UNIVERSITY OF ST. MICHAEL'S COLLEGE
3 1761 07097055 3

CARSWELL Co., Limited
Bookbinders,
Printers,
Law Books,
Publishers, etc.
TORONTO
ONT.

ST. MICHAEL'S COLLEGE
LIBRARY

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

http://www.archive.org/details/dublinreview139londuoft

THE DUBLIN REVIEW

Edited by Wilfrid Ward

Volume CXXXIX
Quarterly Nos 277, 278; July & October 1906

BURNS & OATES
28 Orchard Street London W

THE CONTENTS
July and October, 1906

Our Latin Bible. By the Rev. W. Barry, D.D. *Page* 1
Some Characteristics of Henry Sidgwick. By the Editor 24
Matilda of Tuscany. By Viscount Llandaff 38
In a Library. A Poem. By G. W. 72
Crinagoras of Mitylene. By Professor J. S. Phillimore 74
Catholic Social Effort in France 87
The Syrian Christians in India 105
The Plaint of the Kine. By the Bishop of Salford 123
The Condemnation of Pope Honorius. By Dom John Chapman, O.S.B. 129
Denominationalism and the Education Bill 155
Some Recent Books 181

Histoire de l'Église, by Mgr Duchesne—Father Tyrrell's Lex Credendi—The Origin of Life, by J. Butler Burke—The Metaphysic of Causes, by Père de Régnon—The Unseen World and the Dangers of Spiritualism—Richard Raynal: Solitary—Fenwick's Career—Out of Due Time—L'Œuvre des Apôtres—The Witness of the Gospels—Mgr Moyes on the Existence of God—St Francis as Social Reformer—Father Thurston's Stations of the Cross—The Founder of St-Sulpice—Histoire de la Théologie Positive, by the Abbé Turmel—Père Souben on Dogmatic Theology—A Modern Pilgrim's Progress and A Soul's Wayfaring—M. Lefébure's Portraits de Croyants—The Religion of All Good Men—L'Église Byzantine—The Early Scottish Church—Simple Annals, by M. E. Francis—Dr Inge's Studies of the English Mystics—the Door of Humility—Voyage de Sparte, by Maurice Barrès—Möhler's Symbolism—Greek Theories of Cognition, by J. I. Beare—The Life and Letters of Alfred Ainger, by Miss Edith Sichel.

Catholic Reviews, Home and Foreign 228
For Truth or for Life 233
The Report of the Ritual Commission. By the Rev. R. H. Benson 252
Æneas Sylvius and Nicholas de Cusa: Symbols of the Renaissance 267
The Fiscal Question. By Hilaire Belloc, M.P. 277
Fénelon in Exile, 1699-1715. By the Hon. Mrs Maxwell Scott 300

The Contents

Is Socialism Right after all? By C. S. Devas, M.A. 321
Guildford Slingsby and John Morris: two Servants of Lord Strafford 339
The Dance of Death. Adapted from Victor Hugo's "Fantômes." By Wilfrid Scawen Blunt 359
The Catholic Missions in the Congo Free State. By John de Courcy MacDonnell 362
Winchester, Mother of Schools. By Mgr Stapleton Barnes, M.A. 383
The Church of France and the French People 400
Some Recent Books 412

Dr Gigot's Introduction to the Study of the Old Testament—Mr Bodley's The Church in France—M. Barry's Le Droit d'Enseigner—Le Clergé Rural sous l'Ancien Régime—Les Saints—Pauline Marie Jaricot—Father Magnier's St Gerard Majella—Father Lucas's Sermons to Boys—Mrs Craigie's The Dream and the Business—Father Benson's The Queen's Tragedy—The Abbé Turmel's Saint Jérôme—Father Meyer's Institutiones Juris Naturalis—Le Comte Domet de Vorges' Abrégé de Métaphysique—Six Westminster Lectures—Dr Moulton's Grammar of N. T. Greek—Father Mann's Lives of the Popes—Father Denifle's Luther—Science in Public Affairs—Sir John Thompson

Books Received 438

OUR LATIN BIBLE

Histoire de la Vulgate pendant les premiers Siècles du Moyen Age. Par Samuel Berger. Paris: Hachette. 1893.
Geschichte der Vulgata. Von Dr Fr. Kaulen. Mainz. 1870.
Handbuch zur Vulgata. Idem. 1870.
Opera Sti Hieronymi, studio D. Vallarsi. Venice. 1766-71.

FIRST of modern books, we said in our preceding article, is the Latin Vulgate.* Under one form or another it has come down to us through seventeen centuries; and at this day it is alive, studied, recited, newly edited, by Catholic priests and religious vowed to its unceasing commemoration in their offices; by scholars, Anglican or merely scientific; by historians and *literati*, who follow the Roman chronicles in their second or Christian course. Of all versions which reproduce the Holy Scriptures in a Western tongue it may be considered the prototype. None have altogether escaped its influence: not Luther's Bible, nor King James's, nor the Revised of these latter years. The Catholic nations, from Poland to South America, read it in their own dialects, and that in translations the sources of which go back beyond the Council of Trent, especially as regards the New Testament. But on all the world of volumes thus widely scattered one stamp is discernible; one editor, whom in a very true sense M. Berger styles the author, must be owned as gathering up whatever of value the classical Latin could bequeath, and combining with it elements rich in life and poetry from the rustic old Italian for this book of books. It was rightly termed in the Middle Ages the Divine Library of St Jerome: *Bibliotheca Hieronymi.*† Linguist, critic, master of words, genius by nature indefatigable and severe, not to be moulded on another man's pattern, the Dalmatian Saint was given that he might do for medieval and modern Europe that which Origen had not succeeded in doing for the Greeks. His Vulgate remains unique among translations. If we will not say with Dean Burgon that it is "the best commentary on the Bible," at any rate we know it to be the most interesting and authoritative. It is, in fact, the Church's Bible. And St Jerome's name will stand, while Rome lasts, on its title page.

---

* *Dublin Review*, April, 1906, "The Holy Latin Tongue."

† Codex S. Germani, ad calcem Ep. ad Hebr.

Hence the Benedictine editors opened their collection of the Saint's writings with his Vulgate; and Vallarsi, to whom we are indebted for a still better recension, admirable in type as in the more serious care of text and notes, decided by their example that he must also reproduce it. He made use for this end of the celebrated Codex of Verona, his native city, which has Psalms and Gospels in Old Latin.* But how many others he would now have to consult before he might call his edition critical, students like M. Berger will tell us. It appears that some eight thousand manuscripts of the Latin Scriptures are known to exist. On collation of a few among these and early printed Bibles our present text, the Clementine of 1592, is founded. The lately-attempted revisions, which do not travel outside the New Testament, are associated with the names of Tischendorf, Hetzenauer, Wordsworth and White. Anything like a complete and satisfactory screening of the materials extant would include a study of quotations in medieval Latin literature from the fifth century down to the time of Stephen Langton and Roger Bacon. Clearly there is no lack of opportunity here for scholars who know not how to dispose of their mornings in the country! Shall a Protestant Bishop, such as Dr Wordsworth, have spent his leisure on our Vulgate, and enthusiastic young Catholics be wanting to take up the task he left undone? *Avertat Deus!* It is a challenge which we are bound to accept. And in proportion as we appreciate St Jerome's labours, so much the more shall we be encouraged to make the fruits of them our own.

