

Mrs. Ellen Rohrer.

Mrs. Ellen Rohrer, formerly of Monmouth, Oregon, and well known as the proprietor of the "Great Oregon Cure for the Lungs," died of paralysis at her home in Indianapolis, Indiana, on Sunday, the 10th day of October last, at 10 minutes past 3 o'clock in the afternoon.

On Friday morning, October 1st, while engaged in the duties connected with the manufacture of her medicine, and being apparently in good health, the fatal stroke came which prostrated her upon the bed of sickness from which she never arose.

Mrs. Rohrer was born in Fountain county, Indiana, Nov. 19, 1833; became a member of the Christian church at the age of thirteen, and remained a constant, worthy and useful member of the same until her death. May 23, 1850, she was married to David Rohrer, who survives her. Five years afterwards they moved to Oregon, and settled at Monmouth. This trip to the far West was taken for the benefit of Mrs. Rohrer's health, which began to fail her at the age of thirteen, and continually grew worse until cured by her own remedy many years after. It is a strange but indisputable fact, that after medical science had exhausted all its resources, and her physicians had pronounced her disease incurable, it was reserved for her own skill and indomitable perseverance, guided, possibly, by the light of inspiration, for her trust in Providence was perfect, to find that which her fast ebbing life required, and which was destined not only to restore herself to health, but that should be the means of alleviating suffering among thousands of her race. This restoration to perfect health, was regarded by her neighbors at the time, as almost miraculous, and opened up a new and different future in the life of this remarkable woman. A patent was obtained, in the name of Ellen Rohrer, for this new and strange medicine, hitherto wholly unknown, until made by her own hands. For a while it was prepared by her at Monmouth, was introduced and had a rapid sale in Oregon. Four years ago Mrs. Rohrer and family came to Indianapolis and commenced the manufacture of her "Great Oregon Cure" on a larger scale, being followed with that success which the noble undertaking of a noble woman deserves. In this work our deceased friend was engaged at the time of her death, and to this work she was devotedly attached, conscientiously believing that it was the great mission of her life. She thought it her duty, a great and binding obligation which she could not escape nor evade, and believing this, no amount of difficulties, trials and discouragements could turn her from the path of duty. The idea of being the means of alleviating in some degree, human suffering, and of doing good to others, was her fixed star. It grew with her in life and ruled strong in death. The writer knew every phase of her character, all its colors, shades and tints. An impostor she could not have been, for no inducements of temporary gain could have caused her to be guilty of the slightest misrepresentations. She would have lost her right arm sooner than knowingly have been the means of doing the slightest injustice to any one. She was the soul of honor, possessed in a high degree of all those finer sensibilities which go to make up the ideal woman. She had a sweet and amiable disposition, a warm, sympathetic heart, loved by her friends and respected by all. Always cheerful, looking on the bright side of life always. Excusing faults in others, forgiving, treasuring naught of spite or anger. She was a model wife and the best of mothers. In sickness she was always sought for and always on hand. In her death society loses a valuable, useful and honored member; her friends, and they were many, will

remember but to love her. The home altar, made doubly dear by her presence, has been pillaged by death, and only "beyond the river" may her face be seen or foot-falls heard. In the hearts of her husband, son and three daughters, there is a void and a waste which nothing but the sunlight of heaven can fill. May heaven's sunlight penetrate the gloom and fill the wastes of death.

LEE BURDICK.

Indianapolis, Nov. 8, 1880.

The Waning Popularity of the Lie.

BY THE REV. DAVID SWING.

The reader will indulge in a skeptical smile when I state, quite calmly, that the common lie has declined in popularity. He will wonder what was once the quantity and quality of mendacity, if in our age there can be detected some falling off in the amount of falsehood told and printed within a given period. Of course, by help of newspaper and orator and salesman and epitaph-writer, there is no scarcity of fabrication and exaggeration; but, after this is admitted, it is still quite certain that the Hebrews and Persians and the Greeks surpassed America in the steadfastness of their falsification. Some incidents in the life of Abraham indicate that the best families of that period resorted to that form of ingenuity which creates a fact out of nothing. The wholesale fashion in which the Hebrews borrowed jewels and did not keep any promise made to return them, the report of those spies who saw giants, and of such stature that Moses and Aaron were only as grasshoppers in comparison, are fragments of an evidence which tends to show that leaders, male and female, generals and spies, possessed a decided ability to make nothing seem something, or something to put on the character of nothing.

It has never been denied that the Persians and Arabs were, from their earliest appearance on the historic stage, accustomed to look upon the truth as a kind of literary joke or a piece of childishness. The gentlemanly Persian called Tissaphernes, made a speech once to some Greek generals, and so polished up his false sentences that he led three heavy-armed Athenian generals into a lonely tent, where their heads were cut off in a most private and perfect manner; and the potent point made in that speech was that, forbidden by fate from ever wearing a crown of gold upon his head, he had made it his happiness to wear a crown of truth in his heart. Dazzled by such saintly excellence, the Greeks addressed repaired to the tent of the speaker, and did not have confirmed to them what the orator had set forth about a truth-crown in his heart. In no page of modern history, away from the deeds of Sioux Indians, can we find the equal of this old Persian lying.

