

UNIVERSITY COLLEGE (1890).

Night was hov'ring like the shadow
Of God's mighty outstretched hand,
Drawn across the western heavens
Lingered still one long red band.

To my window distant music
Came in undulating swells,
While the tired city, pausing,
Heard the sweet cathedral bells.

And beyond the swaying poplars
I beheld her towers rise
With their sombre broken outline,
Lifted to the silent skies.

Still confusion hath a dwelling
In the courts where it is meet,
Loveliness alone inhabit
Not the spirit incomplete.

But now strength is ever added
And her shattered walls shall grow
Till erect in her full stature
Glorious and pure she show.

And she seemed, O fellow-students,
Emblematic of the soul,
Whose unfinished broken outline,
We must render fair and whole.

As her stone-work, fraught with beauty,
Moulded so our lives must be,
Till we too attain perfection
And unsullied harmony.

EVELYN DURAND.

THE PHILOSOPHY OF LOVE.

(Translated from the German of Immerschnaps.)

[Eroticos, being deeply in love, calls one evening upon
Logicus to solicit his opinion.]

Logicus: So, then, Eroticos, you tell me you—

Eroticos: In truth I am, and it is in respect to that very matter that I have called upon you.

Log.: Let us examine a little the nature of this peculiar mental phase in which you stand; or, rather, let us consider the probable duration of this condition, for thereby will we be enabled to arrive at a just decision in regard to its nature.

Erot.: In respect to its duration, there seems to be but little doubt; for such is the nature of love that I feel constancy to be its first attribute, and a requisite essential of its being. If a man be truly in love, it stands to reason, according to the universally accepted idea of this passion, that it must be constant. If it be not so, the man is under a delusion, and is not possessed by real love.

Log.: Let us examine. We will suppose that A is in love with B and B with A. Now, to say that A's love to B is constant, means that A will always hold B higher in his affections than any other individual, as C, D, E, etc. Had A never met with B what would have happened? Unless we suppose that B is in every case the only person of all the universe of beings, actual or potential, whom A could have loved (a supposition that human experience shows to be false)—unless this, we must conclude that A would have, or at least could conceivably have, fallen in love with some other individual as C. Similarly, had A never met B or C, he could conceivably have fallen in love with D. Or B, C, and E, all being unknown to him, he could conceivably have fallen in love with E, and so further. Do you follow me clearly?

Erot.: I think so. We have thus far concluded that an individual A being given there are a number (greater or

less) of other individuals, B, C, D, E, etc., with each of whom, had he never met the others, he could have conceivably fallen in love.

Log.: Exactly. Now let us suppose that A meets them synchronously. Love being essentially a selective passion he cannot become enamoured of them all. Evidently his love must centre upon one of them, and it will fall upon the one most lovable. Now the words "most lovable" are, to speak algebraically, a variable quantity. That is, the selection depends upon A's own nature. There exists in the potential universe, on the analogy of Plato's horse, a being, from A's point of view, absolutely the most lovable. That is to say one who if brought into contact with A must call forth his love rather than any other. This being corresponds with A's ideal of the sum total of lovable qualities (the good, the beautiful, etc.). Now all the objects upon whom A's love could conceivably have centred, B, C, D, E, etc., approximate more or less to this absolute type. Let it be here understood that this absolute type is not necessarily perfect but is merely the exact embodiment of A's ideal. Should he meet B, C, D, etc., synchronously, he will fall in love with the nearest approximation to the absolute type. And this he does involuntarily and without any volition in selection; for it needs no proof that love is independent of the will.

Now let us suppose that B, C, D, etc., represent a graded order of ascending approximations to the potentially existent being absolutely the most lovable to A, and let it be further supposed that he meets them consecutively. What follows? Necessarily that he falls in love with each consecutively and will continue to do so, if we suppose the series indefinitely prolonged until he meets the absolute type. Let us designate this absolute type Z. Now to suppose that in every actual case B, the first met object, is the absolute of Z as regards A, and A similarly the solute type Z, as regards B, were manifestly absurd.

Nay, in view of the infinitely adjustment of details requisite to the correspondence of Z and Z₁, such a coincidence will only happen in an infinitely small number of cases. To realize this, we must remember that A's ideal is composed of an enormous number of factors, a, b, c, x, y, z, and in like manner B's ideal Z₁ is composed of an enormous number of factors, a₁, b₁, c₁, d₁—x₁, y₁, z₁. Only when these series coincide entirely will the totals coincide and the equation A = Z, B = Z be true.

Hence in nearly all actual cases B is not Z—this is, A is capable of loving each of a greater or less number of other individuals rather than [mark me, I do not say more than] B. And this he must do independently of his own will. Now it may happen that after being united with B, A meets with one of these other objects, C, D, etc., and B similarly, what conclusion must we draw?

Erot.: I can see no other than that, if two beings A and B are united in the bonds of love, in all cases, except the union of the ideal types Z and Z, it must happen that should the proper individuals present themselves, A becomes inconstant to B and B to A.

Log.: Exactly. And here let me forestall a possible argument. I do not mean by "become inconstant" to signify an open rupture or actual avowal of disunion. A may give no mark of love to the third individual C; he need not even confess it to himself; but the sentiment nevertheless must arise as involuntarily as did his prior love to B.

Erot.: It would seem to follow, then, that in almost every case of union between A and B, one or both must become virtually inconstant by harboring an at least unconfessed love towards C. But this we know is not the case in a large portion, I might almost say, in the majority of actual instances. Are we not, then, to infer that some step in your reasoning is fallacious?

Log.: Not that, but that your conclusion from my reasoning is fallacious. Such inconstancy will by no means occur in all cases. A may never meet C, D, or E, etc. For remember that meet must here connote an intercourse of sufficient duration to permit A to be well acquainted