Rightly, however, to estimate the mingled skill and good fortune which were combined in this *Opus Maximum* of Catholic antiquity, we must begin with its Old Latin foundation. The story is not yet unravelled, perhaps never will be, since, like other famous origins, the Vulgate has its period of darkness. We are driven to conjecture when we reach beyond St Cyprian's date (250 A.D.), or at all events that of Tertullian, half a century earlier. The scattered notices in St Augustine and St Jerome have been carefully examined, but they yield very little, or rather nothing, that comes up to our demand for evidence, as regards the circumstances under which a Latin Bible first appeared. St Augustine, who probably means by his word "interpretation" the original rendering, and not merely a recension, had no materials except the manuscripts of his day from which to draw inferences. Therefore his statement implying a large number of separate Old Latin versions from the Greek, and "an infinite variety of interpreters," leaves the history where it was. St Jerome's language is ambiguous and disputable. Zahn observes with much good sense that if these Fathers had a definite tradition to go upon which reported the time, place and authorship of their elder version, we should find them explicitly setting it down. This in particular is true of St Jerome, who was curious about facts, though not always disinclined to colour them in transit, as we sometimes feel where he quotes Eusebius. It would seem, therefore, that our only way of arriving at a sound conclusion must be indirect, by comparison of texts and versions themselves.*

---

* See Preface to Vol. IX, pp. vii seq., in Venice edition, 1766-71.

St Cyprian, whose musical periods betray the rhetorician, and are frequently, as Benson points out, "a softened echo of strong words," adheres to one particular type of text, perhaps always, in quoting Scripture, though he did not as a literary critic prize that rustic Latin at its genuine worth. Nevertheless, he keeps to it; and his *Testimonia* (which in Hartel's edition occupy one hundred and fifty pages) exhibit a catena the links of which are all citations from the same version. Was it not then "authorized," as we now speak, in Africa, by the year 250, so that a Bishop of Carthage might not disregard it any more than a modern Bishop the Tridentine Bible? It has been so held by competent writers. This Cyprianic recension is nearly identical with our Codex Bobiensis (*k*) in the Gospels (recognized as the standard Old Latin text) and has affinities with the Palatine and the Claromontane. Hort designated the group "African." He found a second which circulated in Northern Italy, and this he called "European"; while a third, the second revised, as it would appear, and much used by St Augustine, he termed "Italian." These names, however, do not indicate the origin but only the character of the readings in question. No recent explorer has accepted the solution which Wiseman put forward in this *Review*, suggestive and learned as it was at the time, viz., that our Old Latin Scriptures displayed their African *provenance* by the idioms occurring in them. Studies more profound have brought to light the wide range of popular Latin. If the first Western Bible holds much in common with Carthaginian usages, it contains also numerous elements that we may observe in Petronius; in the lawyers, as Papinian, Ulpian and Paulus; nay, in Spanish and Gaulish remains, as well as in the *Corpus Inscriptionum;* all bearing witness to a dialect with variations according to locality, which developed on its own lines and did not obey the classic rules. In other words, the Bible was cast into spoken Latin, familiar to every rank of society though not countenanced in the schoolroom; and thus it foreshadowed the revolution of ages whereby the Roman tongue expanded into what we may label as Romance—those rich and varied sister-languages that are now spread over Europe from the Black Sea to the Atlantic Ocean. Their common prelude is the Vulgate.*

---

* Aug. *De Doct. Christ.* II, 11, 13; Jerome, *Præf. in Paralip.; in Job; in Proverb.; Ep. ad Damasum;* Ziegler, *Latin Bible Versions before Jerome* (Germ.), 6, 10, 13; Wiseman, older view, *Essays*, I, 24.

Tertullian could perhaps have enlightened us with regard to its unofficial stage. He is not like Cyprian, consistent; often he translates directly from the Greek, or his citations drop on the paper by memory. That he follows in part the same text which Cyprian had is indubitable. More we cannot affirm. And what was the state of the case before Tertullian? The Roman Church, during the second century and some decades of the third, kept its Greek liturgy; nevertheless, it surely made use of Latin to instruct and exhort the native converts whose household dialect could not be foreign. At this point we are left in the dark. How shall we kindle a ray for future guidance?

---

* Bibliography in Kaulen, *Handbuch*, 6, 8.

The map tells us that our sacred writings would penetrate into Christian Africa by one, or both, of two routes: most easily by way of Rome, which was hardly more than twenty-four hours' voyage; but likewise by the Northern coast from Alexandria. Then, too, the Latin versions, being traceable to some particular Greek sources, should carry in their make signs and tokens of the quarter whence they proceeded. The clue thus thrown out has been followed up. It is known that Greek MSS. of the New Testament fall into strongly-marked groups, one of which, tabulated as the Western, may be studied in the long-paramount Codex of Beza (D). That recension, from the time of Erasmus, held its rank as the *textus receptus* of the sacred volume. It has now given place to a skilful blending of sources more relied upon. But when stripped of its "conflate" interpolations, it yields a result substantially in agreement with our Old Latin; hence " Western " is an apt name for the group. To these considerations it must be added that, while our Latin on one side resembles the Western Greek family, so on the other does the Syriac in its several versions. We are now, as children say in the game of hide-and-seek, "burning." The Old Latin, the basis of the Peshitta, the Western Greek, had a common home. Where was it, then? Scholars reply, at Antioch on the Orontes, where the disciples of Jesus were first called Christians.

Arguments for this fascinating theory come by distinct paths; as a conclusion it has found advocates of the *momenta* composing it in Kaulen, Chase, Rendel Harris, Sanday and Kennedy.* A German writer, Resch, would even hold that the archetype of Codex D, i.e., of this whole group, existed in a Gospel canon made about the year 140. We mention the date as a convenient *memoria technica*. Speaking broadly, we may say that the original from which our Old Latin was derived belongs to the period of Tatian's *Diatessaron*, if not somewhat earlier. Dean Robinson thinks a Latin version was in existence so far back as 177 A.D., and was circulated in

---

* Hastings, *D. B.* III, 54-56, a good compendium.

Gaul. Supposing that we allow Dr Sanday's remarkable hypothesis of a "workshop of manuscripts" in the second century at Antioch, we are brought to the luminous though still conjectural idea that Greek, Latin and Syriac, by reason of their affinities, had their starting-point in that capital of Christendom, which Newman somewhere calls "the first Apostolic See." The primitive associations of Antioch with Rome are significant. We sum them up in St Peter and St Paul, St Luke and St Ignatius. "Peter the Apostle," says St Jerome, translating the *Chronicon* of Eusebius under the year 42 or 44 A.D., "first pontiff of the Christians, when he had founded the Church of Antioch, sets out for Rome, where he preaches the Gospel and continues twenty-five years Bishop of the same city." There follows immediately another suggestive entry: "Mark the Evangelist, St Peter's interpreter, announces Christ to Egypt and Alexandria." Thus, on whatever line of country the Scriptures came into the West, we find at its beginning St Peter the Apostle. Who the translators may have been, we cannot say. But their work, in Antioch or elsewhere, went forward under the eyes of the Bishop; and without his approval it would not have been finally received. For us it remains anonymous; until St Jerome revised its now corrupt editions, it had so great a dignity that St Augustine shrank from any tampering with it. And the consequence has been altogether that our present Bible in manner and substance bears, throughout the New Testament as well as frequently in the Old, a close likeness to the primitive Latin from which it comes down.

