

Cabala. If the Jew founded medicine, what became of the medicine which he founded? The Middle Ages bequeathed none, it is believed, worthy the name of science. Trade was developed not by the Jew, but by the merchants and mariners of the great Italian, German, Flemish, and English cities. Its progress in England did not in any appreciable way suffer by the absence of the Jews from the time of Edward I. to that of Charles II. It may be doubted whether even the money trade which was the special province of the Jew, did not owe at the least as much to the bankers of Florence and Augsburg as to the Jewish houses. Rossieu St. Hilaire, in his history of Spain, while he shows abundant sympathy for Jewish wrongs, finds himself compelled to contrast the narrowness and rapacity of their commerce with the boldness and grandeur of Arab enterprise. In the early Middle Ages Jews were the great slave-dealers. This was not the reproach in those times which it would be in ours; but slave-dealing was never the noblest or the most beneficent part of commerce."

A STANDARD ARGUMENT. AN argument that we have sometimes heard advanced in New Zealand also, is answered as follows by Bishop McQuaid:—"Should Catholics at any time, and in any part of the country, grow to be

the majority, they will take delight in placing the minority on a footing of equality with themselves, even as the French Canadians, forty years ago, being then a large majority of the inhabitants of Lower Canada, settled this question of schools, in its moral and religious aspect, by conceding to the Protestant minority every privilege and claim asked for. It is an unfortunate suggestion to offer that to keep Catholics from practising intolerance towards a Protestant minority, it is advisable for a Protestant majority to be intolerant towards a Catholic minority."

ARCHBISHOP MACCABE'S PASTORAL.

ARCHBISHOP MACCABE, of Dublin, delivered an important pastoral on Sunday last, Oct. 30th. The following is an extract referring to the present crisis:—"The condition of our dear country calls for our bitterest tears. Only a little while ago our own city presented scenes of lawlessness which might disgrace an un-Christian rabble. It is true the evil-doers were but a handful of misguided youths, but it is nevertheless true that evil-doers are in our midst, and that the youthful culprit of to-day may become the hardened profligate if society fails in its duties to the rising generation. We feel ourselves, very reverend Fathers, imperatively called on to enter our most solemn protest against another indignity which has been offered to the moral sense of our own people in this city, the centre of Catholic Ireland. Only a few days ago over-confiding men were startled from their dream of security by the publication of a manifesto which at once assailed the eternal law of good and struck at the foundations on which society rests. Passing over all other cases in which these rights are threatened, let us confine ourselves to one particular class of the community. There are hundreds of honest, industrious men among us who, trusting to their faith in the public conscience and calculating on the security which a duly constituted Government is expected to give, have invested the fruits of their years of toil and self-sacrifice in property from which they hoped they and theirs might draw the means of an honorable subsistence.

"But all this must swept away by the breath of a handful of men, the bulk of whom have neither stake nor interest in the country. We disregarded the warnings which cautioned us against the danger that lurked in the specious programmes pretending to aim at nought save the redress of the wrongs of oppressed people. But now God's Providence has forced from the lips of the unsafe guides an avowal of their aims, and if the notice to pay no rents be not the teaching of communism, communism is yet to be defined. Let no one suppose, very reverend Fathers, that we have a word to say in defence of the oppressors of the poor. We feel as keenly as the most outspoken of our brethren inspired by the ministrations of cruel injuries worked by bad laws on the defenceless tenants of Ireland, but we must not allow our abhorrence of injustice to betray us into a repudiation of the claims of justice. If to-day the landlord's claim to his just rent be questioned, who will guarantee the tenant's right to his outlay of money and toil to-morrow? Injustice will repay injustice, and in the day of retribution the wrong-doer will be laughed at when he seeks for sympathy in his troubles. The issue is now plainly put to our people which of two paths they will follow—whether they will follow the men who have marked out the road that must lead to anger with God and disgrace before the Christian world, or the bishops of Ireland, who through a glorious and unbroken succession of fourteen centuries are the heirs of those who encountered poverty and exile and dared death in its most terrible form for the people with whom their lives are irrevocably bound up."

Dublin Oct. 30.—The pastoral of Archbishop MacCabe was read in all the Catholic churches of the Dublin diocese to-day and created considerable sensation. Passages from the pastoral were printed late last night, and demonstrations against it, to be made to-day, were at once organised. At the Pro-Cathedral, in Marlboro' street, hundreds of men rose at the moment when the priest began his references to the Land League and left the building. At Arran Quay Chapel and other churches similar incidents occurred.

