

bodies seem to be letting slip a unique opportunity to regain to some extent their hold upon the lapsed masses, as fearless bestowal of substantial sympathy and aid would almost surely have enabled them to do. As it is, the ranks of Roman Catholicism on the one hand and of the Salvation Army on the other, will be likely to be largely recruited as one result of the memorable conflict.

AND so Boulanger is to have his chance in the French elections after all. The singular vacillation of the French Ministry in the matter suggests a possible apprehension of danger. It is hard to find any other explanation of the change of tactics than a growing conviction that it would be safer to let the pent-up Boulangism of the country find vent at the polls, than to run the risk of its bursting the arbitrary barriers they had set up, and making a way for itself. It is not easy to foresee the vagaries of the French populace, else one would confidently declare it impossible that any self-respecting French constituency could make the disreputable and now wholly contemptible General, its chosen representative. Should such an event occur it could be accounted for only in the words of the Public Prosecutor in his eloquent charge before the High Court, "France has fallen under a fatal spell. The populace is beside itself." Whatever may be thought of the tactics of the Government, or the impartiality of the Senatorial Court, there is no longer room to doubt the deep degradation and utter worthlessness of the man's character. As the venerable Dr. Pressensé, who, albeit one of the official judges, is a witness of undoubted probity and judgment, declares in a letter to the *Christian World*, "Never was there more overwhelming evidence of the infamous conduct of a party and its leader." "His whole history has been a living lie." "His chief weapon was lying—downright lying. His political programme varied, chameleon-like, with those to whom it was unfolded. To the Radicals, it was ultra-radical; to the Bonapartists it followed on the lines of the first Napoleon; to the Right it assumed the clerical colouring. While calling himself a Republican, he figured also as a lord-protector, another Cromwell, and to his trusty ones, his whole talk was of the blow to be struck at the palace in the Elysée." And so on through a column of eloquent denunciation. Should the populace, in its madness, trust the future of France to such a leader, the world might well despair of the French Republic.

AN English exchange gives the following as the reply of a schoolboy to a query in regard to the vexed Homeric question, after having listened to a lecture by his teacher or professor: "It is said that writing was not invented when Homer composed his poems. He must therefore have lived a good deal later." This lad, in common with a good many scholars of riper years, may be relieved to find that the ingenious theories they have devised to account for the preservation of the Iliad and the Odyssey through the ages preceding the invention of writing are likely to be rendered unnecessary by the progress of archaeological discovery. It was, for instance, announced a few weeks since in the *London Times* that Mr. Flinders Petrie, who has been exploring in the Fayûm, has discovered a series of alphabetic signs incised on pottery of the Twelfth Dynasty at Illahun, and on pottery of the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Dynasties at Tell Gurob. The styles of the two towns are, it is said, "as distinct as the periods to which they belong. The characters incised upon them have, however, this much in common, that they are neither hieroglyphic nor hieratic. In a word, they are not Egyptian, but apparently very early Cypriote or Greek. Moreover, the signs traced on the Twelfth Dynasty pottery are distinctly Cypriote, while Phœnician also is found upon the later pottery of Tell Gurob." If this discovery is confirmed it will prove that the beginnings of the alphabet were in existence and use 2,000 years before the Christian era. As this wonderful pottery is on its way to England, we may expect to have the question authoritatively settled before very long, and, if Mr. Petrie's conclusions are found valid, a great weight will have been lifted from the mind of the student of Greek, though many a learned prelection on the transmission of the Homeric poems through the long centuries which were waiting for the invention of alphabetical writing, will have been rendered worthless.

MR. PETRIE'S excavations have brought other long-buried wonders to light. Half a mile from the pyramid of Illahun he came upon a Christian cemetery of the fifth and sixth centuries. The rich garments of the pious Copts buried there are described as being, from the extreme

dryness of the spot, "still quite sound and even wearable." Below the cemetery were found the foundation deposits of Userthesen II., about B.C. 2960. Close to the temple are the remains of a town of the same period, evidently built at one time, and originally, it is supposed, intended for the architects and workmen employed upon the pyramid. It was here that the pottery with the alphabetic signs was found. Here also dozens of invaluable papyri were revealed. Of some of these Mr. Petrie writes: "They are apparently accounts, all in ruled columns and lines, exquisitely neat and in a beautifully clear hand, many of the entries being in red. I have flatted and laid under press seven square feet of sheets and fragments, all of the Twelfth Dynasty." But the most remarkable of the relics of the ancient civilization, or at least those which come home to us with most of the freshness and pathos of a living and personal interest, were those turned up at Tell Gurob, five or six miles from Illahun. Here the head cases of mummies were found to be made of many layers of papyri plastered together. "Separated by soaking," says the account before us, "these papyri have been made to tell their story, sometimes trivial, sometimes pathetic, after the lapse of countless ages. One is a letter from a youth at college, telling his father of his progress, and saying that he now understands mensuration and can draw a plan of a house; another from a royal goose-herd, who states that he cannot supply twelve geese for King Ptolemy's festival." How these revelations of the common feelings and wants of humanity bridge the chasms of scores of centuries and bring back to us the real life of those actors on the stage of a world so long past that it is hard, without such assistance, to conceive of it as peopled with beings of like wants and feelings with ourselves.

OUR SCHOOL BOOKS.

IT is one of the misfortunes incident to popular agitation that superficial grievances receive ready attention, whilst those which are deeper and more serious too often evade notice. Whatever may be thought of the grievance connected with the incorporation and endowment of the Jesuits, it is absolutely unimportant in comparison with the fairness and accuracy of our school books; and we believe there is good reason to think that some of these are seriously infected with Roman misrepresentations of various incidents in the past history of the English people.