To the Roman province of Syria, then, we may hold ourselves indebted for the first Western Bible. It had great merits. Kaulen has proved the acquaintance of its authors with Hebrew or Aramaic. Alone among versions from the Greek, it contains a text which antedates Origen's Hexapla. And so, as the *Encyclopædia Biblica* says, it "occupies a unique position, and must be regarded as the chief authority for the restoration of the κοινὴ ἔκδοσις, or pre-Hexaplaric LXX." Another light shows how it is related by anticipation to the text of Lucian the Antiochene presbyter, whose Septuagint has good ancient readings. But the Old Latin remains an "invaluable witness," for it gives the true Greek Vulgate "approximately pure." We need scarcely observe that such a check on the Massoretic recension has its doctrinal no less than its critical value.*

What of its literary form? Granting the high antiquity of these older Latin versions, we see also that they represent the original with punctilious care. "They preserve," says Hastings' *Dictionary*, "the late Latin renderings of an extant Greek original," prior to any MSS. which now survive, and they use many varieties of synonyms, abnormal constructions, strange formations, "all of which reveal the tendencies of the later language."

"It is disputed," observes Matthew Arnold, "what aim a translator should propose to himself in dealing with his original." There is a school which would sacrifice verbal precision; "the reader should forget that it is a translation and be lulled into the illusion that he is reading an original work." On the other hand, Francis Newman, who would not tolerate this method, was desirous "to retain every peculiarity of the original," and "with the greater care the more foreign it might happen to be." In like manner Robert Browning, "If, because of the immense fame of the following tragedy [the *Agamemnon*], I wished to acquaint myself with it, and could only do so by the help of a translator, I should require him to be literal at every cost save that of absolute violence to our language."† Now the men who took in hand to give Rome and the West a rendering of the Bible from Hellenistic Greek, below which lay Hebrew ideas, were moved thereto, not by the "immense fame," but by the divinely inspired character of the volumes they had before them. Verbal accuracy to the degree of barbarism was what they aimed at, even as the Jew Aquila when he turned into almost unintelligible Greek the language of Zion. So they invented new words, set grammar at defiance, transplanted Hebrew idioms bodily, and fashioned a prose with its accent or music hitherto not dreamt of in Latin.

---

* *E. Bibl.* "Text and Versions," 5022.

† Arnold, *On Translating Homer*, 2; Browning, Pref. to *Agam.* v.

Our Latin Bible

Translations from the Attic style, from Plato and Demosthenes, were a holiday task for Cicero; but no one had been led to the seemingly impossible thought of putting Hebrew into a Latin toga. The languages were as disparate as the matter was barbarous to civilized minds. We know how seldom an Oriental book has triumphed over difficulties such as these. Nor would the Scriptures have been more fortunate did they simply appeal to a learned or literary audience. Their claim was that under symbols rude and exotic they contained the wisdom of God. Their "barbarism," i.e., their non-Hellenic origin, thus became their justification, as appears so forcibly in Clement of Alexandria. But the impact of a new life, with which they smote upon literature in decline, was mighty enough to call out a reaction which is not yet exhausted. Graceful classic renderings could never have wrought this miracle. They would have defeated the religious purpose by subduing to colours already familiar a doctrine most unlike the cold, hard discipline of Rome; and no literary transformation would have followed. But modern Europe owes its character in a marked degree to the combination of Hebrew ethics and dogmas with what was least unspoilt in provincial or rustic Latin. That neither Pagan, Jew nor Christian quite understood the movement at large is merely an illustration of the laws which govern historical perspective. The thing was too great to be measured by one age or generation.

Moreover, its real significance lay hid beneath a mask of Puritanism, which, as Tertullian exemplifies, made this new people, termed Christian, alien to the social usages, and consequently to much of the language, current around them. The cultivated style had become a dead letter, taught in schools, imitated by pedants, when our Bible was done into a vigorous uncouth dialect by men without respect for Quintilian. How much they brought of daring innovation and an entirely fresh poetical sense to the Latin they so violently handled, we shall point out later. To them, rather than St Jerome, is due the ground-tone of the Vulgate which we possess. And this again we must attribute to a principle, in itself not accepted by the Saint—he calls it often "misdirected zeal"—which clung to the letter, was rigidly faithful, and took no account of the reader's embarrassment before a text that he could not make out. Our Latin Psalms, in particular, still offer dark sayings, where meaning and construction are anything but clear. Yet St Jerome was hardly allowed to touch them, so sacred in the ears of the congregations did they sound. The whole of our New Testament had thus grown to be stereotyped; and though skilfully amended wherever possible in the Hieronymian revise, it could not be simply translated afresh from the Greek for public service.

Local differences, nevertheless, made their way in, or existed from the beginning; and so we are brought round to the distinction established by Westcott and Hort between African, European and Italian families of Old Latin MSS.

Taking the Gospels for our standard, we learn that the African, represented as was said by the Codex Bobiensis, have the most ancient texts, not revised according to any Greek sources after St Cyprian. The so-called European had their course in the fourth century, among Gauls, Italians and Spaniards. Some association of this group with Eusebius of Vercelli has been traced; it is possible that the Latin Irenæus (of disputed age, but undeniable importance) comes from the same school. Critics observe a smoothness, or even a certain insipidity, in the "European" type, which leads them to consider it as the old African revised. Its MSS. are numerous, centred round the Veronensis (*b*), and the Vercellensis (*a*). When we arrive at the "Italian" group, we find ourselves on a battlefield crowded with combatants. Is this the edition called "Itala" by St Augustine and strongly recommended in the well-known words, "*In ipsis autem interpretationibus Itala ceteris præferatur, nam est verborum tenacior cum perspicuitate sententiæ*"? Our greatest English scholar, "slashing" Bentley, proposed to read *illa* for *Itala;* others have suggested *usitata.* But Kenrick showed, in 1874, that *Italia* was the regular name from the third century onward of the political diocese which had Milan for its capital. St Augustine's *Confessions* narrate how intently the Bible occupied his thoughts and studies when he became acquainted in that city with its Bishop, Ambrose, the quotations in whose writings exhibit the text now preserved in the Codex Brixianus (*f*) and the Freisingen Fragments (*r*) of St Paul's Epistles. It would seem, therefore, to be probable that this family is the one intended. But, as St Jerome's New Testament approximates more closely to the Brescian type thus singled out than to any other, we can see why, later on, St Isidore of Seville and Walafrid Strabo fixed the epithet "Italian" upon our actual Vulgate.* For clearness' sake it is advisable not to employ the term "Vetus Itala," when we mean the Old Latin.*

Neither must we draw these lines of variation too strictly. St Jerome's dictum concerning editions, "*tot sunt pæne quot codices*," while it exaggerates differences, also proves what modern learning has demonstrated, that our groups pass easily into one another—perhaps that "every region of importance ecclesiastically had its own recension." Here the name of Priscillian, Spanish bishop, scholar and heretic, has lately become important. Bible quotations in his works display resemblances to Late African, and very markedly indeed to the type of Leon. Another intermediate section brings us across Lucifer, Bishop of Cagliari in Sardinia, whose meddling at Antioch perpetuated the schism that provoked St Jerome's famous letter to Pope Damasus.† In it we reach once more the great Bible workshop whence our Latin first issued. The next stage takes us on to Bethlehem, with its monks, scriveners, devout women, and to the Doctor Maximus, busy day after day for more than thirty years (389-420) in toil as unceasing as Origen's, amid controversies beyond number, always intent upon the Bible, translating, revising, explaining it, for the centuries to come.

