

objects to his Theism. Of Mr. Matthew Arnold's concluding paper in defence, we have no space left to speak. In this part he examines the Gospel of St. John, and deduces as the result the evidence that the *logia* or discourses of Jesus reported there are mainly his.

The *Fortnightly Review* opens with a readable paper by Mr. Horace White, giving "An American's Impressions of England." First impressions are almost invariably superficial, but Mr. White appears to have visited the mother-country with a better furnished mind than most of his fellow-countrymen who make the grand tour can boast. The tone of the paper is almost uniformly approbatory, except when he treats of the construction of railway carriages and luggage arrangements. England, the writer says, is "more republican" than the United States, because in it "public opinion acts more speedily, surely, and effectively." He does not favour universal suffrage, and thinks England has already gone far enough, if not too far, in the path of enfranchisement. Justice, he contends, is more surely and expeditiously administered there. The first cause assigned for this difference may be commended to the framers of the Supreme Court Act. It is that "English Judges are not concerned to determine the constitutionality of any statute," as American courts are. The latter "have to determine not only the interpretation of the law, but whether it was competent for the legislature to pass the law; and the legislatures, both national and state, have fallen into the habit of passing bills of a doubtful conformity to the constitution, relying upon the courts to correct their errors, if any—a habit which may be mildly characterized as slovenly, dangerous, and destructive of all sense of legislative responsibility. One-third of all the delay and expense of law suits (except those of a strictly common-law type) arises from the necessity imposed upon Judges of deciding upon the constitutionality of statutes." This does not offer a bright prospect to Chief Justice Richards and his colleagues, nor does it promise well for the future of Canadian legislation. In educational matters, Mr. White thinks England will eventually take the lead, and he regards the land system there as practically unalterable. The State Church he believes to be "tolerably well braced," that Dissent is making no headway against it, and that the New Learning is its only formidable enemy. The English landscape, sanitary reform, and the drinking customs, are made the occasion of some shrewd remarks—above all, he is delighted with the civil service system of England, which he contrasts with the party method of promotion in America.

Mr. Lyall's essay on "The Divine Myths of India" is the work of a writer thoroughly conversant with his subject. It must be read through to be properly appreciated, but its two

main positions admit of brief statement. He maintains, as against Grote, that myths are never mere creations of human imagination, but are always founded on a substratum of fact. The other contention is that the polytheistic deities of India, at all events, owe their origin to apotheoses of departed men. The fashionable theory in comparative mythology is that all heathen deities had their origin in the personification of natural phenomena, either of matter or force. Mr. Buckle made a notable error when he stated that Greece deified heroes because nature there was on a small scale, whereas the Hindoo, overwhelmed by the vastness of the world, and the overwhelming power of the agencies at work on it, made gods of natural phenomena. Mr. Lyall says that the entire notion is a mistake. The Hindoo worships the departed great as gods, and then attributes to them famine, war, pestilence, or any other evil that afflicts him. The process is thus reversed, the phenomena are attributed to supernatural beings, not converted into such beings; and he further tells us that the practice is maintained in every part of India at the present day. Mr. Symonds, who has contributed so many valuable papers on Greek and Italian literature, contributes a sketch of "Sophocles" and his relation to Æschylus and Euripides. His analysis of the great dramatist's art is exceedingly lucid and thorough; but we are rather surprised to see that he apparently agrees with Goethe's sneer at the dying speech of Antigone, in which we fail to see anything "bordering on the comic." Mr. Jenner's paper on "Women at the Swiss Universities," should be read by all friends of higher female education. It is a plain statement of the practical results of an experiment tried at Zurich chiefly, but also at Berne. The writer has the advantage of being able to produce the testimony of eminent professors in both universities, testifying unequivocally to its eminent success.

Mr. Morley continues his life of Diderot. The latest instalment covers the period of the *Encyclopædia*, and extends over forty-five pages. When completed, the biography will, no doubt, be published in a separate form, and should be carefully studied by all who desire to hear the other side of the question. Religious people almost shudder at the names of Voltaire, Rousseau, Diderot, and D'Alembert, whom they confuse with Robespierre, Carrier, and the headsmen of the Terror. Mr. Morley's three biographies will enlighten them on the subject of the three philosophical masters of the eighteenth century. We need hardly say that the style of these works is eminently lucid and attractive, and that with the strict regard for truth characteristic of the author, no fault is extenuated, no paltriness ignored or glossed over with apologetic varnish. Probably the large majority of Mr. Morley's readers will differ from *l'im toto coelo* on religious and philosophical grounds,