

the assertion that "Abraham was a demigod to whom prayers were addressed." Hebrew religion has recently been examined by Kuenen and Goldziher in the most critical spirit and with all the modern lights; yet to neither of them does anything like Mr. Spencer's hypothesis seem ever to have occurred. The apparition raised by the Witch at Endor can hardly be called a ghost or double, and what else is there in the Bible of that kind? The departed have a sort of shadowy existence in Sheol entirely unconnected with the religion or the affairs of the living. Warburton, as is well known, based his argument on the absence in the Old Testament of any mention of an existence after death.

How does Mr. Spencer account for Sun-worship and the worship generally of the personified powers of nature? By a confusion of metaphor with fact. This it is, he says, that leads to Sun-worship. "Complimentary naming after the sun occurs everywhere, and where it is associated with power becomes inherited." He cites an address to a King of Egypt who is apostrophized as "the Sun of the foreign peoples." This seems to him a sufficient explanation of a tendency so predominant and pervading that mythologists of eminence have resolved all mythology into the sun myth. A Hawaiian king, it seems, bore a name meaning the heavens great and dark; "whence," says Mr. Spencer, "it is clear that (reversing the order alleged by the mythologists) Zeus may naturally have been at first a living person, and that his identification with the sky resulted from his metaphorical name." He must have been a person of considerable consequence, since he has been traced philologically in Sanskrit and Latin, as well as in Greek. Poseidon, we presume, was another living person who was complimented with the title of the Sea; Hephæstus, one who was complimented with the title of Fire; and Hades, one who was complimented with the title of the Nether World. What does Mr. Spencer make of female deities such as Neph, Astarte, Aphrodite, Ceres. They cannot have been ghosts of chiefs: does he hold that they were ghosts of venerated grandmothers? What does he make of Roman gods that are evidently mere abstractions personified, such as Saturnus, Flora, Bellona, Terminus, Juventus, Salus, Fides, Concordia? What does he make of the connection between the Greek and the Sanskrit mythology? His theory appears to be simply the ghost of Euhemerism, rising again after so many centuries from its grave of oblivion and contempt. His mind does not seem to admit the notion of a myth. He actually takes for real persons the personifications of races such as Dorus, Æolus, or Hellen. A polytheistic Pantheon he supposes to have been formed through the conquest of one tribe by another, by the superposition of the conquerors' ghost-god on that of the conquered; and he instances the deposition of Uranus and Kronos by Zeus. Surely he knows that Uranus and Kronos mean the Firmament and Time. Instead of being the predecessors of Zeus, they evidently belong to a later age in which cosmogonical speculation had commenced.

Man now speculates on the origin of the universe and of his own being, on his estate and destiny, on his relation to the power which made and rules the world. Why should he not have done the same in his primeval state, though in a rudimentary, coarse, and feeble way, taking the sun and the elements for the lords of the world and the disposers of his lot? This surely is the most natural hypothesis, nor is there anything about it in the slightest degree mystical or at variance with positive science. Mr. Spencer opens his treatise with a demonstration that the consciousness of deity is not innate. Minds, he says, which from infancy have been cut off by bodily defects from intercourse with the minds of adults are devoid of religious ideas. It may be so, but if in the normal man the religious sentiment is always awakened by his environments, that sentiment surely is a part of his nature and may in that sense be designated as innate. It requires at all events to be accounted for; and the ghost and "double" theory we must respectfully submit is no account of it at all.

Towards the close of Mr. Spencer's book there is a remarkable resurrection of Religion in the shape of a recognition of special observances and sacred music as fitting modes of keeping alive and expressing the sentiment of our relation to the Unknown Cause. No veneration attaches to anything merely because it is Unknown—to the result, for example, of a mathematical problem which is yet unsolved. An Unknown but Universal Cause which is the proper object of a religious sentiment and of spiritual observances, call it by what name you will, and veil it as you will, is God. G. S.

WHEN Lord Byron published his sentimental "Farewell" after his separation from his wife, the matter was a subject of much after-dinner comment. Curran's opinion was once appealed to. "I protest," said he, "I do not understand this kind of whimpering. Here is a man who first weeps over his wife, and then *wipes his eyes with the public.*"

JACOBINISM IN CANADA.