A training more adequate to the extent and difficulties of his enterprise, no Christian scholar until the latest modern period has enjoyed. Almost from infancy the Roman lad, born on the confines of Dalmatia and Pannonia (340, 342 ?) was learning how to be a man of letters. His father,

---

* Hastings, *D. B.* III, 57.

† Opera, I, Ep. 16.

Eusebius, taught him the elements. He was sent to Rome as his university, put under the celebrated Donatus, became an excellent classic in both languages, Greek and Latin; "Wellnigh from our cradle," he says, "we have been exercised among grammarians, rhetoricians, philosophers." But he had no turn for abstruse speculations, and he teaches even the mystical doctrines of Christianity with a hard common sense. Very characteristic are the swift vehemence, blazing temper, trust in his own resources, and somewhat unrefined humour which did not spare man or woman who crossed his way of thinking. Rufinus, when they had quarrelled, thought his heathen accomplishments disgraceful in a monk, "*dum totus Plautinæ et Tullianæ cupis eloquentiæ sectator videri.*" And Jerome confesses, in the singular Epistle to Eustochium which is a page of his autobiography, that when he was worn out with fasting and tears he took up Plautus for recreation. The comedian's hearty laugh is echoed in the divine's correspondence. Strength, not subtlety or Virgilian pathos, marks the soldier-saint, whose breeding was in the neighbourhood of camps, and his life upon earth a warfare. In disposition he resembles Cato rather than Cicero; but he was a born linguist. For words and phrases he had a memory which bit them as into steel or copper. He recalled them after twenty years without book. His own writing was direct, sarcastic, fierce to his enemies, a little too florid when addressing friends, astonishingly pure in diction, but it never touched the heights where prose or rhyme kindles to inspired beauty. He is, almost by definition, matter of fact.

Those who judge history to be a science, learning a question of detail, and criticism the anatomy of words, will find St Jerome always interesting. He is their man. A great man, undoubtedly; conspicuous among the world's triumphant scholars, not to be superseded in this day of Eastern discoveries and textual abundance. His merits cannot be overdrawn. Perhaps the chief of them was that he knew Latin so thoroughly as to elicit from its unsuspected powers a new language, equal to the demands of religion, strikingly novel in its whole effect, firm and deep enough to withstand the wear and tear of centuries, fresh now as in his own time. Neither Tyndale nor Luther, whom their English and German votaries would compare with St Jerome, need be mentioned here. Both, in a certain degree, are antiquated; the Latin of the Vulgate remains unsubdued by years. It claims all the privileges of a dead language, while it lives on the lips of generations ever new.

At Treves it was, when less than thirty, that Jerome wrote out the *Commentaries* of St Hilary on the Psalms. His baptism had taken place not long before. But the turning point in his life, as he looked back upon it, occurred in 373 at Antioch, after a journey from the West by Thrace and Asia Minor. He gave up the study of profane authors, retired to the desert and set about learning Hebrew. Pleasantly, in reply to critics later on, he observes, "*Latinus sermo utcumque nobis non deest.*" Hebrew to the multitude of Christians was not simply unknown, but held in slight consideration; while the Greek of the Seventy, as most among their teachers believed, had come to its interpreters straight from heaven. To pass it by and take lessons from "the Jew, Barabbas," implied no ordinary courage. But Jerome had his answer ready. When those Jews glanced at that unhallowed Greek, they charged upon it interpolations and mistakes; neither would they suffer it to be quoted against them. "Out of their own book," said the new apologist, "we Christians ought to convince our opponents; therefore we must acquire the truth as it is in Hebrew." Take note how, on one side, he was rebuked for his knowledge of heathen Latin; on the other, for attempting to master the language of Israel. These are heads of accusation which he dwells upon constantly, returning scorn for scorn.* "I thrust my hand into the fire," he exclaims, "that Jews might no more insult the Church as ignorant."

In 379 he was (much against his will) ordained priest by Paulinus, the Latin Bishop of Antioch; but it is remarkable that he never afterwards said Mass. His calling, as he viewed it, was that of the cenobite and the scholar. St Epiphanius, who greatly admired him, puts down this resolution to the monk's profound humility; nothing, at all events, would persuade Jerome, even in the crisis brought about by his dispute with John of Jerusalem concerning Origen, to celebrate the liturgical office. Writer and cenobite he remained until his death. True, he spent from 379 to 381 with St Gregory Nazianzen at Constantinople; and then comes the Roman episode, without which no Vulgate of his editing would have reached posterity. Yet a few short years (382-385) will cover it. The rest of his days he dwelt in Palestine, where he died on September 30, 420.

---

* Opera, 1, 426-430, *Ep. ad Magnum.*

To the Spanish Pope Damasus, "a great Pontiff" in modern estimation, and to his care for the order of Church service, we owe it that St Jerome was made something like official translator in Rome. The Papal mandate first had in view a revision of the New Testament, largely corrupted by multiplication of copies. That he dealt with all its books has been doubted, yet his own language is very clear. Liturgical reasons forbade his undertaking a version utterly *de novo;* his emendations of the Gospels were cautious, and in St Paul's Epistles they are not easy to trace. What Greek MSS. he followed in particular we have no means of determining; but their quality was excellent, and we may associate them with our actual Sinaitic and Vatican texts, though others must have been consulted. Outside the Gospels Jerome did little more than polish the Old Latin readings into smoother forms. At all times he worked with amazing speed. His first instalment, the four Evangelists, appeared in 383, after little more than twelve months' labour. By the end of 385 he had gone over the remaining books.

He also revised in Rome the old Psalter from the LXX during this busy period, which has given rise to the painters' legend of him as a Cardinal in a red hat. Certainly his influence with Pope Damasus, and his fame in the world, might have yielded him these honours, if they were then accessible. Such things belong to another epoch. Jerome did not covet places, titles or money. There was no copyright in the Vulgate; nor would his dearest friends have ventured on offering the scholar payment for a single sheet. Their alms went to the work itself, to buy materials, supply MSS., and reward the numerous scribes who set down the text which Jerome dictated. He thought no virtue so easy as the disdain of wealth: "*Hoc enim et Crates fecit philosophus, et multi alii divitias contempserunt.*" But Pope Damasus died towards the winter of 384; and Siricius, who did not favour Jerome, reigned in his stead. The monk naturally glanced eastwards again. He set out for Palestine in August, 385, when his New Testament was done, travelled through the Holy Land, then saw Egypt, and fixed his abode at Bethlehem, where a double monastery was established in 389, after the Oriental fashion. Some time during these journeys he completed from the LXX a second revision of the Psalms, long known as the Gallican Psalter, which under St Pius V became official, and is the one we use. It will be found in the Clementine Bible.

