

Mr. Paget, who shows himself a pronounced Liberal and an advocate of Jewish emancipation. This writer says: "The Jews are employed by the nobles as men of business, as tenants or middlemen, as distillers, and as publicans. From their ability, knowledge of business, and extensive connections, they are, when honest, invaluable in such situations, but they sometimes abuse the confidence reposed in them, and make away with large sums of money, which are conveyed to some of the tribe in Poland or other countries, and which it is impossible for justice to extract, so close and secret is the connection they maintain amongst each other. The Jew is no less active in profiting by the vices and necessities of the peasant, than by those of the noble. As sure as he gains a settlement in a village the peasantry become poor. Whenever the peasant is in want of money, whether from the occurrence of misfortune, or to make merry at his marriage feast, or to render due honour to his patron saint, the Jew is always ready to find it for him, of course at exorbitant interest. All the peasant has to repay with is the next year's crop; and that he willingly pledges, trusting to chance or his landlord's kindness to support him during the winter. In this way the crop is often sold as soon as it is sown, and during the rest of the year the peasant finds himself bound hand and foot to his hard creditor. On this account I have known many gentlemen refuse to let a Jew live in their village, and rather lend money to their peasants themselves, where they saw the need of it, and allow them to pay it back in labour."

This precisely and almost verbally tallies with the description of Jewish practices in Germany given by another religious Liberal, Mr. Baring Gould, and of Jewish practices in Russia given by the British Consuls in their reports to their Government on the riots in that country. The reports indicate more clearly the detestable use which the Jewish user often makes of the drinking shop in getting the destined victim into his hands. When to cruel and grinding extortion is added that insolent exclusiveness of race which refuses to intermarry or eat with the people, who can wonder if hatred is engendered in the breast of the peasant, or if it does not always restrain itself within civil bounds? Who can wonder even if in a simple and ignorant population imaginary atrocities should be charged to one who is a real and terrible oppressor? Would our people, tolerant and kindly as they are, remain passive under such an invasion of alien extortioners? The cynical, but on that very account, cool-headed writer of a recent work on Berlin Society says that the antagonism to the Jew in Germany is not likely to subside, and that the much abused Stoecker is not a religious malignant but a leader of the people against oppression. The conflict is deplorable; but it will end only when the Jews in Eastern Europe abandon their extortionate and demoralizing practices, take to the walks of honest industry, and cease to treat their fellow-citizens as unclean. Christendom at all events is not specially to blame for the inevitable consequences of habits which made the Jews odious to all nations before Christianity had come into the world, or while its followers were still a feeble and obscure sect hunted from city to city by the persecuting Jew.

THERE is an act of justice to be done, in connection with the Jewish question, to an eminent Christian who has been a long time in his grave, and whose name represents an epoch. If you want to enter into the spirit of the middle ages, read Danté, the life of St. Francis of Assisi and, if you can digest medieval Latin, some sections of Thomas Aquinas. The Angelic Doctor has been constantly accused in the course of this controversy, not only by Jewish Rabbis, but by Christian divines ardent in the Jewish cause, of teaching the abominable doctrine that the Jews being the serfs of the King, and their children the children of serfs, it was lawful to baptize Jewish children against the will of their parents. A reference to the text of Aquinas will show that the charge is founded on misconception. After the formal fashion of the scholastic philosophers, Aquinas sets forth the arguments on each side of a proposition, and then sums up and pronounces a judgment. That Jews being serfs, their lord has a right to baptize their children without their consent is one of the arguments on the side of compulsion. The final judgment of Aquinas on the whole question is "That the children of unbelievers ought not to be baptized against the will of their parents, since this has never been approved by the custom of the Church of God, which is in all things to be followed, while it would be contrary to natural justice and fraught with peril to the faith." He adds that the servitude of the Jews is civil, and excludes them not from right divine or natural. In a previous section he has distinguished the case of the Jews and the heathen from that of heretics and apostates. In the case of heretics and apostates, whom he deems bound by their religious allegiance, he sanctions, in accordance with the vicious theory of his church and age, the use of compulsion; but in the case of the Jews and the heathen he says compulsion is by no means to be used, since belief is voluntary; only they may be con-

strained by the faithful, if means can be found, not to impede the advance of the faith by blasphemies, by evil preachings, or by open persecution." The middle ages were not enlightened or tolerant, but we owe to them a good deal, and they have been painted somewhat darker than they were. Compared with the Talmud the religious philosophy of Thomas Aquinas is the height of liberality as well as of good sense.

