.

It may be asked by what logic these arguments were answered. The reply was generally that the traffic was expedient in order to win the Indians from France's rivals and foes. But on one occasion Colbert employed a sophistry which reminds one of the guise that Satan can, it is said, assume when he pleases. This commerce, said the great minister, was absolutely necessary to attract the Indians to the French colonies, and thus give them an opportunity of being imbued with the Christian faith. It might be thought that such a plea was more ingenious than sincere. That conclusion would probably be incorrect. If refused brandy by the French, the Indians, it was felt, would go to the English or Dutch, from whom they could get all they wanted. But even the dread of that alternative did not justify the indiscriminate sale of liquor, in which the traders were known to indulge. In the heat of the controversy the taunt of *tu quoque* was some times heard. But there is no note of inconsistency in the document from which we have quoted.

### A REMARKABLE DISCOVERY.

The Rev. John Morris, S.J., F.S.A., writes to the London *Times* of the 15th ult. an account of an extraordinary discovery recently made at Canterbury Cathedral. The following is his letter:

SIR,—A few days ago I saw a sight in Canterbury Cathedral that interested me greatly, and as I am not aware that any account of it has been sent to you, perhaps you will allow me very briefly to describe it. In the course of the investigations into the history of the cathedral that the Dean and Chapter have intrusted to a committee of experts, a local tradition has been swept away, or indeed I might say two incompatible traditions. In the south wall of the aisle of the famous Trinity Chapel at the east end of the cathedral stands a tomb, which for some long time past has been called by Archbishop Theobald's name. He was the predecessor of St. Thomas of Canterbury in the Metropolitan See, and the year of his death was 1160. Those who are conversant with the history of the cathedral will have always known that Theobald was buried elsewhere. Inconsistent with this tradition was another to the effect that when the choir of the cathedral was burned in 1174 the shrines containing relics were flung down from the beams on which they rested, and the relics from the broken shrines were collected by the monks and placed in this tomb. It must be acknowledged that the tomb presents much of the appearance of a shrine; and as it has projecting from the quatrefoils of its ridged roof various marble heads in deep relief, it was not surprising that these heads should be regarded as those of the saints whose relics were supposed to be within. That ridged roof has been lifted off, and it has been ascertained that no relics from the broken shrines were deposited there. But underneath there is a coffin-lid, which also was raised, and there beneath lie the undisturbed remains of an ancient Archbishop, fully vested. The body has been left as it was. The objects of value that were in the coffin have been carefully removed; and this, indeed, was a necessary precaution, for it would not have been wise to leave them there now that they are known to exist. These will form part of the treasures in the Chapter Library—a beautiful chalice and paten, silver parcel-gilt; a gold ring with an engraved emerald; the pastoral staff, of cedar wood, with a very poor volute, but with three engraved gems in the knob; and some specimens of beautiful embroidery on the vestments. These will all be precious helps in the history of mediæval art.

And who is the Archbishop upon whom we have reverently gazed? It is either Hubert Walter, who died in 1205, or Cardinal Stephen Langton, whose death was 23 years later. I do not now trouble you with the reasons that lead me to believe that the face I have seen is that of the great Archbishop who sided with the barons of England against King John in the struggle that gave us Magna Charta. I am not exaggerating when I say that I have seen the face of an Archbishop who lived six centuries and a half ago. The state of preservation of everything in that stone coffin was very wonderful. The vestments were quite sound—all but the woollen *pallium*, which had almost perished, though its pins were there—and, to my great surprise, the shape of the nose and chin was clear and distinct. "May he rest in peace," I may be permitted to say, in a sense different from that in which usually those words are said. These remains have been treated with the greatest respect, and the Archbishop rests still quite undisturbed in the stone coffin in which he has rested so long. To have seen, not a heap of bones—for I have seen none but those of the head and hands—but to have seen Stephen Langton in his vestments is an event in life, and I am very thankful to those who have done me the signal service of inviting me to Canterbury at such a time.