The social order under which millions are daily lavished in senseless luxury while willing hands cannot find wherewith to keep starvation from wives and children is neither humane nor Christian, but essentially brutal, pagan, and barbarous. No argument from precedents can warrant the perpetuation of arrangements under which want must be the lot of the many. . . . The time has nearly gone by for appeals to the compassion, and fairness, and Christianity of those who value the social order because it gave their forefathers, and gives themselves, and may give their posterity, the best and brightest of what life yields. All men know well that those who have had and have will keep, and squander, and enjoy purple and fine linen as long as the masses are foolish enough to put up with a system in which they hold only vested poverty. . . . Therefore, so much of a revolution as may be necessary to distribute the earnings of the community according to the product of individuals is in all ways desirable. Could it be secured in a year, true civilization would have made the greatest of its advances.—Toronto *Globe*, February 19, 1886.

LOOK ON THAT PICTURE, THEN ON THIS.

A spirit of innovation is generally the result of a selfish temper and confined views. People will not look forward to posterity who never look backward to their ancestors. Besides, the people of England well know that the idea of inheritance furnishes a sure principle of conservation and a sure principle of transmission, without at all excluding the principle of improvement. It leaves acquisition free; but it secures what it acquires. Whatever advantages are obtained by a State proceeding on these maxims are locked fast as in a sort of family settlement, grasped as in a kind of mortmain for ever. By a constitutional policy, working after the pattern of nature, we receive, we hold, we transmit our government and our privileges in the same manner in which we enjoy and transmit our property and our lives. The institutions of policy, the goods of fortune, the gifts of Providence, are handed down to us and from us in the same course and order. Our political system is placed in a just correspondence and symmetry with the order of the world, and with the mode of existence decreed to a permanent body composed of transitory parts; wherein, by the disposition of a stupendous wisdom, moulding together the great mysterious incorporation of the human races, the whole, at one time, is never old, or middle-aged, or young, but in a condition of unchangeable constancy moves on through the varied tenor of perpetual decay, fall, renovation, and progression. Thus, by preserving the methods of nature in the conduct of the State, in what we improve we are never wholly new; in what we retain we are never wholly obsolete.—BURKE, *Reflections on the French Revolution.*

Few things can be more startling to sober-minded Liberals and Conservatives alike than the sudden revivification in Canada of the wild theories of the French Jacobins of a hundred years ago. Men who have been taught that they have duties from the performance of which no law can absolve them, and that they possess rights of which no law can justly deprive them, look in amazement at the confident advocacy of principles which, made the basis of legislation, would reduce social order to chaos, in turn to be followed by reconstruction through invariable forms of evolution. What these reconstructive evolutionary forms are history abundantly exemplifies, but the genius of Shakespeare presents, in "Hamlet," a realization of both the turbulence of dissolution and of the throes of reconstruction:—

Save yourself, my lord,
The ocean, overpeering of his list,
Eats not the flats with more impetuous haste
Than young Laertes, in a riotous head,
O'rbears your officers. The rabble call him lord;
And, as the world were now but to begin,
Antiquity forgot, custom not known,
The ratifiers and props of every word,
They cry, "Choose we; Laertes shall be king!"
Caps, hands, and tongues applaud it to the clouds:
"Laertes shall be king, Laertes king!"

One would think that Canada, with her fairly even distribution of wealth, her yeomen farmers, her practically limitless virgin soil, and her self-reliant people, would be socially too healthful to emit the dank and pestiferous mists of Jacobinism. But here they indubitably are over-spreading the land, and their portentous growth impels me to examine their nature, to inquire as to their origin, to ascertain the real measure of their vitality, and to warn, if need be, the classes whose happiness they threaten to blight.

"Jacobinism," says Sir Henry S. Maine, "essentially consists in the advocacy of certain *a priori* principles of our order, regardless of the, possibly, conflicting claims of principles belonging to other orders. It demands of every citizen the entire alienation to the State of all his rights and possessions, each man yielding himself up entirely, without any reserve whatever." This is a luminous definition upon which it would be difficult to improve.

Insidious Jacobinism, broadened and deepened into Socialism, finds its most congenial field for development under cover of a solicitous regard for those who are usually called the Labour Classes. As these classes