Very few Catholics now trouble themselves about the Septuagint. It has become in our schools the shadow of a name. For the Christians, however, of East and West until the fifth century dawned, that complex and unequal series of translations, made we know not exactly when or by whom, had authority as quoted by the Apostles and even as literally inspired. St Jerome held the Lucianic recension in some disfavour; resolute opponent as he was, after slight early leanings the other way, of Origen's theology, as a text he preferred the Hexaplar by which to be guided in amending the Latin Old Testament. His efforts, which, if we take what he tells us rigorously, extended to a complete handling of this vast collection, were unfortunate. The greater part of his work, he wrote in 416 to St Augustine, had been stolen from him, and nothing of it except a few fragments is left. Of one thing we may be sure: the lonely scholar, confronted by a Greek Old Testament received everywhere, did his utmost to find and translate a satisfactory text. Living, however, among Orientals, and daily better versed in the language, manners, topography of the Holy Land, the conviction grew upon him that none but a fresh rendering from the Jewish Bible would meet the demands of experts. Approbation, such as he had from Pope Damasus for an amendment of the popular Latin

Gospels, was not likely to be given. His most venturesome work was undertaken at the instance of private friends, without a plan, as if merely to please the more learned and not for public use. Yet, even so, many condemned it in the strongest terms as not only superfluous but rash and unsound.

About fifteen years elapsed (390-405) ere this immortal enterprise saw its completion. Jerome began it with Samuel and Kings, to which he prefixed, *more suo*, a challenge known as the Prologus Galeatus. The Psalms, Prophets and Job followed, and before 396 the books of Esdras (i.e., Ezra-Nehemiah) with Chronicles. "Broken by a long illness," he did nothing for at least a year. In 398 he gave out Proverbs, Ecclesiastes and Canticles, done, though it seems hardly credible, in three days. When the Pentateuch appeared is uncertain, perhaps 401. Joshua, Judges, Ruth and Esther belong to 405. The reluctant as well as rapid oversight of Tobias, Judith and the Greek Daniel and Esther brought Jerome's translations to an end.*

Our interest in the story is manifold. The never-ceasing quarrel between custom and scholarship finds here one of its most remarkable exhibitions. Jerome repeats, but to little purpose at his day, that he intends no censure of the ancients; that he venerates the Seventy; that he had kept close to his Hebrew original, and thereby cleared up doubtful places in the Greek and Latin. He was called a forger, *falsarius*, charged with sacrilege as laying hands on a God-given text, and, as he says, "run down in public though read in private" by the very men who blamed in him what they approved in others. He complains bitterly, "Were I making baskets of reeds or weaving palm-leaves together, and so eating my bread in the sweat of my brow, not a creature would rend or rebuke me." But he was doing an imperishable work, hence the accusation. "*Tanta est enim vetustatis consuetudo*," he remarks, "*ut etiam confessa plerisque vitia placeant, dum magis pulchros habere volunt codices, quam emendatos.*" Cheap and poor though his "papers" might be, however, in comparison with old vellum copies inscribed in purple and uncial letters, they represented the

---

* Hastings, *D.B.* iv, 875-6 for these dates.

Hebrew truth. On this foundation, *Hebraica veritas*, he took his stand with increasing confidence. We now read the Saint's victorious prologues at the head of our Bible, inserted by Roman authority.* The word Vulgate itself, long applied to the Greek Seventy, has been taken over in triumph and carries the name of Jerome in its syllables. How did such a change come about? Scholarship alone would never have won the day. So much is clear from the failure of the Saint's last work on the Psalms, an admirable version, which could not gain a footing in Missal or Breviary. What combination of elements was it, then, that overcame the prepossessions even of an Augustine before he died, so that he accepted Jerome's Gospels by 404, while in his *Speculum* and the *De Civitate* he follows the new Latin text?

We may indicate the answer which, in our narrow limits, cannot be developed. St Jerome, while creating a literary masterpiece, wrought under conditions more favourable than he believed. There was a Church-Latin already in existence; and although "*sancta quippe rusticitas sola sibi prodest*," as he writes to Paulinus, and he has often to insist on the privileges of sacred learning, yet, like other creative minds, he took all that suited him from the past. In an age when Ausonius, a real decadent, was stringing together *florilegia;* when Claudian feebly echoed the hexameters of a dead and gone antiquity, Jerome too might have droned verses and indulged conceits as they did, were his subject not the Scriptures. There his natural taste for rhetoric was curbed; the matter he could not diversify; and inside a well-marked range even the words had their prescription. As a Hebrew expert he was bound by the text furnished to him; in substance, not altogether, it was the Massorah which is our actual reading. As a Roman divine he recognized instinctively, though sometimes chafed by the rule, that old sacred terms were not to be cast away; and in studying the rustic Latin he caught more than he suspected of its colour.

His style was hardy and expressive. Critics admire in the Vulgate "the classic simplicity of its language," and of this St Jerome deserves all the praise. Large, nay continual, differences are observed between his translation and those which it superseded, especially as regards the Hebrew volume; but he comes after the Old Latin and not in vain. Its influence may be for the most part unconscious, yet it is certainly real; and he now and then incorporates in the text its very words. Thus, while Berger declares that he first made known the Old Testament to our Western peoples, which in a general sense is true, his own Vulgate in point of language has been described as "at once artificial and archaic, and yet forcible, clear and majestic." These diverse qualities lend it a richness that no other Latin work has ever equalled. Traces of the Septuagint mingle with Hebrew; provincial idioms enhance the picturesque style. The laws of rhythm have not been overlooked, as St Jerome himself points out, and Vallarsi notes in his edition. Energy and concentration are features of the ancient Bible; they check the Latin eloquence which loves to flow abroad; and this great version charms us most when its periods fall into brief musical phrases that are not verse but measured prose.

---

* See above passages in *Biblia Sacra*, Paris, 1870, VI, IX, XV, XVI, XXI, etc.

In principle its translator would have agreed, not with Francis Newman, who held to the letter (as the Old Latin did), but with his brother the Cardinal, to whom belongs a choice and well-known page on the subject at large. "In a book intended for general reading," says J. H. Newman, "faithfulness may be considered simply to consist in expressing in English [or in any other language] the sense of the original; the actual words of the latter being viewed mainly as directions into its sense, and scholarship being necessary in order to gain the full insight into that sense which they afford."* This tells us pretty much what St Jerome was aiming at, "*non verbum e verbo, sed sensum exprimere de sensu.*" He justified his method by the citations from Scripture in the New Testament, which constantly exhibit verbal differences. Yet any one who compares the Vulgate and the Hebrew will perceive that even the order of the words is often followed, so far as Latin syntax will permit. Repetitions, indeed, which an Oriental for want of the indirect narrative is compelled to use, do not find favour in Jerome's eyes. Sometimes he interpolates a meaning; he amplifies or paraphrases; but almost every portion of his Old Testament has been singled out in turn and highly extolled by good judges. Hagen praises the Pentateuch, not without reason, as might be demonstrated if space were allowed from the numerous passages we have gone through for this article.* Kaulen, whose treatment of Jerome's Latinity deserves careful study, ranks the translation of the historical books above the rest, and after that Job and the Prophets. Our Saint was proud of his Samuel and Kings. But, in fact, it is not easy to discriminate where all has merit. Doubtless, we should have gained if the so-called Gallican Psalter had given place to the direct version from the Hebrew. Whenever a critical edition of the Vulgate Old Testament is projected in Rome, this will be a matter for serious consideration.