It may well make us cherish hope for our own times when we learn that the skill of the Persians in this direction was equaled by the theory and practice of the Greeks. Nobody will, perhaps, ever know just what Aristotle meant when he said that "in his times there was too much speaking of truth. It seems, from the surrounding moral landscape, that the question whether a man should speak the truth depended upon the loss or gain of such regard for the actual. To tell a truth, when a falsehood would have secured a better result for the speaker, was a form of effeminacy which a philosopher must discourage. Herodotus mentions that Persian children were taught to speak the truth; and it is mentioned by Xenophon as a good quality of the younger Cyrus that he had been taught respect for veracity. It is mentioned as an exceptional kind of teaching, and not as a part of the national education. Darius declared Scythes to be the most just Greek he ever knew, and as proof he cites an instance wherein

this man kept a promise. Cicero in one of his law speeches gives the court his opinion about Greek testimony; and would seem to intimate that Aristotle's alarm lest his countrymen should estimate a true story too highly was not well founded; for the Latin lawyer said: "I grant to the Greeks literary excellence. I concede their skill in many arts, the charm of oratory, acuteness of intellect and facility of speech, and if they should assume to possess some other virtues, I shall not dispute their claim; but I must affirm that that nation does not appreciate the sacred nature of testimony, does not cultivate honesty. Of the value and force and merit of truthfulness it is entirely ignorant."

In the Homeric days craft was one of the best of qualities, and the poems of Homer abound in the eloquence of deception. It is in our day alleged against lawyers only, and against them only as a reproach, that they can make the worse appear the better cause; but in Homeric times it was the charm of all public men to be wily of speech. The crafty Ulysses was noble because he was so double-tongued. The gods and goddesses all did a large lying business, because it was, all through and through, an age of cultivated fraud. Lying being a form of cruelty, for it is a betrayal of faith, and hence a natural companion of crime, it may be inferred from the excessive hardness of much of the Greek epoch. Thucydides reports some awful atrocities in his country, which could not be surpassed by Indians or cannibals; giving an instance where the infants and small children of an enemy were put into a large inclosed threshing-floor, and then oxen were brought in to trample the innocents slowly to death. And when the parents of these murdered babes gained a good opportunity, they put pitch on some children of their enemies and set fire to these living torches. It is easy to believe, after reading these stories, that the average Greek could tell a falsehood at the slightest temptation.

It is generally believed that the Romans gave a new impulse to truth-speaking. An era of grand old Romans came along, and for a time made truth popular with a few; but there is no evidence that this popularity was wide or long-lasting. The reign of falsehood seems almost unbroken, and to have been as slow to pass away as the despotism of kings or the general ignorance of the human race. A lie is a relic of barbarism, and, like other qualities of barbaric times, will long curse the earth with its presence. When truth gave some signs of life by help of the Christian religion, then came the Jesuitical maxim "that one may tell a lie if good can be gained," and under the influence of this teaching falsehood came to the front in the very ages that were devoted to piety. Falsehood was crowned at the altars of God.

We must remember that in olden times the lie was popular with the upper classes, and not with the low idlers and ruffians; and, in comparing the old and the new, we seem justified in saying that the beauty of a downright lie has fallen off greatly in the late generations. Modern statesmen of the highest school surpass Greeks and Romans in their estimate of the worth of veracity. It was a modern that said: "No one can afford to tell a falsehood for anything less than an empire." For a less price or for the acuteness of the affair many of the great classics would freely tell what never came to pass.—Independent.

—When Hans Christian Andersen, one of whose dearest hopes in going to Sweden had been to meet Fredrika Bremer, was presented to her on the deck of a steamer, she had never heard of him, and was quite stiff. He produced one of his books, however, as she left him; and after an hour or so she hurried back. "I know you now," said she; and thus began a lifelong friendship.

Swearing.

"Ye have heard them say of old time, Thou shalt not forswear thyself, but shalt perform unto the Lord thy oaths; but I say unto you, swear not at all, neither by heaven, for it is God's throne; nor by the earth, for it is his footstool; neither by Jerusalem, for it is the city of the great king; neither shalt thou swear by the head, because thou canst not make one hair white or black; but let your communication be yea yea; nay nay; for whatsoever is more than these cometh of evil." Matt. v. 37.

"But above all things, brethren, swear not, neither by heaven, neither by the earth, neither by any other oath; but let your yea be yea, and your nay be nay, lest ye fall into condemnation." James v. 12.

