

The history of reporting is skillfully treated in this work, from the days of ancient Rome until the appearance of the newspaper in England. There are extracts from English papers of the seventeenth century, which show that the reporter was in quest of the marvellous and sensational three hundred years ago.

The man fish and the mermaid were in those times treated as realities. Here is an item which shows that such shows were attended to by the English newspaper man of three centuries ago:

"A true relation of the strange appearance of a man-fish about three miles between the river Thames, having a musket in one hand and a petition in the other, credibly reported by six sailors, who both saw and talked with the monster."

Here is another relating to the mermaid:

"A perfect mermaid, was, by the great wind last night, driven ashore near Greenwich, with a comb in one hand and a looking-glass in another. She seemed to be of the countenance of a most fair and beautiful woman, with her arms crossed, weeping out many pearly drops of salt tears; and afterwards she, gently turning herself upon her back again, swam away without being seen any more."

The London *Gazette* of 1666 contains a report of the great fire of London. It reminds one of the Chicago fire of 1871, and the excitement, alarm and destruction caused by it. Here is a report of the London fire:

"On the 2d inst., at 1 of the clock in the morning, there happened to break out a sad and deplorable fire in Pudding lane, near New Fish street, which falling out at that hour of the night, and in a quarter of the town so close built with wooden pitched houses, spread itself so far before day, and with such distraction to the inhabitants and neighbors that care was not taken for the timely preventing the further effusion of it by pulling down houses as ought to have been; so that this lamentable fire in a short time became too big to be mastered by any engines or working near it. It fell out, most unhappily too, that a violent easterly wind fomented it, and kept it burning all that day and the night following, spreading itself up to Grace Church street and downwards from Cannon street to the west side, as far as the Three Cranes in the Vintrey."

It is not generally known that Dr. Samuel Johnson is really the founder of our modern system of reporting. He was employed by Cave the London publisher, to write the parliamentary reports. The Doctor was dining one evening at Samuel Foote's the actor. The conversation turned on reporting. Foote expressed his admiration of one of the older Pitt's speeches as it appeared in print. Dr. Johnson said he wrote the speech, whereupon Foote expressed his astonishment, saying that it was almost impossible. The surly Doctor replied as follows:

"Sir, I wrote it in Exeter Street. I never was in the gallery of the House of Commons but once in my life. Cave,

the publisher who employed Dr. Johnson, had interest with the doorkeepers: he and the persons employed under him got admittance, they brought away the subjects of discussion, the names of the speakers, the side they took, and the order in which they rose, together with notes of various arguments adduced in the course of the debate. The whole was afterwards communicated to me and I composed the speeches in the form they now have in the parliamentary debates."

Dr. Johnson was employed as reporter for three years by Cave. The Doctor was a staunch Tory and admits that in writing parliamentary reports took good care the Whig dogs should never have the best of the argument." The speeches as written by Johnson were polished, eloquent and forcible. The orators to whom they were credited were as much surprised at the excellence of their language as were the public.

The fight between the English parliament and the press was long and bitter. At one time Cave had to publish his parliamentary report under the title of, "An Appendix to Captain Lemuel Gulliver's Account of the Famous Empire of Lilliput." The debates were headed, "Debates in the Senate of Great Lilliput," but the politicians understood the whole matter, while Cave could not be prosecuted.

In 1771, Miller, the editor of the London *Evening Post*, was expelled from the House of Commons by the Sergeant-at-Arms. Miller gave the officer into custody for assault. There was a law suit. The city of London and the public in general sided with Miller. The result was that the press triumphed over parliament, and the debates are no longer a mystery.

Anything that relates to the distant past is interesting to the people of the present. And all the developments of history, archæology and modern research and discovery go to show that "human nature is human nature" in every age and that the people of ancient periods were very much alike the folks of today.

#### RELIGIOUS FREEDOM AND RELIGIOUS OBLIGATIONS.

"The most important and interesting theological question of our time has come before the public in the trial for heresy of Rev. Howard MacQueary, Episcopal minister of Canton, O. The proceedings at Cleveland have attracted universal attention, more even in the secular than in the religious papers, if possible. It is interesting to note, too, that Rev. Mr. MacQueary desired to expound his views before the Episcopal church congress at New York, but Bishop Potter objected so stoutly that he did not do it.

It does not matter in the least what Mr. MacQueary does or does not believe. Among other things, he holds to the Darwinian theory of evolution, and says that the Book of Genesis is the work of Chaldean sages. The defense the heretical preacher claims is the right of private

and individual interpretation of the Scripture. That is to say, every man has the right to interpret the Bible according to the light of his own reason and conscience. This, be it observed, is the original ground maintained by Luther, the founder of Protestantism.

"Mr. MacQueary says he acknowledges the authority of the Scriptures. The only point he claims is that he will let no other man interpret them for him, not even the framers of the Episcopal creed. His interpretation, in the light of modern scholarship and research, leads him to conclusions different from theirs, yet he says he has today as much right to his judgment as they had to theirs when they formulated the creed. The question is, has he?"

"Some of his conclusions are as follows: He rejects the supernatural birth of the Savior, and believes he was the son of Joseph. He disbelieves the literal doctrine of the Trinity, and believes it originated with the theologians. The literal atonement in his judgment is a relic of barbarism, and the resurrection of Christ was a spiritual, not a physical and bodily one.

"This then is the real issue that was to be decided in the trial of MacQueary: Has any man who belongs to a church, Episcopal, Baptist, Methodist or Presbyterian, a right to interpret the Bible for himself?"

The foregoing appears in an eastern exchange, and asks questions that appear to have agitated a good many minds. The trial of Mr. MacQueary took place some weeks ago, but the principle involved in his course and the doctrines which he disputes form a topic of present interest in the religious world, and we offer some remarks in relation to it.

The right of every man to think for himself, we presume, will not be denied by members of any Protestant religious body. Belief must be free, and the human mind must not be fettered. That which seems right to each person must be his guide, or personal responsibility would fail and man could not be justly held accountable for his acts. The doctrine of rewards and punishments depends on the freedom of the individual. If every man is to be judged "according to his works," every man must be left to the exercise of his agency and to that liberty of choice which is essential to it.

When people associate as members of any society, religious or otherwise, they make some kind of agreement that places them under obligations which they must respect, or they should leave the association. If that agreement be in relation to the observance of given rules or the upholding of certain tenets, they should observe the rules, hold to the tenets, or sever their connection with the body. This appears to us to be beyond dispute.

Nor does this curtail the liberty of the individual. He is free to join the society or church of his choice, and he is equally free to leave it. And if he changes his mind as to its rules or doctrines, it would seem that he ought