---

* *Historical Sketches,* II, 11.

Meanwhile, the power of St Jerome can be appreciated only by going over his whole achievement. Let us bear in mind also that no Latin Homer, Æschylus or Pindar exists; but here is a pen equal to every effort—history, the prose epic, lyrical and reflective poems, and the peculiar strain which we term prophecy. The liturgical year brings each kind before us, submitting it to a trial which would wear out Milton's iambics, and make intolerable the sound of most other verse. Yet our Latin Isaiah during Advent, the Lamentations in Holy Week, seem always new. Taken merely as literature, the Vulgate has been examined, in a volume now somewhat rare, by the late J. A. Symonds. He noted "the austere and masculine virtues of Latin," its "naked strength," and, in contrast, "its studied oratorical magnificence." The "solemn march of Livy's historical narration" fascinated him, as it charmed De Quincey. Virgil's tongue, he says once more, became "the mother-speech of modern nations." But how did this happen? It was the task which the Latin Church undertook, and which she executed. St Augustine, for example, whom Symonds thought an incomparable master, was "steeped in the style of the Vulgate"—he means the Old Latin. That Bible was the "chief monument" of a transformation greater than we can parallel in any other thousand years. He adds with much force, "This resurrection from the grave where Cicero, Tacitus and Livy lay embalmed is one of the most singular phenomena in history." For it made Latin cosmopolitan during nine centuries, scattered and displaced the classics, yet gave a noble literature in their stead. St Jerome has accomplished a million times more, he concludes warmly, than any other *vulgarisateur* by creating "a new instrument of verbal utterance in the prose of the Vulgate."

---

* Look at Gen. xv, xl; Exod. ix-xiv, xvi, xix; Lev. xxvi; Num. xxii-iv; Deut. xxviii; xxxi-iii.

When we turn to details, we discover that Symonds was particularly affected by the "plangent music" and "deep reverberations," as in Job, which express "modern emotions." He quotes the solemn chants, *Pereat dies*, and their like, with some of which all are acquainted in the Office for the Dead. A very different chord is touched in *Veni de Libano*, from Solomon's Song, a kind of prose "artless in style, oppressive in passionate suggestion," as the dilettante calls it, remarking acutely that "the language of Canticles aspires towards music," and he thinks of Palestrina. The younger school of decadents—for there is something a little morbid in Symonds's critique—would surely substitute Wagner. Glancing at the Book of Wisdom (which is Old Latin, not Jerome's) he draws attention to the "new structure" and the "hitherto unapprehended colour-value," destined to enhance "the rich sonority of ample Latin verbs and nouns." Here was "no laborious attempt to recapture the past," but Latin adapted to the Western races at the very moment, marked by the death of Theodosius, when the Roman Empire broke asunder, not to be united evermore. The *Confessions* of St Augustine, it is admirably observed, show us Latin Christianity in the making, a worn-out language rejuvenated "in the spirit and manner of a modern artist." St Ambrose discards quantity for accent, invents new rhythms and new stanzas, adopts the ornament of rhyme. What St Jerome did, who shall measure? He gave to the Middle Ages their Iliad and their Odyssey—laws, histories, ritual, romance, devotion, cast into a universal mould, the dialect of Christendom. Or, to apply the words which J. A. Symonds has used elsewhere concerning our religion, the Vulgate exhibits an "ancient hereditary wisdom and sense of beauty woven into the very stuff of simplest speech."* Thus it became for the nations that developed Romance from Latin their literary primer, while it fixed the standard of ritual terms, gave to preachers a world of references and a vocabulary not to be exhausted; overflowed into the Roman decretals, furnished the daily talk of the cloister, and was perpetuated in codices which are marvels of painting and calligraphy. No more brilliant chapter exists in the long story of the Catholic Church. And its central glory falls upon St Jerome.

Most old manuscripts of the Bible, says Duchesne, served as lectionaries for the use of the clergy in their Offices. To accept the Vulgate or let it alone was no question for the learned, as it would be now, but instantly practical. This explains why it met with opposition of so decided a character at first, and how St Augustine would not have it read in his diocese. The popular feeling was against it. By temper and training the Bishop of Hippo did not at all resemble the monk of Bethlehem. Their famous correspondence shows them in lights amusingly contrasted. St Augustine, like many converts, desired to rest and be thankful. But he was too open-minded, as well as too sensible of literary excellence, not to perceive in the new version merits which outweighed its novelty. He praised and by degrees adopted it. As we have seen, the *Vetus Itala* dear to him from its Milanese associations, possessed many things in common with our Vulgate. And much of the Old Testament, where St Jerome was chiefly original, had no great hold upon the average Christians, who clung tenaciously to their accustomed hearing in Church. The result, it would seem, was that in Augustine's last years (415-430) he gave the impulse by quotation and approval which carried the Hieronymian text over its initial stage. It is pleasant to believe that the two most eminent Latin Fathers may be

---

***Essays Suggestive and Speculative*, I, 282-297; *Autobiography*, I, 97, 256; II, 183.

joined, the one as originator, the other as patron, in this mighty work.

Others, indeed, as Rufinus, furiously incensed against Jerome, opposed it. The Donatists held to their ancient readings, as we learn from St Augustine's dispute with Fulgentius, who quotes the Old Latin. Various Africans preserved this custom, while Italy, Gaul and Spain took up without reluctance a Bible distinguished for its clearness, accuracy, ease and elegance. Soon after 430 we find Vincentius of Lerins, Faustus Regiensis and Prosper of Aquitaine (the interesting school of Marseilles) citing their Scripture from the Vulgate. In the sixth century Isidore of Seville imagines that by the *Itala* was meant in St Augustine this actual edition; and so the medieval commentators with Walafrid Strabo generally understood. Some late critics would agree with Isidore. Still more important, in a world falling to confusion, was the practice of St Gregory the Great. He tells his friend Leander, who had succeeded that prelate at Seville, in his preface to Job, that "the Apostolic See uses both versions," and himself preferred the later. It has been said by Kaulen that St Columban, of Luxeuil, who died in 615, was the last to employ an exclusively Old Latin Bible. But scholars acquainted with MSS. all over Europe would perhaps not draw the line at this year. In any case, the mixture of readings, due to ignorance, caprice, quotations from memory and other accidents, went on increasing for wellnigh two hundred years afterwards. Ireland, it appears, had received the earlier text from St Patrick, though he studied at Lerins. Irish missionaries, preaching in Britain, Gaul, Germany and Switzerland, writing their Gospels with unrivalled penmanship, mingled the lections in every conceivable measure. The Vulgate most widely adopted was, nevertheless, a good copy, represented by the Codex Amiatinus of 716 (*am* or A), which Ceolfrid the Northumbrian offered at St Peter's shrine; it is now in Florence, and its true origin was found out by De Rossi. This magnificent volume is one among various tokens that the new Latin had made its way, slowly but surely, even in the British Isles, cut off though they had been from Roman influences at the moment when it first began its course.