JUDGE NOAH DAVIS, in the *North American Review*, takes up the tale of Mr. Roy and bewails the advancing dissolution of the family in the United States. One to six, or even more, he says, is now the proportion of divorces to marriages in some districts and cities. Like Mr. Roy, Judge Noah Davis sees the root of the evil in relaxation of divorce laws. To this source he is disposed to trace even the avoidance of maternity, which is now so palpable and so ominous a fact among the Anglo-American population of the United States. A pair which has a numerous offspring has given hostages to the indissolubility of marriage; this is felt to be the case, and means are taken to prevent the birth of children, in order that there may be nothing, when fancy prompts, to preclude the severance of the tie. That appears to be the Judge's view. If it is correct, the domestic morality of New England is on the road that leads to destruction, and Mormonism, when arraigned, will not lack materials for a retort. It may be doubted, however, as has been said before, whether the lax divorce laws are not as much an effect as a cause. The deeper source of all these phenomena seems to be the progress of a social revolution which is altering the aims and aspirations of women, urging them to "come out of the Egypt of dependence and sentiment," preaching, in the bitter words of John Stuart Mill, that marriage, as it exists, is the worst kind of slavery, jealously separating the interests of the wife from those of her husband, and lessening the honour of maternity. It seems as if society was bent on trying some new set of organic principles with regard to the relations between the sexes, in place of the Christian principles upon which these relations have hitherto been based. If this is the radical tendency of the age, of course it will prevail, and a century hence social observers will be enabled to judge of the result. Momentous, for good or evil, that result will be. It is very well to say that fundamental change may be made with impunity because Nature is sure to vindicate her own laws: Nature is sure to vindicate her own laws if you take arsenic or fling yourself out of a fifth storey window. The full bearings of sexual revolution are not yet seen. They will be seen when the teachings of Mr. Stuart Mill, backed by those of law reformers, shall have thoroughly penetrated the minds of husbands as well as those of wives. Then it will appear that marriage, though essential to the purity and happiness of both sexes, is more especially a restraint laid for the benefit of the women on the roving passions of the men. Let White Cross Associations do what they will to guard female purity: their object is admirable; but they will labour in vain, by preachings or enactments, to extinguish the most powerful of all passions; and if virtuous women refuse to be wives, or to be wives of a different type from that foreshadowed in the writings of John Stuart Mill, lust will reign again as it has reigned before in the eclipse of married love.

A BYSTANDER.

#### HERE AND THERE.

OWING to a misunderstanding, Mr. Roberts' article on the writings of Mr. Fawcett has appeared, though with some difference of form, both in this journal and in the *Chicago Current*. Though it happened to appear first in *THE WEEK*, nobody will suspect a journal conducted on so liberal a scale and with such ample resources as the *Current* of borrowing from the stores of a contemporary or publishing any but fresh matter. Every reader of the *Current*, if he notices the circumstance at all, will conclude, as is the fact, that misapprehension is the cause.

IN lacrosse, the great game of the season was played on the Rosedale grounds on Saturday, between the Torontos and the Shamrocks, for the championship. Seldom in the history of the game has such a crowd gathered together; hundreds were turned away from the gate unable to obtain admission. The history of the match is not so interesting, as the Shamrocks sadly disappointed their adherents, and finally suffered defeat by three goals to one. After the recent games we have had to record, characterized by much rough play, it is a pleasure to be able to chronicle that this match, in which, in outside circles, an unusual amount of partizanship was displayed, was totally devoid of the rough element. The first game was a very short one, and was at once won by the Torontos; the second, of sixteen minutes' duration, in which good play on both sides was shown, went to the Shamrocks, the third and fourth games, after