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the Canao annual Domination of the Statesmen and the Union. Service is a Latin conception belonging to a solar cult, and associated with a group of goddesses to which being Virides of Ares, and Herculius, Volens, and Volans.

All this is very alluring and most interesting, but it is not always convincing. In fact, Professor Paul's own teaching would lead him to view with incredulity many of his theses. Moreover, his style is not such as to attract the general reader or even to explain the scholar, for it is very involved and is lacking in logical acumen; which tends to make a difficult subject even more difficult by reason of the manner. The translation is very well done, although the paragraphing in often odd. There is little to suggest the move-ment of Italian phraseology into English. On page 31 "oral oral" is con-structed with Latin writing, where the evident intention is to refer to half-sentences and capitals. On page 118, the sentences, "Another doctrine was still more intimately connected with Dionis Antiochus—namely the Xian, that is, the people of Antioch." is untranslatable. Probably Virtus is the di-vision thought of. We note also clauses asrious (p. 13), Convex for Concave or Concave (p. 145), Sextal for Sexural (p. 148), seawater for seawater (p. 149), "fish in the sea" (p. 150), "Doric for Doric" (p. 150), "sword for sword" (p. 154), "word for word" (p. 224), and Palestra for Palastrum (p. 282). The book closes with sixty pages of notes in italic which bear a valuable corroboration of the statements in the text. The index, which is indispensable in a work of this kind, has been omitted.


The periodic renewal of discussion of the Declaration of Independence is more upon us, and the trial of the abstractions on either side of the question has been spoken of by the appearance of a clever lawyer, somewhat大力支持 or upon the matter, and therefore deceased before disposed of at a small price. In his book Dr. Graham claims to present new evidence in favor of the Declaration. The evidence is (1) a point, dated 1777, called the "Mecklenburg Scheme," in which omission is made of a "table;"

(2) a child born twelve years after the alleged Declaration and called "the Independence Boy;" (3) books for land which date from 1713 and not from 1776 as the year of independence; (4) a scholar's declaration in 1889, mentioning the Declaration, and (5) a discussion of how Mar- tin and Goode obtained their information of the facts. Dr. Graham believes that the evidence dated May 28, which have been accepted by historians, were adopted May 25, and were additional and supplementary to a true Declaration of Independence.

However interesting as a dissertation of anachronism this play in favor of a Declaration may be, it does not carry conviction. Because Martin and Goode associated with men who were present at a convention in Mecklenburg in May, to no reason why they should have discussed the matter with them or obtained original materials. The resolutions of May 25 assented all royal communications as null and void, and placed all legislation and executive powers in the Provincial Congress. This was in some de-grees a declaration of independence, and the reference to the "Covens" and in the schoolboy's exercise could apply equally to these sections as to a separate and distinct Declaration. Further, the schoolboy was a pupil of the Rev. Dr. Goddard, who married the daughter of John McKinley Alexander, secretary to the meeting, and had thus been under the influence of one interested in maintaining the existence of a Declaration. The fact that the resolutions of May 25 were widely copied, while the more notable Declaration has left no mark in contemporary newspapers, is a difficult point against the passage of the latter, and is not to be hastily solved by mere assertion. Nor does Dr. Graham's mode of treatment inspire confidence, for order he hands a "repetition now be-comes a certainty." . . . and at the end of the chapter on the Declaration, given in his authorities, "Records, Magazines, ga- zetts." Martin said Dr. Goddard had found a copy of the Declaration in the western part of the State prior to 1888. To this statement Dr. Graham adds: "Whether it was a manuscript or newspaper copy is not stated, but probably the latter." A few pages later, our author states positively that Martin had read the "Four Resolves of June, 1776.

This copy from Mecklenburg is not known to exist in any collection, but it is entirely possible to suppose that a copy was abstracted from the British records by Andrew Scottson, when minister plenipotentiary at the Court of St. James.

There is nothing in his official correspondence to show that he had made any dis-covery on an important question, and to justify belief that in 1827 the followers of Jefferson were in favor of his belief that they would employ the facilities of early Mecklenburg Declaration. It would be much more in the spirit of the times to discredit contemporary records, which have not yet been entirely exhaust- ed.

