

is liberality, and hardness is justice, and mere appearance is religion; or, we may have conscious union with God by the faith of the gospel; we may rejoice as we summer in the sun of the great Father's love; we may be free from the lower and the higher sin; we may rule the animal in us and devote all the mind and heart to truth and God. That is better. Let us seek it; let us have truth in the inward parts, and truth in all our outward acts; let us be real, not seeming; generous, not hard; ruling self and denying self for the sake of men and God, and so the smile of heaven shall be our constant joy.

CORRESPONDENCE.

Letters should be brief, and written on one side of the paper only. Those intended for insertion should be addressed to the Editor, 162 St. James Street, Montreal; those on matters of business to the Manager, at the same address.

To the Editor of the CANADIAN SPECTATOR:

SIR,—In the number of your excellent and interesting paper for July 5, 1879, there is an Essay on Parents by "An Old Boy," with some excellent observations. He refers to a "recent school case in Toronto" as showing that a male teacher in Canadian schools can inflict corporal punishment on *girls* (the italics are his), and hints that the punishment may be inflicted in the most degrading way. Is this true? and can you give any particulars of the case which has not been noticed in this country? It was decided here forty years ago, when public opinion was much less formed on the subject than now, in a case of *Regina v. Miles* (not having my books, I am not sure that it was not *Rex v. Miles*), that while a male teacher might inflict chastisement on girls in a reasonable way, the birch was not a reasonable chastisement, and that the teacher who used it was guilty of an assault, though the girls were young. I don't know of a similar decision in the case of a school mistress, but fancy that now at least the use of the birch on a girl in her teens, though by a female, would be held to be an unreasonable and therefore illegal chastisement by a court of law. There are instances of Magistrates convicting school teachers of an assault for punishment of a less degrading character and not severe enough to cause danger. I believe there was a contrary decision in Massachusetts some years ago, but in that case the girl refused to submit to a flogging at the hand of a female teacher, who then summoned a male teacher to her assistance, and the result might have been different if the male teacher had flogged the girl on his own responsibility. The case, too, created an outcry in the United States at the time: but I fancied that in Canada you followed English rather than American decisions, and am therefore surprised to hear (if I interpret "An Old Boy" rightly) that a male teacher may flog a girl like a boy. I shall be glad to have any information on the subject, and will be happy to hear that I have been mistaken, if such be the case.

I am truly yours,

Lex.

Dublin, Sept. 10, 1879.

To the Editor of the CANADIAN SPECTATOR:

SIR,—An article in your issue of 6th instant, "The English Language," induces me, with your permission, to notice a few words which it surprises me to see used in papers of the day that are generally supposed to be better informed.

We constantly see the announcement of deaths preceded by the Latin word "obit." Obit used properly is correct enough, but it applies to the constellations, and obeo means to set, to go down. This latter meaning seems rather suggestive as connected with death, by the way, to say in its proper connection that Jupiter "obit" would be correct. As applied to man or woman, it simply means that he or she sets or goes down, which is absurd, but the prefix obit, perfect tense of obeo, would, I apprehend, be correct, meaning he or she died as the case might be.

Another word commonly used, and also by papers that ought to know better, is "Statute," where a statue is intended. It is astonishing how often this gross mistake occurs; every one knows, or should know, that a statute is an Act of Parliament; nothing but ignorance can confound it with statuette, meaning a miniature statue, the statue proper being life size or larger.

No doubt the English language is an exceptionally difficult one to speak with purity, and many apparently insignificant words continually raise a puzzling question as to their propriety. For instance, I am often quite at a loss to decide whether "shall" or "will" is correct. I believe there is a general rule as to the use of these two words, but if so it has escaped my memory.

Again, which is it the nominative or objective case follows the preposition "than," or is either correct? e.g., I am stouter than he (is understood), or I am stouter than him.

There is another word lately become fashionable—"crass," a very ugly word as I think, and apparently used to supersede the word "gross." There are many nouns, however, to which the former would be inapplicable, the latter the reverse. "A crass witticism" would be absurd; while "gross" answers for all purposes to which I have seen the word "crass" applied, it is therefore superfluous and should be relegated to its original obscurity.

The list might be prolonged almost indefinitely; and I think, sir, that an occasional short article on the subject of the English language would be welcomed by the public and could not fail to be useful.

Ottawa, 23rd Sept., 1879.

Q.

"EUSEBIUS" AND THE NEW CHURCH.

To the Editor of the CANADIAN SPECTATOR.

SIR,—It is painful enough to be the object of attack on the part of adversaries and opponents, who, it may be, misapprehend or wilfully misrepresent our opinions. But how shall we characterize the matter when those who profess to be on our side, and to share our views, become our assailants, and do not scruple to make even the public press the channel of a personal attack upon us. In this case, may we not well pray: "Save us from our friends."

Your contributor "Eusebius," (who appears to consider himself competent to deal with all topics, on earth or in heaven, from Free Trade to the New Jerusalem) has seen proper in your last issue to make a direct assault upon the "sect," as he is pleased to call it, known as the Swedenborgian, or New Jerusalem, Church, stigmatizing it as "a body of men who try to raise themselves to eminence by conserving and re-interpreting from their own self-hood the grand thoughts of their founder." Now, sir, I beg to demand of "Eusebius" how he can find it consistent with that love to God and charity to the neighbour, which, as he rightly says, are the foundation-principles of all religion, and of the New Church, in particular, to bring an accusation of this kind against a religious body. As a minister of the "sect" he so cordially despises, I ask for proof that such is, or ever has been, the spirit or the aim of the New Jerusalem Church.

So far as my experience goes, and it is not a very limited one either, in this particular, it is those who reject all religious worship (except the daily and hourly worship of themselves and their own superior intelligence), and affect a spirituality wholly above and apart from all outward forms and ordinances—though they can, on occasion, discourse very fluently of the "power" that "resides in ultimates"—who are most liable to be inflated by "their own self-hood," and readiest to do violence to the great "founders" of the faith, by attributing to them ideas and "re-interpreting" their words in a sense of which they never dreamed.

Were this the proper place, I could show, Sir, from a hundred passages in his works, that Swedenborg clearly anticipated an external organization of the Church in harmony with the doctrines he taught; and in this light have his teachings always been understood by those who have made them a life-long study. Nor is there any difference of opinion upon the point among those who have any adequate understanding, or are free from bias, in regard to his views, on this question. Can we, who accept his teachings on this head as on others, feel otherwise than indignant, therefore, to find our simple desire and purpose to worship the Lord our Saviour according to our highest ideas of Him, and to bring up our children in the knowledge and belief of these doctrines, and in the use of the Sacraments of Baptism and the Holy Supper in a form consonant with such belief, assailed in the manner they are by this writer? Such feeling alone, Sir, must be my apology for trespassing on your columns in a matter of so purely personal and private a nature.

I am, &c.,

E. Gould.

AUTUMN SIGNS.

Is there no lesson in the year
Running her latter seasons out,
No type or shadow in her thoughts,
Whilst fading leaves are strewn about?

Surely we have a sympathy—
Made true by all our hearts have known
Of faded hopes and ended joys—
With dying leaves and flowers blown.

Are these not things that touch a spring—
Where scenes, both sad and dear, are lain—
In Memory's immortal bower,
That makes the past come back again?

Do they not mind us of the time
When we must also leave the light—
When the last bloom upon our cheek
Shall turn into a deathly white?

When, from its watch-tower, the soul,
Like a leaf falling from its bough,
Shaking and twining to its goal,
Must draw its gaze, and, trembling, go?

—Chambers' Journal.