The *New York Herald*, while commenting on that part of the pastoral which condemns the manifesto of the League, is amazed that an Irish prelate could shut his eyes and be silent as to the significance of English outrages in Ireland. The *Herald* says:—

So far, therefore, the pastoral address of the Archbishop is to be commended. The question, however, which now excites thinking men is not the platform of the Land League or the declaration of the agitators. Common sense will settle that. What the world sees is that in free England—the England of Magna Charta—liberty, free press, free speech and the right of petition—it is possible to employ the forms of government made familiar by Russian Czars and Louis Napoleon. The world sees a liberal government violate every right consecrated to freeman. Members of Parliament are imprisoned, women are arrested, priests taken from the altar, meetings are suppressed, the press is silenced, the right to bear arms is denied, the *habeas corpus* is suspended, martial law is proclaimed, trial by jury is denied to men charged with violations of law. Grant that the teachings of Parnell and the Land League are pernicious. In a free country the law permits the promulgation of any doctrines that do not offend decency. It is well enough to censure the wild teachings of the Land League. But why imprison men for opinion's sake? If Parnell and his followers have committed a crime let them be tried and punished. It is no crime to declaim against property in land. We censure such doctrines, but we do not send a man to prison for holding them.

This is what Mr. Gladstone has done. This is what we mean when we say that his Ministry has applied to freemen the methods of Louis Napoleon. The fact that Archbishop MacCabe does not see in this extraordinary perversion of the powers of government a cause for regret takes from his pastoral address that respect and approval which otherwise would have been commanded by the utterance of so eminent a prelate.

WHAT VOLCANOES ARE NOT.

"WHAT is a volcano?" This is a familiar question, often addressed to us in our youth, which "Catechisms of Universal Knowledge" and similar school manuals have taught us to reply to in some such terms as the following: "A volcano is a burning mountain, from the summit of which issue smoke and flames." This description, says Professor Judd, is not merely incomplete and inadequate as a whole, but each individual proposition of which it is made up is grossly inadequate and, what is worse, perversely misleading. In the first place, the action which takes place at volcanoes is, not "burning," or combustion, and bears, indeed, no relation whatever to that well-known process. Nor are volcanoes necessarily "mountains" at all; essentially, they are just the reverse—namely, holes in the earth's crust, or outer portion, by means of which a communication is kept up between the surface and the interior of the globe. When mountains do exist at centres of volcanic activity, they are simply the heaps of materials thrown out of these holes, and must, therefore, be regarded not as the causes but as the consequences of volcanic action. Neither does this action always take place at the "summits" of volcanic mountains when such exist, for eruptions occur quite as frequently on their sides or at their base. That, too, which popular fancy regards as "smoke" is really condensing steam or watery vapor, and the supposed raging "flames" are nothing more than the glowing light of a mass of molten material reflected from these vapor-clouds. The name of the volcano has been borrowed from the mountain Vulcano, in the Lipari Islands, where the ancients believed that Hephestus, or Vulcan, had his forge. Volcanic phenomena have been at all times regarded with a superstitious awe, which has resulted in the generation of such myths as the one just mentioned, or of that in which Etna was said to have been formed by the mountains under which an angry god had buried the rebellious Typhon. These stories changed their form, but not their essence, under a Christian dispensation, and Vulcano became regarded as the place of punishment of the Arian Emperor Theodosius, and Etna as that of Anne Boleyn, who had sinned by perverting the faith of King Henry VIII.—From "Volcanoes, their Action and Distribution," in *Popular Science Monthly* for November.

REDPATH INTERVIEWED.

"THIS policy of no rent," said Mr. Redpath, "was discussed at the recent convention of the Land League in Dublin. It was urged by a certain class of the Land League, and I thought that if its advocates in the convention had had a skillful parliamentary leader, and could have forced a vote at one time, the policy would have prevailed. I was totally opposed to it because I knew it would divide the League, and that numbers of priests could not sustain it in their parishes. In Ulster, especially where they have tenant right, I hold that it would ruin thousands of small farmers, because under the Land bill the farmer who has not paid his rent gets no benefit whatever from the law. He can be evicted. As to the action of the League I cannot judge at this distance, but it seems to be the result of passion, and very unwise. Such men as Archbishop Croke could not possibly support such a policy."

"Then you do not believe in the policy at all?"

"I do believe in the policy as soon as the whole people of Ireland can be brought to adopt it. Then as the English government could not evict a whole nation, it would be bound to compel a settlement satisfactory to the tenants. But a partial strike, in my judgment, will bring disaster instead of victory. Still, on the other hand, these onsets may have so exasperated the people that the strike will be general. We cannot judge of that here. A universal refusal to pay rent would be a strike—a trades union strike—and they are now legal in England."

"Does that law apply in Ireland?"

"There is no law in Ireland; the will of Gladstone is the supreme law."

"What do you think the object of these wholesale arrests is?"

"To prevent Gladstone's trickery from being exposed, Gladstone is statesman enough to see that Irish landlordism could not endure