

trine was developed in the writings of absolutist divines and other supporters of the monarchy, till it attained its fullest proportions in Sir R. Filmer's "Patriarcha." In this book the royal power is directly traced from Adam through the patriarchs to the house of Stuart, and all the weight of Hebrew tradition and Scriptural authority, as well as considerable logical acumen, is brought to prove the *patria potestas* of the king. Here Mr. Gairdner stops. He might have gone on to show, how when the Divine Right had become discredited by the stern facts of the Revolution of '88, the doctrine for a time maintained a shadowy existence—the Non-Jurors holding to a distinction between the King *de facto* and the King *de jure*. The theory of divine right, like that of the Social Contract, has long since ceased to exercise any appreciable weight in practical politics, but is interesting to students of by-gone phases of belief. In essence it was an unconscious testimony to the necessity of some recognized authority in the political world.

Nothing has lately brought home to us with greater force the increasing sympathy between man and the rest of the animal world than the excitement caused in England by the sale of the elephant Jumbo to the American showman. Plato humorously predicted the time when democracy would spread from men to animals; when the hound would be like the mistletoe of the house, and asses and horses "would adopt a gait expressive of remarkable freedom and dignity, and run at any body that meets them in the street, if he does not get out of their way." If we have not quite come to this yet, we have learned fully to love and appreciate the dumb animals, and an incapacity for such feelings, as was the case with Macaulay, is justly considered to detract from the perfection of a man's nature. Our duties to the lower animals are inculcated by the Koran, and the sentiment has been finely illustrated in all ages by writers as different as Homer, Anacreon, Scott, Burns and Matthew Arnold.

The London *Spectator* lately had a suggestive article on the future of English Humour, a prominent part in which was naturally occupied by American Humour. The writer considered that the best types of such humour, "for the most part, imply a rare faculty for turning the mind aside from the direct way of saying a thing to one that is so indirect as to lead you travelling on a totally opposite track," and instanced the blasphemer's retort to his censor that if he had "jumped out of bed on to the *business end* of a tin-tack, even he would have cursed some." The American humorist has great power of mixing thoughts "neither mental neighbours nor mental contracts, but simply utterly unlikely to suggest each other." In tracing the origin of this humour the writer discovers it in the action of utility upon the imagination. "Perhaps it is that amongst our kinsmen the principle of utility has gained what we may call a really imaginative ascendancy over all minds, to a degree to which it has never yet touched the imagination of Europe, and that this has resulted not only in the marvellous inventiveness which Americans have always shown in the small devices of practical life, but in the discovery of a new class of mental associations—such as that which distinguishes the head of the nail from the point as sleeping and working partners in the same operation." This principle will explain also the lower phase of American fun which depends upon spelling familiar words in an unfamiliar, though sometimes ingenious, manner.

R. W. B.