asking after the origin of the existing disaffection, it is easy to give judgments off-hand; and it is quite certain that most of these judgments will be erroneous or defective. On the one hand the severity or laxness or want of judgment of those in command will be held to account for what has happened. On the other hand, the discontent of the men will be regarded as an instance of that general rising of the masses against authority, capital, influence which is being fostered by socialists and the promoters of strikes among the labouring classes. It is quite necessary to take account of both sides in the matter. No one can doubt, for example, that it is much easier to get up a mutiny in these days than in former times. Subordinates will not bear for an hour what they would formerly have endured for years, and without serious complaint. The bonds of authority are everywhere relaxed. Whether for good or for evil, and it is not wholly the one or the other, it has come to pass that men can no longer issue the imperious mandates of the past time, or that, if they issue them they will not be obeyed. It must be further remarked that the Labour movements are aiding this tendency, we may say, even to a dangerous extent; and many sober persons have serious fears that we must go to pieces before we can be properly organized again, that the story of the French Revolution will have to be repeated—Liberty, License, Chaos, Autocracy—which may heaven avert. On the other hand it has been said that there was harshness of discipline among the officers; and even if this accusation is not well founded, there may have been faults among them. It is the business of rulers to understand the age in which they live and the men whom they have to govern; and it is quite clear that the officers of the Grenadier Guards did not possess this knowledge or did not know how to profit by it. One serious disadvantage under which the Guards are labouring is that there are no quarters in their barracks for the officers. In the Life Guards it is different; and those who are well acquainted with military matters say that the residence of the officers in the barracks enables them to be in contact and "in touch" with the men, so that misunderstandings are less likely to arise. It is obvious that the opposite method has corresponding disadvantages. It is to be hoped that their sojourn in Bermuda may bring these *enfants gatês* of the army to their senses again. Perhaps we should not, after all, be surprised that spoiled children sometimes behave badly.

THE proposal, on the part of some American Universities, to reduce the ordinary course from four years to three, has caused a great deal of discussion. It is a question which has to be decided in connection with other considerations. For example, the terms or sessions may be lengthened; or it may be better for a young man to have one year longer at the grammar school or high school and one year less at the University. In England the Universities have a three years' course and in Scotland they have four years; but the academic year is longer in England, and men entering the Universities are generally older than in Scotland. In this country the Church of England Universities have generally taken Oxford and Cambridge as their models, whilst McGill and the University of Toronto bear marks of the influence of the Scottish Universities. But the University of Toronto allows of a three years' course on condition of the student taking a higher matriculation examination. On the whole, we are disposed to think a three years' course adequate, providing that the students are properly prepared for admission to the University. But here is the great difficulty. The preparation at the great Public Schools of England, Eton, Harrow, Rugby, Winchester, and the rest of them, is, in regard to elementary Greek and Latin, superb; so that most youths who come up to the Universities could take a pass degree with hardly any amount of work. Such a state of things cannot, at present, be hoped for in this country. But we must, at least, remember that the shortening of our college course involves the raising of our standard of scholarship for those whom we matriculate.

IT is generally agreed that practical kindness is a better way of bridging over the gulf by which classes are separated than the propagation of new theories about socialism or the extinction of poverty. As the admirable Vicar of Wakefield said, he "was ever of opinion that the honest man who married and brought up a large family did more service than he who remained single and only talked of population"; so we think that those who actually go among the poor and the weak and guide and strengthen them, are much better and kinder friends than those who teach them to be discontented with their position, but do nothing to lighten their burdens. Happily, there are some everywhere who are choosing the better part. From England, for example, we hear of a daughter of the late Archbishop Tait, who has taken up her abode in a poor part of the great city of which her father was for a good many years bishop, and is living plainly among the poor, that she may help them as one of themselves. It is a long way from the capital of England to the great western city of Chicago; but humanity and Christian love are the same everywhere, and a beautiful illustration of this principle comes to us also from Chicago. It appears that a poor family in this city, deserted by the father, had been greatly helped by the daughter of a judge. She provided them with food and raiment, and found a situation for two of the older girls in a tailor's shop. Keeping her eye upon her *protegées*, she found that work and confinement were beginning to tell upon one of the girls. A change of air was thought quite essential for her recovery; but her master would let her go only on the condition that she got a substitute, or lost her place. The judge's daughter told her to go and she would find a substitute, which she did in her own person. For two weeks she laboured in the tailor's shop, leaving her home at six o'clock in the morning and returning at seven in the evening. Such examples must be contagious. And yet it is not necessarily these special acts that are required, but the spirit that produces them. Many a pope has washed the feet of beggars without thereby manifesting the meekness and gentleness of Him who washed the feet of His disciples. It is the spirit of humanity—it is the pure, human brotherly love that we want; and when that abounds, agitators will find that their occupation is gone.

