which custom demands, but which, in reality, means nothing, leaving every one to think and believe whatever he chooses. The result of this has been to resolve Protestantism into mere rationalism, and belief in religious doctrine into mere personal opinion. As a natural consequence of this, a membership in Protestant sects is no longer regarded as a matter of duty, but simply of personal preference; and thousands exercise their liberty of opinion and action by dropping entirely out of connection with any Protestant sect. The review is interesting, not so much as a statement or explanation of the facts as it is in showing the view of those outside the "rationalistic movement."

t \_\_ #

Now that the A.M.S. is considering ways and means of removing the Conversazione deficit, a few suggestings regarding the nature of that event may not be out of place. The Society cannot but be convinced that the last Conversazione was in many respects a failure. It certainly was not representative of the university. But few of the students attended and the professors of all faculties were specially conspicuous by their absence.

There must have been some good reasons for such a lack of interest as this in what ought to be a university event. Neither students nor professors of Queen's are lacking in college spirit. To that which is truly representative they have always been found ready to give their hearty support, both financially and otherwise. The reason then for such a lack of interest upon this occasion must, we think, be sought for in the nature of the Conversazione itself. It either lacked that which was necessary to commend it to the majority of professors and students, or else it contained elements which were sufficiently distasteful to the majority to keep them away.

To what extent either or both of these elements of failure entered into the last Conversazione is the duty of the A.M.S. to determine, and then to take good care that they shall not enter into like events in future. Certain it is that the feelings and rights and principles of any large class in the university cannot be utterly ignored without producing at least partial failure in that which ignores them.

., \* .,

Harrowing tales reach us at times of students in London or Edinburgh who have managed to live on a few pence per week, by dining frugally on porridge or some such delicacy. While admiring the fortitude of those devoted seekers after truth, we cannot help reflecting that, considering the actual outlay of cash, they fared better than do some of their equally poor brethren at Queen's, whose board bill is ten times as great. For some time there has been an openly-expressed dissatisfaction among the students

of Queen's with regard to the boarding-house system. While we know that students are but human, and that all men are prone to grumble, we know also by sad experience, that there is, in some quarters, very sufficient reason for complaint. There is of course accommodation for the majority of the students in respectable boarding-houses, but some, especially those who come to college for the first time, are, of necessity, driven to places not worthy of the name. A remedy, we think, might be formed in the adoption of some such system as that of the Foxcroft Club of Harvard, which had, in December, 1892, a membership of 221 members. The organization of such a club under a competent management, would be, we think, a great boon to many who are at present boarding at hotels or running the risk of a dyspeptic old age, by patronizing houses run on a strictly financial system.

In college circles of Toronto, "Antigone" has come and gone. A roving breeze from ancient Athens has wandered down through the centuries, picked up Mendelssohn on the way and landed him with Sophocles in the midst of the Queen city. There those "twain kings" of music and of verse sat them down to observe Canadians trying to speak with Greek voices and to see with Greek eyes. And who can say they were not satisfied?

The presentation of the play must have cost the actors and managers a great amount of hard work, but the result is worth it. To the actors there has probably come a vivid appreciation of, and sympathetic with, Sophocles, his characters and his times. This could be obtained by no other method than that of hard effort; and to fully appreciate the characters of Sophocles is to be a long way advanced in knowledge of human nature. Antigone and Haemon, Kreon and Ismene were men and women with hearts like ours, and their joys and sorrows, struggles and fears have power to touch us only inasmuch as we realize this fact. Hence we heartily approve of an "Antigone" who is more powerful in displaying the characteristics of a woman than those of a goddess. That is exactly as it should be.

As for the spectators, it were worth the trouble of preparation ten times over, if they left the hall realizing, perhaps for the first time, that a kindred feeling existed between them and the Athenians who first saw the play acted beneath the shadow of the Acropolis, and who were moved to tears at the lament of the condemned maiden; if for the first time they felt that the men of Toronto and the men of Athens are of one kindred, and that many an Antigone and many an Ismene moves in the everyday world around us. Perhaps there may come to them the further truth that Zeus is Zeus all the world over, and although now, as then, the laws of heaven and the affairs of earth seem not to fall out