

Unfortunately, the learned Doctor of last night made a very weak showing for his ancient brethren. The subject of the trial proper, he did not touch at all, but endeavored to show that the Galileans were a turbulent, disorderly people who did not speak correct Hebrew and who were to Judea proper what Ireland is to England. In this way he tried to make Christ of a kind with his countrymen, and referred to the upsetting of the money tables in the Temple as a disorderly and unlawful act, because the money changers paid for their places in the Temple. There is neither argument nor logic in that, but only simple sophistry.

The questions first to be considered, were there two trials or only one? Was Hebrew or Roman law adhered to in the two trials, if there were two? Or was one trial merely a review of the other? The history available for determining these questions is not extensive. It is confined to the four gospels of the New Testament. The accounts in all these correspond fairly enough to impress the impartial jurist with their accuracy and correctness. Tacitus, the Roman historian has a few lines in reference to the event, but nothing to help the modern investigator. The paragraph in Josephus directly relating to the event is disputed, but there are other references to Christianity by that writer, which materially help the student in his inquiries. There are also references in the Talmud, but they are mostly execrations. What renders the Gospel narratives of the event most satisfactory is the fact that they read like an ordinary court report of today. There is no reference made to portents or marvels as far as the narrative goes.

The basis of Hebrew law was:

"Thou shalt do no unrighteousness in judgment. \* \* \* When a judge decides not according to truth, he makes the majesty of God to depart from Israel. But if he judges according to truth, were it only for one hour, it is as if he established the whole world, for it is in judgment that the divine presence in Israel has its habitation."

Modern Jewish scholars unhesitatingly state that the criminal code of the Talmud was that adhered to under the high-priestship of Annas and Calaphas. It is, however, an historical fact that no portion of the Talmud was reduced to writing until early in the third century. The four Gospels of the New Testament were all written in the first century, hence the possibility of greater accuracy.

The Mishna lays down the law distinctly relating to trials. It says:

"Money trials are commenced only in the day time, but may be concluded after nightfall. Capital trials are commenced only in the day time, and must also be concluded during the day. The former may be concluded by acquittal or con-

demnation on the day on which they have begun; the latter may be concluded on that day if there is a sentence of acquittal, but must be postponed to a second day if there is to be a condemnation. And for this reason capital trials are not held on the day before a Sabbath or on a feast day."

The crucifixion took place on Friday, and the meeting of the council took place on Friday morning. Both were against Jewish law, and hence Jewish rabbis hold that the Jews did not break the law, and that if an execution took place it was according to Roman law. But if we follow the whole course, from the arrest on Thursday night to the close, both Christian and Jew admit that, according to the Mishna, the proceedings were illegal.

But our record tells us that Jesus was led before Annas. He was not the high priest then, but he controlled the Sanhedrim. His son-in-law Calaphas was chairman of the council, and his own five sons were members. Annas, during his administration as chairman some years before, stretched his power to carry out executions, and for this he was removed by the Roman procurator.

The audience last night expected the learned Doctor would touch on these points, but instead he gave a long hypothetical case about George Washington, Jr.

It is plain that from the answers of Jesus the trial was supposed to be according to Jewish law. He said to the judge: "Why askest thou me? Ask them which heard me, what I have said unto them: behold, they know what I said." A court flunkey of Annas then struck Jesus on the face, but Jesus simply said: "If I have spoken evil, bear witness of this evil; but if well, why smitest thou me." These extracts are ample evidence to show that Christ knew the Jewish law, and that both the high priest and his assistant were violating the law.

Had Dr. Browne gone into the trial proper, and touched on its main issues as rendered in the gospels, he would at least have been speaking on the subject as announced. He contended that Judas did not commit suicide, that no traitor ever did so. What about Richard Piggott, who only two years ago blew his brains out in Spain? He mentioned Jefferson Davis as a traitor and Benedict Arnold also. These cases had no analogy whatever to the Judas Iscariot treachery.

It is to be hoped when the learned Doctor touches the crucifixion and trial again he will deal with the subject proper, and not with side issues.

A number of furnaces which have been idle for some time will blow in shortly.

## THE CZAR'S CONSCIENCE.

THE Czar's anxiety to make the Finlanders more Russian seems to grow on him the more he encroaches upon their old privileges. He began a few years ago by forcing the Russian language into the public schools and forcing the Finnish language out. This was ostensibly a summary method of his to break down the old lines of community distinction and get a warmer feeling of sympathy into the heart of the Finlander for his majesty's interests. He could not hug them to the bosom of his magnanimous empire as the father he would like to be to them while they persisted in talking in a foreign tongue.

The Finlanders did not love him any better for this interest in them, but accepted the innovation because they could not help themselves. The next step was to put them under a sort of military espionage which was of course the natural following of his former encroachments upon their institutions.

But the last act of curtailment reveals unmistakably the fangs of the tyrant. It was to dismiss the representatives of their parliament stationed at St. Petersburg, whose offices there gave to Finland the appearance at least of having a local government. The rumor has now gone forth among them that hereafter there will be no more Finland in the sense it has heretofore been styled. That province must henceforth regard itself as a part of Russia, with no privileges or considerations not enjoyed by other loyal subjects of the empire.

While the Czar has thus far made no attack upon their religious observances, the rumor prevails that their religion was the chief subject of his anxiety from the first, and that his conscience would not let him rest until he had forced upon Finland the religion of the Russians.

The Fins are poor, and helpless to resist any tyranny he may choose to inflict. But they are notoriously the most respectable people under his dominion, being distinguished from his slavonic subjects by their honesty and scruples of conscience generally. The persecutions which the Jews are suffering for their religion at the hands of this bigoted ruler afford to the threatened Fins a graphic example of what is in store for them in the event of an assault upon their religious faith followed by a refusal on their part to comply with all demands. The outlook ought to make them wish the conscience of their monarch was not so sensitive in one respect at least.

Admiral Farragut died August 14, 1870, aged 70.