But, as must be admitted, the Old Latin stood its ground in service-books, glosses and citations, nay, in the Bible itself, far down the Middle Ages, so that remnants of it survive till the thirteenth century (Codex Colbertinus (*f*); Perpignan MS.) Rome had no strictly official standard in times when learning had almost died out. The victory of St Jerome was due to Charlemagne, yet not to the Emperor's direct ordinance. If Irish monks preserved the Gospel and other texts, it was an Englishman, Alcuin of York, Abbot of St Martin's at Tours, who made the Vulgate their acknowledged representative. Over against him our attention is caught by Theodulf, Bishop of Orleans (787-821), a Wisigoth by descent and a native of Narbonne, whose labours unhappily not completed were based on the Spanish manuscripts, but included other materials from different sources. Theodulf's recension came before its time as a critical effort. It remains among the curiosities of literature. Alcuin succeeded where the Bishop of Orleans failed. Yet in both cases the text wrought upon was Irish in its pedigree, though one entered France from the north and the other from the south.*

Charlemagne, by a capitulary of 789, had prescribed a revision of liturgical books; *emendatos libros* he desired to secure for the Church services. The Bible he had not, we say, directly in view. However, in 796, he ordered Alcuin, his Minister of Education, as the French would now phrase it, to send for MSS. from York, the home of the best readings, illustrated by such works as the Amiatinus, the Book of Lindisfarne, and others. The Abbot lost no time. At Christmas, 801, he was able to present the Emperor with his newly edited Scriptures, sent by the hand of Nathaniel or Fredegisius his disciple. Between 799 and 801 he had corrected the entire Bible. We no longer possess an autograph of this memorable text. It may, however, be followed in the Codex Vallicellianus (V) preserved at the Chiesa

---

* Berger has summed up the story in his preface, xii-xvii; on Theodulf, 141-184; on Alcuin, 184-196.

Nuova in Rome; and the group of ornate MSS. which date from Tours will afford us a second line upon which to recover it. The consequence of Alcuin's publication was a certain uniformity, troubled by variants in detail and the faults inseparable from written copies, yet decisive as against the Old Latin versions. These had forfeited their authority. St Jerome's Bible was not known, indeed, as the Vulgate until the days of Roger Bacon. But with Alcuin it acquired that supreme place among the Latin nations which it is never likely to lose.

Englishmen may certainly be proud that their country has taken a share so large in correcting and editing the Latin Scriptures. After the great Northumbrian we meet Lanfranc of Canterbury, who revised all the books of both Testaments, though his work is not extant. St Stephen Harding made a recension preserved at Dijon. To Stephen Langton we are indebted for the present division of the Bible into chapters and much more; while in Roger Bacon, a true disciple of St Jerome, we may consider that scientific handling of the inspired text found a champion as well as a martyr. The current Bible in his day, the *Exemplar Parisiense*, was cheap, inaccurate and plentiful. Thus from Antioch the Old Latin had overspread the West; from Bethlehem the Vulgate which embodied or superseded it had been brought to the Northern nations. Corrected under Charlemagne, accessible to thousands of students from all sides in medieval Paris, not to be conquered even by the classic Renaissance, it deserved and won at the Council of Trent its place as the Latin Bible, the authorized text and standard of our teaching. The editors of King James's version acknowledge its merits. And the *Encyclopædia Biblica* declares, "It was the great good fortune of the Latin Church that so excellent a translator should have been raised up; and it is his great glory that neither the sentimental associations of the old versions nor the increasing ignorance of the Dark Ages were allowed to interfere with the final acceptance of St Jerome's labours."[*]

WILLIAM BARRY

[*] *Encyc. Bibl.* 5025.

SOME CHARACTERISTICS of HENRY SIDGWICK

Henry Sidgwick. A Memoir. By A. S. and E. M. S. London: Macmillan. 1906.

IT is mainly as a character-study that the recently published Memoir of Henry Sidgwick is interesting. External events in his career there were next to none. But a mental history instructive for the times we do find in its pages, and the revelation, largely the self-revelation, of a profoundly interesting personality. "An enthusiastic doubter" is a type not easy at once to conceive. Yet I think this phrase conveys fairly well the peculiar—the almost unique—interest of Sidgwick's intellectual character. The enthusiasm was, indeed, suppressed and undemonstrative, but it was unmistakable.

A man who in written criticism or in conversation can accept no statement as satisfactory, who finds a flaw in every theory, who bores fatal holes in every intellectual structure, theological or philosophical, which has stimulated the enthusiasm of men in the past, and who after so much destruction cannot even then offer any decided alternative, whether by way of affirmation or of negation, for the systems he has killed or mutilated, would seem likely to be a very unstimulating individual. If he is wrong, he would appear to be at once disheartening and mischievous. If he is right, he is at least disheartening; and it still remains a question whether the wholesale slaughter of helpful illusion is a gain to life. He is at best a most unwelcome prophet of ill-tidings. Destruction is ever a melancholy process; and indecision adds an element which is extremely provoking.

Yet the fact remains that Henry Sidgwick, relentless critic though he was, and concrete embodiment of intellectual indecision, was a most stimulating companion and friend, one who inspired, at least in many, real enthusiasm; and it is, as I have said, on the explanation of this apparent opposition that much of the supreme interest of Sidgwick's character depends.

I am disposed to account for the combination mainly by two characteristics. In the first place his gift of sympathy was as remarkable in conversation as was the habit of inexorable and incisive criticism. If his companion urged a view which he could not accept, he met him in the first instance not by mere objections. On the contrary, he walked two steps with him in fullest sympathy before finding "no road" at the third. The sympathy was quite as marked as the critical tendency. This will be remembered by all who knew him, and the quality of mind it represented is vividly shown in the second paper he read before the Synthetic Society (printed in the Appendix to the Memoir), in which he gives with extraordinary sympathy and fidelity an entirely original version of his opponent's argument before dissecting it.

His very scepticism in matters of theology had in it this element of sympathy. He might almost have been the seventeenth-century sceptic gibbeted by the witty Bishop Earle in his *Microcosmographie* as "one that hangs in the balance with all sorts of opinions, whereof not one but stirs him and none sways him; a man guiltier of credulity than he is taken to be, for it is out of his belief of everything that he fully believes nothing." This is the description of a hostile critic. But Sidgwick had the quality Bishop Earle caricatures in its most winning form. Thus conversation began with all the charm of sympathy, and then it was kept from flagging by the additional stimulus of what Tennyson has called "the clash of yes and no."

But this quality of sympathy was supplemented by something which went far deeper. There was an ideal passion for truth which shed a halo over all his discussion of the problems of the mind, and gave it an almost religious earnestness. The dissecting process, so minute, so detailed, so persistent, was different, even opposite in character, from the dry word-chopping of the mere logician. Its spirit was constructive—that of a great artist, who in his carving or sculpture fastidiously removes what deviates by a hair's breadth from fidelity to his model or ideal. Sidgwick's delicate work on a small area of discussion was the building of an altar or perhaps the carving of a reredos in the great cathedral of philosophic truth. The thought of the greatness of the ideal whole gave zest to the work of completing one portion with fastidious care.