THERE are few subjects of higher intellectual interest or of deeper practical importance than the protracted controversy which goes on, from generation to generation, with varying fortunes, between spiritualists and materialists. Each age seems to imagine that it has arrived at some kind of settlement of the problem, that, if it has not been solved, or perhaps cannot be solved, yet its conditions are understood and the weight of argument on either side has been fairly estimated. But the next generation thinks differently, and reopens the controversy by demonstrating the inconsistencies of the attack and the defence alike. Kant thought he had answered Hume; and the strange commentary which has to be made upon this opinion is the simple fact that modern Agnostics trace their parentage to Kant. Yet it can hardly be said that Agnosticism has held or is holding its own. During the last few years a more distinctly spiritual influence has manifested itself in philosophical thought on both sides of the Atlantic. A very interesting paper on "Recent Discussion in Materialism," from the pen of Professor J. Mark Baldwin, appears in the July number of the *Presbyterian and Reformed Review*, to which we have pleasure in directing attention, not only because of the general value of its contents, but because it may satisfy the most critical of the followers of Professor Young that he has a successor fully worthy to occupy his chair. The article indeed shows wide reading, a firm grasp of the topics discussed, remarkable acuteness in seizing the weak as well as the strong points of recent theories, and admirable lucidity of exposition and criticism. Professor Baldwin, who may be said to have won his spurs in the field of psychology, shows that he is quite at home with metaphysics. It is impossible in this place to give an outline of the article which would, in any case, be unsatisfactory alike to the expert and the novice. It may suffice, by way of drawing attention to the matter discussed and in order to indicate the writer's conclusions, to refer briefly to his starting point and his conclusion. "Now," says the writer, "that philosophy is learning to value a single fact more than a detailed system, and is sacrificing its systems to the vindication of facts, it is spiritualism and not materialism which is profiting by the advance of science. Materialism has appealed to the metaphysics of force, spiritualism has appealed to consciousness as fact. Which is more in harmony with the scientific spirit of the day? The successive positions which modern materialism has taken in its necessary retreat into metaphysics, are interesting from an historical point of view. First it was matter and no mind; then matter with a function mind; then matter, a force manifested in extension and mind; then force, which is doubtless matter, but may be mind. First, mind was brain; then mind was a function of brain; then mind and brain were manifestations of a material principle; then the material principle became force, which may be mind." Several of the recent materialistic theories are then passed in review; and the writer concludes that the hypothesis, that thought is a mode of motion, a function of matter, fails to explain the facts. . . . . To show that the unity of the mind cannot be explained by the unity of the nervous system is to show that conscious unity is an irreducible characteristic of the mental principle itself. The following summary is excellent: "Contemporary thought is tending, I think, to the recognition of the fact—as wholesome to the idealist as to the materialist—that the personality is one, that it includes mind and body, that we know these only in an apparently inseparable union, that mind is not mind without an object, and that an object is not an object without mind, that a within is as necessary to a without as a without is to a within, and that rational unity lies deeper in the nature of things than either the empirical unity of the atomistic psychology or the organic unity of the nervous system."

THE MODERN NOVEL.

IT is not very likely that the character of the modern novel will be much affected by the curious discussions of the subject which have recently proceeded from English and American pens. Literature is not much governed by theories even when promulgated by the most influential writers. Doubtless there are fashions, and stronger writers have their imitators, their school; but, in general, the literature of an age must have its qualities determined by the character of the age to which it belongs.

In saying this, however, we are by no means forgetting the individuality of the writer or the form which he gives to his own work. Scott, Dickens, Thackeray—it could not be said of these, or of many others belonging to their fraternity, that they were the mere product of their age, or that their works simply represented the thoughts of the society to which they belonged. They had, each of them, creative power; yet in fashioning the creatures of their hand, they each worked upon the material which lay ready for their use.

One of the most remarkable distinctions of greater novelists of former times was that they seemed to work without any conscious theory. In this remark we might include the great dramatists, and even the greatest of all. They put their characters upon the stage, as living men and women, and leave them to play their part. Sometimes they have a distinct plot, prescribed by history or devised by their own ingenuity. Sometimes they seem to let even the plot work itself out of the situations in which their characters find themselves. But in regard to all the details of their story, there is a naturalness, a spontaneity, which shows how the writer has as much abandoned himself to his work as he has controlled it.

According to a good many modern novelists and essayists this is all wrong. Yet these reformers, all holding that there is to be some special theory of the novel, are widely at variance as to the theory which has the best claim upon our homage. Thus, to borrow from Mr. Barrie's amusing symposium in the *Contemporary* for June, we have the Realist, the Romanticist, the Elsmerian and the Stylist, and we might add one or two other classes to the list.

There seems to be one thing in which these new fangled writers are agreed—namely, that Walter Scott could not write a novel; in fact, the art of novel-writing was not discovered in the days of Walter Scott! Perhaps we might add, the art of dramatic composition was totally unknown in the days of Shakespeare. We also believe it is a fact that there are so-called educated people who cannot have the "patience" to read either Shakespeare or Scott; but whether this is a condemnation of the writer or the reader, we must leave posterity to judge. Let us try for a moment to forecast the fate of those writers whom they can read and the fame of the writers whom they cannot read.

It would seem that the schools which are at the present moment most prominent and most self-assertive are the realist and the stylist, with perhaps also a mixture of the two. M. Zola, in spite of English police courts, and other repressive agencies, moral and physical, has a very large following. Doubtless, we are Philistines, or whatever worse name the latest literary fashion may bestow upon our supposed squeamishness; but we no more enjoy the kind of beastliness which M. Zola places before his readers than we should enjoy living on the edge of a sewer. It may be quite true that man has a large infusion of the brute in his composition, and that this element is prominent in his life; and we admit that the novelist, like every