Many, it seems, when they read the foregoing command, mistake cursing for swearing. They forget that "God, because he could swear by no greater, swore by himself, saying, surely blessing I will bless thee," &c. Heb. vi. 14.

Now, will some one who is able, tell me, through the MESSENGER, what the Bible meaning of swearing is, and why is it right for us to take an oath before the court, an oblige

AN INQUIRER.

Aumsville, Or., Nov. 19, 1880.

Will Education Yield Subsistence?

An education, yes; but what sort of an education? A bricklayer's education, an artisan's, a farmer's, would indeed help him to earn a living. A college education would give him a social advantage, but it would not, in itself, increase his chance of earning a living; it would rather diminish it. For, as was pointed out in an interesting paper lately published in this magazine, our colleges do not, like the French and German universities, instruct a young man in the bread-winning pursuits; the American colleges are, on the contrary, institutions for general culture. I do not take up the question here of the amount and value of the culture they supply. The point for us to note is that the educated

young American who has not a special education as a bread-winner is worse off, as to his money prospects, than the young American who has no college education at all. Dig he can not, and to beg he is ashamed. Two of the professions at least are fatally overcrowded. The United States, with a population not greatly larger than that of the German Empire, graduates every year five times as many physicians; for the German Empire limits the number of its doctors, and we do not limit that of ours.

Very many of our physicians not only wait years for practice, but never get into practice at all. It is much the same with the profession of law. In both professions there are prizes for a few, and failures, more or less complete, for the many. The engineering, mining, and other scientific professions offer a somewhat better chance, and public life, almost neglected as a profession, will attract a better class of young men from year to year. But upon none of these, save in favored and exceptional cases, as where a son succeeds to his father's practice, can a young man depend for fortune, or even for immediate support. They, too, offer a certain social dignity. But as a rule it is the laborer, artisan, or tradesman that has the better chance of supporting himself; it is the educated man that has, more frequently, to wait before he can pay his way. If, therefore, we educate our sons, it is all the better reason why we should provide, not indeed for their independence, but some aid during the years which they are likely to spend in waiting before they can achieve their position.

It is to be remembered, too, that these years of waiting may become, with such aid, years of scholarly or

scientific accomplishment, if not of money-making; years of strengthened preparation; years that might introduce and brighten a career, instead of wasted years that cloud or spoil it.—T. M. COAN, in *Harper's Magazine* for November.

Learning a Foreign Tongue.

That a foreign language may be learned and even thoroughly mastered without the unwholesome drudge of memorizing the rules of its grammar and syntax is an important truth which the majority of young men and women who have no inclination to widen culture, but hesitate before sacrificing much time to the process, do not sufficiently recognize. It is a fact, however, that of two students who shall take up any language with a view of obtaining a key to its literature, the one by way of grammar, the other in some great classic, the latter will outstrip his competitor not only at the beginning, but will retain his advantage, for the reason that while he is insensibly learning the laws of the language, he is also mastering that inner meaning, that subtle something which we call the genius of the tongue. Of course, we do not intend to undervalue the value of the grammar as a discipline, although we are convinced that mathematics offer a better medium with greater good in the end. We are speaking for those who aim at a knowledge of a literature, not for amateur philologist. Minister Lowell, in addressing the Workingmen's College of London recently, stated that he had read "Dante," and at the same time mastered Italian simply with the aid of a dictionary. Bayard Taylor was enabled in the same manner to give to the world his great translation of "Faust"—a translation which reproduces the original as nearly as it is possible in English; and Mr. Lowell mentioned as another notable instance a gentleman residing in a little Vermont village, who not only learned Danish by his own unaided efforts, but was enabled to keep up a correspondence with Danish scholars. Of course, as our accomplished representative at the Court of St. James remarks, there is inspiration in a living teacher, and then again, every one is not a Taylor or a Lowell. But the fact remains that any person of average intelligence can by faithful study vastly increase his knowledge and derive incalculable benefit from direct contact with the great minds of all ages in their own vernacular. Let the student, therefore, choose in some language some master spirit of its loftiest development: in Greek, Homer; in Latin, Virgil; in Italian, Dante; in French, Corneille; in Spanish, Cervantes; in German, Goethe. Having learned the rudiments of the tongue, and if possible, the pronunciation through a living teacher—the latter a desirable, though by no means necessary, step—and with the aid of a dictionary, and at the beginning, perhaps, a literal translation of the author, he will find himself in a comparatively short space of time making surprising advancement. And for those who have not the energy or desire to undertake a foreign language, there is their mother tongue, of which none of us can know much, and which can be mastered in no other way than in the pages of classics with dictionary and notebooks at the reader's elbow. The long winter evenings afford plenty of time for such a course of study, which if it point the way to the mastery of one great book, will have resulted in the acquirement of a liberal education.—Boston Traveler.

—When we are young we waste a great deal of time in imagining what we will do when we grow older, and when we are old we waste an equal amount of time in wondering why we waited so long before we began to do anything.