

that college have reason to be proud of its members, and they of their college. The description is that of "the true gentleman."

"The true gentleman carefully avoids whatever may cause a jar in the minds of those with whom he is cast—all clashing of opinion or collision of feeling, all restraint or suspicion, or gloom, or resentment; his great concern being to make every one at his ease and at home. He has his eyes on all his company; he is tender towards the bashful, gentle towards the distant, and merciful towards the absurd; he can recollect to whom he is speaking; he guards against unseasonable allusions or topics which may irritate; he is seldom prominent in conversation, and never wearisome. He makes light of favours while he does them, and seems to be receiving when he is conferring. He never speaks of himself except when compelled, never defends himself by a mere retort; he has no ears for slander or gossip, is scrupulous in imputing motives to those who interfere with him, and interprets everything for the best. He is never mean or little in his disputes, never takes an unfair advantage, never mistakes personalities or sharp sayings for arguments, or insinuates evil which he dare not say out. From a long-sighted prudence he observes the maxim of the ancient sage—that we should ever conduct ourselves toward our enemy as if he were one day to be our friend. He has too much sense to be affronted at insults, he is too well employed to remember injuries, and too indolent to bear malice, he is patient, forbearing and resigned on philosophical principles; he submits to pain because it is inevitable, to bereavement because it is irremediable, and to death because it is destiny. If he engages in controversy of any kind his disciplined intellect preserves him from the blundering discourtesy of better, perhaps, but less educated minds, who, like blunt weapons, tear and hack, instead of cutting clean, who mistake the point in the argument, waste their strength on trifles, misconceive their adversary, and leave the question more involved than they find it."—*Piles*.

THE ENGLISH MAIL COMES IN TO-DAY.

They looked their last on Cornish cliffs,
In western gale they came away,
On lonely ranch—so far from home—
They get the English mail to-day.

All Britons! One—whose nervous hand,
And blanched face doth well betray
The anguish of a stricken heart—
A dark-lined letter reads to-day.

Another! Doth confused delight
His cheek so crimson? Who can say—
If by the warmth of western fire,
Or note from English maid to-day.

And others of that little band,
From English homes in yule-tide gay,
From cosy cot or festive hall
Their Christmas greetings get to day.

G. F. S.

THE INFLUENCE OF THE INTELLECTUAL MOVEMENTS IN ENGLAND IN THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY UPON SUBSEQUENT ENGLISH THOUGHT.

II.

Moral Philosophy is necessarily modified by speculative. A sensualistic theory of the universe must produce a sensualistic theory of morals, and as far as the former holds sway so far will the latter be popular. We have seen how entirely the Lockian philosophy was, and to a great extent is, in the ascendant, and we shall have to witness the same triumphant progress of a materialistic philosophy of Duty, Virtue, Vice, and the like.

The seventeenth century witnessed the extinction of scholasticism, and the birth of modern science and modern philosophy. Scepticism we have seen was the starting point of these, and correspondingly scepticism was the starting point in the new philosophy of morals. An utter disregard for the beliefs of the past, and a determined effort to begin anew from the very beginning, this was the object which *Hobbes* set before him. Hobbes is in reality the predecessor of Locke, but the latter is by historians placed at the head of modern philosophy, and Hobbes' importance is chiefly in the sphere of politics and morals. Hobbes started with an enquiry into the natural state of man. His result is very surprising. Man, he declares was naturally in a state of warfare, every man's hand was against his brother. The question immediately rises to our lips, "Must not man then, have become extinct?" But passing by this natural reflection let us consider what this terrible theory means. Man is in accordance with it, degraded to a position infinitely below that of beasts. The same species do *not* maintain a position of constant enmity against each other, but on the contrary often herd together, finding in numbers defence against their foes. But man, according to Hobbes, in his primitive state is utterly devoid of any latent spark of love, or of kindness. Self-preservation is his only instinct, in accordance with which force and fraud are his only qualities. Where then is there room for the development of those qualities which are supposed to be part of man's nature? There can be no development of them, and Hobbes' system throughout supposes man to be utterly devoid of what is called good—*called good*. For he knows of no such thing as good in a moral sense. No ultra Calvinist in his zeal for the promotion of the glory of God, ever debased man as Hobbes did. For the former at least allowed that man was once in the image of God, and taught that God would restore the lost likeness to such as he willed. From the Calvinistic theory of predestination men shrink with horror, yet they can calmly read a theory of man infinitely less noble, and allow it to influence the thought and religion of generations.

There is something noble in the Calvinist's faith. He argues as a man, and dogmatizes as to the desires of