For instance, why did it require only twenty days for the news of Lexington to reach Williamsburg Va, and nearly twenty-nine days to go further south and west to Richmond, N. C.? Yet the news is said to have reached Mecklenburg while the movement was sitting, and led to the framing of the Declaration. Then, too, the supporters of the Declaration that the first copies of this important paper were sent by special messenger to the Continental Congress, and the receipt was acknowl- edged and acknowledged given by Hon. John and by a joint letter of the Virginia delegates. Yet the letter-book of John Han- cock does not show any such letter, the joint letter has never been found, and the two men in Congress most interested in obtaining every support for independence, Adams and Jefferson, had never seen or heard of the Declaration until it was first printed in 1788. Jefferson believed it to be a forgery, and in an unpublished letter to John Adams, believed it his opinion: "It appeared to me utterly incredible that they should be genuine; and there were so many circumstances calculated to impose on the public that I thought it my duty to take the steps for the detection of the imposture. I have there- fore distinctly cleared the paper and declared that if you or any of your friends in the State or elsewhere had met them, you would have informed me of it. As they were unknown to you, they must have been pro-duced in this State. But who ever heard of such a forgery issued before five or forty years, and what could be his motive? Was it not a charge of insurrection against the Congress to, on the contrary, the unauthorized se- cret society which had existed in the State, which was to prevent the existence of Independence? Or could it not be the mere reality of proving a man a forger, to set the world at bay and afford a little of the piping to this piping time of popular delusion? It is sometimes perhaps in June or July, when the highways are full of men from the counties, that the leaders of the Declaration of Independence have left no mark in contemporary newspapers, is a difficult point against the passage of the latter, and is not to be hastily solved by mere assertion. Nor does Dr. Graham's mode of treatment inspire confidence, for order he hands a "repetition now be-comes a certainty." . . . and at the end of the chapter on the Declaration, given in his authorities, "Records, Magazines, ga- zetts." Martin said Dr. Goddard had found a copy of the Declaration in the western part of the State prior to 1888. To this statement Dr. Graham adds: "Whether it was a manuscript or newspaper copy is not stated, but probably the latter." A few pages later, our author states positively that Martin had read the "Four Resolves of June, 1776.
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der long before he will have earned their The truth is that the personal recognition was so fervent, interest, but the record of what was said is considerably less so.

Oeuvre: Earth History, Vol. II. & III. By M. T. Chamberlin and R. S. Molesworth. Professor of Geology and Geography at the University of Chicago, Henry Neil & Co. 8vo.

That oeuvre is not yet an exact science, and that many of the commonly accepted views of the earth's history rest in the last analysis upon the demonstrated assumptions, is emphasized in a striking manner in the above work. Contrary to the plan of either text-book on the same subject, marked attention is paid to the hypotheses of the origin and early phases of the earth, and several alternative views are discussed in considerable detail. For a number of years past, Professor Chamberlin's studies have led him to consider those fundamental problems connected with the origin of the earth, and he has conceived for him the common adjectival Nebulosity hypothesis of Laplace and the Nebular hypothesis of Laplace and Darwin can possibly meet the demands that later discoveries put upon them. For example, this hypothesis presupposes an original crust with autoween: definite chemical and physical characteristics; such as are based on theories. Indeed, new studies in Canada, the United States, Great Britain, Scandinavia, and Finland have demonstrated that great breaks of the Aurorae rocks, which were previously supposed to be a part of that crust, are also hierarchies, and that they had been forced into rocks which were formed on the earth at a period much before than the original one. Indeed, Professor Chamberlin has been led, therefore, to develop the "phenomenal hypothesis," in which "it is assumed that the parent nebula of the solar system was formed from inconceivable small bodies, planetesimals, revolving about a central nucleus, much as our planets today." His finds in the Jovian nebula, with orbiting stars or streams, with luminous centres and knots of light on the streams, and which present a continuous spectrum, some reasons for assuming that such small bodies exist in greater numbers. By this hypothesis, "the condition of the system consisted in the aggregation of these innumerable small bodies into very much larger ones." The earth is supposed to have started as a stellar knot, acting as a motive, and to have grown gradually to its present mass by aggregation of the scattered planetesimal masses.

This hypothesis calls for a relatively slow growth of the earth—first at first, but with a rate of internal temperature developed in the central portion, chiefly through convection and conduction outward. The young earth is believed to have had no atmosphere until it attained about one-twentieth of its present mass, owing to its insufficiency to form the limit of gravity to sustain and hold to itself the light atmosphere gaseous against its high molecular velocities, which would carry them off into space. But when the greater part of the earth reached the requisite mass, an atmosphere, gradually accumulated by contributions from the free admixture

We can here mention only one or two standing at least a dozen strikingly irrefutable papers that will deserve the reader's perusal. "The Nation" is divided into two sections: the first being the "Science" and the second the "Letters." The former consists of articles on various scientific subjects, while the latter contains letters to the editor. The "Letters" section is often a forum for philosophical and political debate.
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