

Forecasts of approaching death belong to the most common experiences.

Elizabeth, Countess of Thuringen before she took sick, told her servant girl as well as a clergyman that she would die on the 19th of November, 1231. This happened. She was then twenty four years of age. Christian I of Denmark told Noviomagus that he would die on New-years day. Nobody believed this until the king really took sick and died that day. Jacob Boshme died at 6 o'clock in the morning, having predicted this three hours before.

That soldiers in times of war very often have a foreknowledge of their death is a remarkable fact which is well known. We give an instance:

Steingel, a favorite officer of Napoleon I, on the evening before the battle of Marengo was called to the tent of the great commander and came bringing with him a black, sealed parcel. On being questioned by Bonaparte as to this, he replied: "General, this is my will. Tomorrow I will be killed and I lay my depositions in your hands that they may be complied with." When further asked why he believed that he was going to be killed, he said he had had a dream, in which he had seen himself encountering a well armed enemy. When he struck this with his sword, the armor fell to the ground and before him stood a skeleton ironically laughing at him. Steingel fell the following day in the battle wounded to death by a person whom he recognized from his dream, and the sight of whom made him neglect to defend himself."

We may close this article with a quotation from Socrates which illustrates the subject under treatment very well:

"Something wonderful has followed me from my childhood. It is a voice which always, when heard, admonishes me to desist from something which I intend to do. But it has never told me to do anything. If any of my friends counsel me to do something, this voice, if heard at all, tells me no to follow. You may ask Clitomachus the Brother of Timarchus, what Timarchus said, when he went to his death, in spite of the warning of this divine voice. he and Enachus, who overtook Timarchus on his flight. 'O Clitomachus,' he said, 'I know I must die, because I did not listen to Socrates.' The case was this: When Timarchus rose from the table and also Philemon. In order to kill Nikias, the son of Herodotus—circumstances known only to the two—Timarchus said to me: 'What do you think, Socrates? You remain here and drink, I have to go somewhere else, but I will soon return.' Then I perceived the voice and I told him: 'Do not go under any consideration, for the customary sign, the divine, has been given to me.' Then he waited, but after a while he again prepared to leave, and said: 'I am going now.' The voice came the second time, and I pressed him to remain. Again he rose and left without saying anything. As my attention was called to something else, he went to his death."

Socrates had also, as is well known, a dream in which he was made acquainted with the time when his beautiful soul should be separated from the mortal body.

A WEAK SPOT.

THE following timely and pertinent article on "The Weak Spots in American Social Life," is taken from the *Chicago Tribune*. It will not suit these reckless and immoral writers who advocate freedom above everything, even at the sacrifice of self-control and the defiance of every recognized rule of sound morality. But thoughtful parents, and all who recognize the value of wise discipline in the family and in society, will approve the sentiments expressed in this Chicago editorial:

"There is one phase of social life in America which continually engages the attention of critics, foreign writers, and observant travelers among us. It is a constant source of wonderment to them that there is so little respect manifested by the young towards the old, of children for their parents, so little regard paid to authority, and so little discipline enforced in the family. The question most frequently asked by them is 'Why are so many of your young men and young women going wrong?' The indictment of American society by these foreign critics has a basis of truth, and the answer to their question is primarily to be found in the absence of family discipline. The new method of parental government is to have no discipline or compulsion. The family authority must be maintained upon the basis of 'moral suasion,' or not maintained at all, and the two conditions are about synonymous. There is no authority. Our fathers and grandfathers believed in family law and compelled obedience. Now if a parental order is violated there must be no punishment. This is the fad in the house, and it is the fad in the school. It is only a question of time how soon the fad will become universal, all parental authority over children cease, and all social law become a nonentity. There is no longer chastisement or punishment of any kind in the school, nor even restriction. The child is regarded as a free agent from its earliest years. Its will is allowed to prevail, and if a successful appeal cannot be made to its conscience, then it must be permitted to go on its way. With such a system of discipline, is it any wonder that so many boys and girls are turned out upon the world from the home and the schoolhouse with the loosest ideas of obedience, authority, morals, honor, or honesty; that so many city boys are becoming 'hoodlums,' and so many girls are 'fast' and following dangerous paths; that they take to improper literature and improper habits, and end by going to the bad or wrecking their lives in some other way? Boys and girls are observant, even in their earliest childhood and they reason shrewdly even if they reason wrongly. They ascribe the non-action of parents and teachers to fear, and from this it is an easy step to the conclusion that the law is all on their side. Hence so many of the children of the rich become idle and dissolute and the children of the poor become vagabonds or hoodlums, they following the natural bent of their inclinations because no restriction is imposed upon them and no punishment follows the disobedience of parental commands. In this serious emergency which confronts so many American homes, what are the board of education and the clergy

doing who have charge of the intellectual and, to a large extent, the moral growth of children? The clergy have the closest access to the family and the most influence upon the parents, particularly upon the mothers. What are they doing towards instructing parents in their plain duty towards their offspring? What are Baptist, Presbyterian, Methodist and Episcopalian ministers and Catholic priests, whose influence is almost absolute in such matters, doing to enforce better parental government? Why do they sit idly by, knowing that marital discords, family scandals, violations of the moral code, contempt for all the laws of honor and honesty, and out-breaking defiance of social proprieties proceed from the absence of authority in the home, followed by equal absence of authority in the school? They must know that the next generation will be worse than this; that it will not take many generations to suppress completely parental authority, and, this once accomplished, that the nation itself will tumble into ruins. Youth will always seek the lowest levels if left to itself and not directed and influenced by some other power. There are two forms of education needed in this world. The one must give the child enlightenment in matters of knowledge. The other must be a moral education, which shall enable the child to overcome the dragging down influences of its own nature and to resist the evil advice and examples of older and depraved companions, and it must be taught through the agencies of discipline and respect for parental commands as aids to its will and conscience. What are you doing towards this, gentlemen of the pulpits and school boards? Your homilies, theories, dogmas, and ceremonies are of little account in bringing the child to right living, to proper habits of thought, to high ideals of personal honor and honesty, and to loyalty to parental authority. Are not the loose and vitiated conditions of society sufficient proofs that there is something wrong in the prevalent method of bringing up children? Solomon says bring up a child in the way it should go, and when it is old it will not depart therefrom. What was true and necessary in family government thirty centuries ago is equally true today."

ON UTAH AFFAIRS.

THE *Boston Post* of November 5th contained an interesting correspondence from Salt Lake City on the result of the Declaration and the manner in which it has been received. The writer says:

"The Gentile press of Salt Lake City, especially, questions the genuine character of this movement. It staggers under the blow it has received, depriving it of the object of its attack, while it still kicks at the air that has escaped from the collapsed football which has heretofore been its grand *piece de resistance*. When the government and people of the United States become thoroughly convinced of the sincerity of this action of the Church it will turn its attention more exclusively to the accusations against it of the *imperium in imperio*, 'disloyalty,' and the influence of the Priesthood on elections."

"In various letters and articles I have taken occasion to demonstrate the utter absurdity of the first two charges."

The difference between President