

change offices. Nay, offer a fair price for the *Tribune* and the whole outfit, editors and all would soon be sold.

Let the Democrats "set apart" most of the figure-heads of the late campaign for senators, congressmen, judges and what not, and put into the harness a few men who know how to organize men; carry the next campaign on, not as a play, a Punch-and-Judy show, but as a Gettysburg siege, every day making more sure the final triumph, and then in February we can wrest Salt Lake from the control of liars and thieves and in that act secure the freedom of all Utah.

CHARLES ELLIS.

#### DR. BROWNE'S LECTURE.

The beautiful Jewish synagogue was well filled August 12, with an attentive audience gathered in order to learn what the renowned lecturer had to say upon the above stated subject.

The lecturer, having been briefly introduced, said his lecture was not calculated to elicit applause, but he would discuss this subject with all reverence. It had been forced upon him. Mr. Moody once, before a large audience had credited the following statement to a learned Jewish Rabbi: "I glory in the fact that our forefathers crucified Christ," and this, the famous evangelist held to be the opinion of all Jews. Senator Sargent had said: "The Southerners may as well deny that they used to shoot niggers as the Jews can deny that they assassinated Jesus." Assertions like these had forced the speaker to take up the subject and to stand up for his people.

The lecturer did not, however, wish to interfere in the least with the faith of his Christian brethren, for it could be logically proved that this question was immaterial to their fundamental doctrines.

The speaker is a Jew and not a Christian, but for this evening he would place himself on the platform of the Christians and believe that Jesus was a divine being who came here to sacrifice Himself for the salvation of mankind, just to prove that nobody can be a Christian and believe the Savior was crucified by the Jews.

According to Paul in Rom. vii, Christ was a man and must be judged as a man. (The lecturer was often confused in his New Testament quotations. The eighth of Romans has no reference at all to the humanity of Christ, but perhaps Phil. ii was alluded to). Christ was bound to carry out His role as a man in every detail, for had anybody suspected Him of being more than a mortal man, He would not have been crucified and He could not have fulfilled His mission. He must therefore be judged as any other man, neither more nor less. Christ came to be sacrificed. How, is immaterial.

The following questions were proposed: 1.) Did the Jews, themselves, crucify Christ? 2.) Or, were they instrumental in bringing it about? 3.) Did they approve of the crucifixion? 4.) Do the Jews today glory in it? 5.) Does the history of the Jews justify the conclusion that the blood of Christ has come upon the Jews, as a curse?

All these questions the speaker emphatically denied.

The historians of the age ignore the crucifixion of Christ altogether. Tacitus has merely a passing remark about Jesus, and Josephus does not mention Him at all. The speaker knew there is a paragraph in Josephus about Jesus, but it was admitted to be an interpolation. Then there are the four Gospels, but these the speaker did not believe, and the Talmud the Christians could not read.

Having thus summarily and remarkably easy disposed of all historical data, the speaker had nothing but circumstantial evidence left. And the "circumstantial evidence" was given.

A case was supposed. Let us say that the Indians had conquered the United States and made Sitting Bull the ruler. Every political right had been taken away from the citizens and they were all serfs. Now a rumor arises that a man comes who will be the deliverer. But the Southerners on hearing that his name is John A. Logan of Illinois, refuse to accept him. Finally he is killed by the Indians and thousands with him. Another deliverer arises, but the Northerners refuse to accept him, and he is butchered by the Indians and thousands with him. The Americans by this time will want no more deliverers. But then another man comes from Santa Fe, N. M., and by his noble character, eloquence, etc., gains great popularity. He is proclaimed a deliverer and thousands follow him. But he is also, finally, slain by the Indians. This represented the speaker's idea of the situation in Judea at the time of Christ. The Jews were conquered by the Romans. Many deliverers had appeared and been slain, and Jesus among the rest, but not by the Jews but by the Romans.

The lecture was interspersed with many good remarks, as well as with some variance with the only historical data we have. To this category must be counted the assertion that the crucifixion took place on the Sabbath while the Jews were in the temple, and the statement that Judas was known to be an honest man.

The lecturer closed with an eloquent appeal for religious tolerance, making the appeal all the more touching, because it contained a quotation from a sermon of the greatest teacher the world ever had, Jesus Christ.

#### THE BEGINNING OF LONDON.

Let us go back to the beginning of all things—to the lay of the land in which London was planted, says Walter Besant in *Harper's Monthly*. The reader, if he will consult that very desirable book, "*Loftie's History of London*," will find a most instructive map. It shows the terrain before the city was built at all. The river Thames, between Mortlake on the west and Blackwell on the east, pursued a serpentine way, in the midst of marshes stretching north and south. There were marshes all the way. At spring tides and at all tides a little above the common these marshes were under water; they were always swampy and covered with ponds; half a dozen tributary brooks flowed into them and were lost in them. They

varied greatly in breadth, being generally much broader on the south side than on the north. On this side the higher land rose up suddenly in a cliff or steep hill from twenty to five-and-thirty feet in height. The cliff, followed from the east, approached the river, touched it at one point and then receded again as it went westward. This point, where the cliff overhung the river, was the only place where the city could have been founded.

I call it a point, but it consisted of two hillocks, each about thirty-five feet high, standing on either side of the little stream of Walbrook, where it flows into the Thames. On one of these hills, probably that on the west, was a small fortress of the Britons, constructed after the well-known fashion of hill forts, numberless examples of which remain scattered about the country. On the other hillock the Roman city was first commenced.

Here was the beginning of the city; here was instituted very early a ferry over the river. On the eastern hill the Romans built their forum and basilica, with the offices and official houses and quarters. When foreign trade began to increase the merchants were obliged to spread themselves along the banks; they built quays and river walls to keep out the water, and the city extended laterally to east and west, just as far as was convenient for the purposes of trade—that is, not farther than Fleet street on the west and the present tower on the east. It then began to spread northward but slowly, because a mile of river front can accommodate a great working population.

When the city wall was built, about the year 360, the town had already run out in villas and gardens as far as the wall. Outside the wall there was nothing at all, unless one may count a few scattered villas on the south side of the river. There was as yet no Westminster, but in its place a broad and marshy heath spread over the whole area now covered by the city of Westminster, Millbank, St. James' Park, and so far west as Fulham. Beyond the wall on the north lay dreary, uncultivated plains, covered with fens and swamps, stretching from the walls to the lower slopes of the northern hills, and even to the foot of an immense forest, as yet wholly untouched, afterward called the Middlesex forest. Fragments of this forest yet remain a Hampstead, Highgate, Epping and Hainault. In a word, all through this period and for long after, the City of London had an immense marsh lying on the west, a third on the east, while on the north there stretched a barren swampy moorland, followed by an immense impenetrable forest.

Later on a portion of the land lying on the northwest, where is now Holborn, was cleared and cultivated. But this was later, when the Roman roads which went out of London ran high and broad over the marshes and the moors and through the forest primeval. Round other great towns there is always a broad belt of cultivated land protected by the wall and the garrison. Here the people grow for their own use their grain and their fruit and pasture their beasts and their swine. London has no such home farm. The cattle which were driven daily along the roads into the city grazed on pastures