Attention was drawn to this subject at the recent meeting of the Anglican Synod of Toronto, by Provost Body, of Trinity College, and our Roman Catholic contemporary, *United Canada*, has poured out the vials of its wrath upon Anglicans generally, and more particularly upon the Synod of Toronto and the Provost of Trinity College, as persons who are resolved to circulate false notions respecting the position of the Church in the middle ages. It certainly is a melancholy spectacle to see a great Church, like the Church of Rome, descending to the grossest misrepresentations; but it is, if possible, more humiliating when these misrepresentations are so conspicuously false. It would not be easy to find a better example of the absolute necessity of watching over these school books, from which the children of the country receive their first impressions and their first opinions, which in all cases are the hardest to dislodge, than the statements of *United Canada* in commenting upon the action of the Synod of Toronto.

The Public Schools, says *United Canada*, are supposed to be unsectarian, and on this ground they are to be "forced upon all classes of citizens, regardless of creed or conscientious scruples." This is a little too strong. Even the opponents of the Separate Schools have never advocated the suppression of denominational schools unsupported by rates. But it seems the Synod of Toronto has a depth of wickedness far beyond the badness of the ordinary opponent of Separate Schools. "The Synod of Toronto desires that the false and fraudulent notion that the Church of England, as by law established at this day, is identical with the Catholic Church of the days of *Magna Charta*, wrung from King John by the nobility of England, with Stephen Langton the Catholic Archbishop of Canterbury, by God's grace and the appointment of the Holy Roman See at their head." We are sorry that this sentence has no end, but we are not responsible.

Whence all this ire? Provost Body pointed out that the History of England used in the Public Schools omitted an important word in its account of *Magna Charta*, inasmuch as it spoke of the Church having its rights, instead of the Anglican Church. Did the Provost, for one moment, mean to imply that the present Church of England exactly resembled the Church under King John? Certainly not,

any more than the Church of the beginning of the thirteenth century was identical with that under Ethelbert at the end of the sixth century. But just as the Church of John's reign was historically continuous and identical with the Church of the time of Ethelbert, so the English Church of the reign of Victoria is the historical descendant of the Church under John. There never was any break. The Church was the Church of England before the Reformation, and it was the same, and bore the same name, after the Reformation. When Mary, during her short reign, brought back her people to the Roman obedience, she had no thought of abolishing a Protestant Church and setting up a new Catholic one in its place, she merely acknowledged an authority over the Church which her two predecessors had disowned. When Elizabeth again threw off the papal supremacy, the Church was neither more nor less the Church of England than it had been before. It was the new Roman Catholic Church in England that was a fresh and foreign introduction, not the Reformed Church.

We can quite understand that these facts are unpleasant for members of the Church of Rome. It has been, for long, the tendency in that communion to destroy the national character of churches. The Gallican liberties, so long defended by some of the best and noblest of the clergy of France, have utterly perished, and it is the same with every Church which owns the Papal power. Ultramontaniam has triumphed "all along the line," and it is unpleasant to be reminded by history that this has not always been the case. But veracious history cannot ignore it; and it is a simple fact that *Magna Charta* provided for the rights of the Anglican Church, and not of the Church at large.

The article in question has a very ingenious way of suggesting that we are indebted to the Bishop of Rome for the granting of *Magna Charta*. It was wrung from King John by the Barons. Stephen Langton was at the head of them; and Stephen Langton was appointed by the Pope. Can anything be clearer, then, than this, that England owes the maintenance of her liberties to the See of Rome? What are the facts? Stephen Langton was forced upon the diocese of Canterbury by the Pope against the will of the King and the Chapter. It is quite true, therefore, that England owes the appointment of that great Archbishop to the Pope of Rome. But what part had the Roman Bishop in *Magna Charta*? We need go to no "heretical" history for information on this subject. So far was Stephen Langton the representative of the Pope in extorting the Charter from King John, so far was Innocent from sustaining the action of the great Archbishop, that he actually professed to annul the Charter on the ground that England was a fief of the Holy See. All this may be read in the pages of the conscientious Lingard, himself a zealous member of the Church of Rome, yet a man who was so fair and candid that he would not even question the validity of Anglican orders.

United Canada declares: "That if the history complained of be amended as the Synod petitioned, it will teach historical falsehood and be grossly offensive to that love of the truth which the Catholic Church, the Church which won the great Charter, inculcates and diffuses among the young in her charge." We ask our readers to consider these words in the light of the facts which we have plainly stated, and to judge for themselves whether the writer of that article is in a position to condemn any person or community as guilty of falsehood or misrepresentation. It is of no use giving railing for railing; but when we hear the disciples of the Jesuit Fathers complaining of the want of straightforwardness on the part of their ecclesiastical opponents, we cannot help remembering the Gracchi complaining of sedition.

The article in question makes much of the inconsistency of a certain class of persons who, at one time profess to be Protestants, at another time to be Catholics. We are not concerned to defend the inconsistencies of individuals or of communities; but it is only fair to remember that language is a very indefinite medium of communication. If people will define the terms which they employ, and stick to the meaning so defined, we have no right to quarrel with them. Now, the terms Catholic and Protestant are of wide application. The name Protestant, for example, which was connected with the Protest presented at the Diet of Spire, has not been adopted by all the Reformed Churches. The Church of Rome herself seems to hide her own catholicity by calling herself Roman; and it is difficult to understand in what sense she is Catholic. Certainly the supremacy of the Roman Bishop has never been conceded by the whole Church. This is a simple historical fact, and no Councils or Bulls can get over it. But enough has been said on this point.