

changes are covered by outward conformity. After material changes have been, made by legal fiction the civilian says, "Behold the law still remains unchanged." So when sceptical criticism has forced the Church to conform to the spirit of the age, the advocate of creed still cries out "*Eadem! Eadem!!*"

It is curious to notice that of synchronous events the cause is frequently mistaken for the effect, and the effect for the cause. In no case has this error lead to more important results than in the consideration of religion and civilization. The usually simultaneous existence of a purer religion and a higher civilization has misled many to assign the former as the cause of the latter. Yet I think no one conversant with the facts can resist the conclusion that it has been the progress of civilization, the exaltation of the natural above the supernatural (if I may use the catachresis) that has purified and idealized religion. It has been the refining influence of advancing civilization that has taken from religion its gross and sensuous character so revolting in the ceremonies of early times.

Scepticism is a relative term and in one age is applied to principles which in the next are received as orthodox. The most sacred faith of one age frequently becomes the subject of ridicule in the next. The "brilliant but dangerous infidel" of one generation becomes the "benefactor of mankind" to their children.

Thus has scepticism, the unconquerable momentum of mankind, pushed forward our civilization and in turn our civilization has moulded and purified our religion.

Of all the gems that brighten the crown of our goddess of liberty, we prize none higher than the freedom of the press and the freedom of worship; the former we owe to the sceptics of England, the latter to the sceptics of America. ELEVE.

SYMPOSIUM.

SHOULD OUR COLLEGES DISCARD THE MARKING SYSTEM?

I.

We are sure that every student is more or less interested in this matter, having at several times, perhaps, questioned the soundness and practicability of the system. In our opinion it may well be questioned in these respects.

It is not only unsound, but impracticable. To substantiate this, we need but mention the various methods in use to settle the exact standing of a student. Almost every instructor has a plan of his own. One marks the general success or failure of each recitation; another judges from the student's general ability; a third marks every mistake against the student, no matter how small a one it is, and so, in a large class, the time is pretty well occupied in marking mistakes.

Perhaps the student is perfectly familiar with his subject, but for the time cannot recall the phrase or word, and so he is marked down, and that little mistake is recorded against him for others to notice. But another consideration, and that is this. Instructors have different grades. Some always have their classes graded from nine to ten on a scale of ten, while with others it is equally complimentary to the pupil to stand from eight to nine, or even less; so that a student may pass in a study under one professor with a standing of eight, when under another instructor the grade might be nine and five-tenths, although he may actually be doing no better.

And now. The most faithful students do not always recite the best. One with a glib tongue may show himself to a better advantage than another, even when the gist of the lesson is not so well understood. This last point is the most important. How well a student succeeds in educating himself, how well he knows to