In both these respects the present writer used to feel his qualities thrown into relief by the contrast between him and one who, as a philosopher and liberal theologian, held a somewhat similar rôle at Oxford. Conversation with Dr Jowett tended at times to languish. His criticisms were intellectual snubs. He would fix on a weak point in one's argument or a point of disagreement at the very outset. He would not spare one, or help one out of a difficulty he had raised by any suggestion that one had not been talking sheer nonsense. The consequence was that difference of view, instead of stimulating discussion, as it does between those who partly agree, often brought it to a dead halt. His criticisms were *douches* of cold water which extinguished the flame. Again, Jowett had not at all the same faith as Sidgwick in an ultimate triumph of the cause of philosophic truth. His very conformity to the Church of England was allied with a want in this respect. The stone cathedrals that were already standing were nearer to him than any prospective temple dedicated to truth and built of ideas. The consequence was that, while the two men in some respects apparently played the same rôle—for both were critics and representatives of broad theology, both philosophers, both independent thinkers of liberal views—it would be hard to conceive two more different men as companions. With Sidgwick conversation never ceased. His fertility was endless. From the ashes of a destroyed theory phœnix-like there arose a new one full of life—though one knew that its life would be short. Jowett's sterility was at times equally remarkable—not indeed universally, but in conversing on similar subjects. He snubbed the man who pressed his doubt to far-reaching conclusions as much as he snubbed the dogmatist. Conversation was often checked by his dislike of any approach to sounding the deeper depths of conviction. Indeed, the popular conceptions of Oxford and Cambridge were almost reversed in these men, for Sidgwick talked and wrote of nothing more readily than of problems connected with the finding of a *Weltanschauung*, while it rejoiced the heart of the Oxford don to bring his friends abruptly down from such soaring heights to the plain prose and *terra firma* of every-day life.

Every one knows the story of the undergraduate who confided to the Master his doubts as to the existence of God, and of Jowett's reply that, unless he could find arguments to prove His existence in the course of twenty-four hours, he much regretted that it would be his duty as Master of Balliol to send him down into the country. I remember another case, not so amusing as a story, but still more characteristic of the man, in which Jowett mistook some random talk of a Catholic for a serious confession of doubt, and replied with great complacency: "I am the last person to come to for answers to your doubts, but I should not advise any one who was born a Roman Catholic to become a Protestant." The uncontrollable laughter which followed disconcerted him, and he did not appear pleased—but quite the reverse—on being assured by his friend that his faith in the Church was deep and unshaken. In fact, he did not like too much demonstration either of faith or of doubt. *Ne quid nimis* was the essence of many of his characteristic aphorisms—as, for example, his "never quarrel, never explain; never spare, never drudge." Anything more unlike the spirit of Sidgwick's sympathetic and searching inquiries could not be conceived.

The two traits in Sidgwick which I am endeavouring to indicate—of sympathy and of enthusiasm—struck the present writer on first meeting him, and subsequent intercourse only deepened the impression. Knowing him only from his published *Methods of Ethics*, destructive criticism and indecision were qualities for which I was prepared; and the agreeable sense which his conversation at once brought of really living sympathy, under which one's own ideas grew and looked more attractive and persuasive in his recapitulation of them than in one's own first presentment, was an unexpected pleasure. Yet at such times Sidgwick was only fattening his ox before killing him. The knife of relentless logic was only put in his pocket for a while. And when the theory had come to look thoroughly healthy and thriving, the instrument of destruction was produced and did its work.

The occasion was one ever pleasant to me to recall, for the company was small, and he was at his best. It was at the house in Cambridge of Baron Anatole von Hügel, about the year 1893, and the first half of dinner was passed in very varied conversation, in which I noticed that, unlike many great talkers, Sidgwick did not insist on choosing a subject, but on the contrary took up what naturally arose with the zest with which a great operator deals with the case set before him—with a certain adventurous sense (it seemed to me) of pleasure in exercising his skill on new material. Many remember the effect of his stammer, but on this occasion it was perhaps more marked than usual, as he was, my host told me afterwards, unusually keen and interested.

Towards the end of dinner Tennyson's poetry was discussed, and something led us to the *In Memoriam.* There was then a remarkable change in his manner. Something of inspiration came into his face, a look which is to some extent conveyed in the photograph given as a frontispiece to the Memoir, and the discussion passed to a higher plane. It soon gave place by general consent to almost a monologue, and Sidgwick's stammer entirely ceased as he recited in illustration of his remarks stanza after stanza of that great poem. I should be afraid to say how much he gave us, but he seemed to know the whole by heart, and though I knew it well, I have read much of it with different eyes since that night. Sidgwick's reading and comments had on me an effect very similar to my first hearing of *Tannhäuser* under Richter's conductorship. In that case, too, I knew the opera well already, but Richter's wonderful power of bringing from the orchestra his own delicate perception of the beauties of the work, revealed new beauties to me, and brought out familiar ones in a new way. His very gestures as he wielded the baton were a commentary of the highest value. And so Sidgwick's prose interludes, describing the effect on him of parts of the poem, led up to the stanzas in such a way as to bring newly before me the poet's mind, though I had had opportunities, and had profited by them, of asking Tennyson himself questions on parts that specially interested me.

Such conversations cannot be reproduced, but some years after my first meeting with Sidgwick he wrote a letter to the present Lord Tennyson—published later on in Tennyson's Life—in which I recognized some of the best of the points he made that evening. The letter also gave the clue to the extraordinary effect of the poem on his own manner and conversation. It was just the combination of intense feeling with critical intellect that marked Sidgwick himself which he here found expressed in a great poet's verse; "the unparalleled combination," he tells us, "of intensity of feeling with comprehensiveness of view and balance of judgement shown in presenting the deepest needs and perplexities of humanity."

Of his own alternations between faith and doubt Sidgwick's letters give a very outspoken record. Perhaps, however, none is more interesting, as summing up the situation, than the following concluding lines of his letter to Lord Tennyson:

> I have always felt that in a certain sense the effect of the introduction [to *In Memoriam*] does not quite represent the effect of the poem. Faith, in the introduction, is too completely triumphant. I think this is inevitable, because, so far as the thought-debate presented by the poem is summed up, it must be summed up on the side of faith. Faith must give the last word; but the last word is not the whole utterance of the truth. The whole truth is that assurance and doubt must alternate in the moral world in which we at present live, somewhat as night and day alternate in the physical world. The revealing visions come and go; when they come, we *feel* that we *know*; but in the interval we must pass through states in which all is dark, and in which we can only struggle to hold the conviction that—
>
> . . . Power is with us in the night
> Which makes the darkness and the light,
> And dwells not in the light alone.*

With this should be read the following passage from the same letter:

**In Memoriam*, xcvi.

Henry Sidgwick

What *In Memoriam* did for us—for me at least—in this struggle was to impress on us the ineffaceable and ineradicable conviction that *humanity* will not and cannot acquiesce in a godless world: the "man in men" will not do this, whatever individual men may do, whatever they may temporarily feel themselves driven to do, by following methods which they cannot abandon to the conclusions to which these methods at present seem to lead.

The force with which it impressed this conviction was not due to the mere *intensity* of its expression of the feelings which atheism outrages and agnosticism ignores, but rather to its expression of them, along with a reverent docility to the lessons of science which also belongs to the essence of the thought of our age.

The combination I have endeavoured to delineate of the critical temper with utter candour and rich intellectual sympathy was doubtless fostered by the great influence of J. S. Mill. Mill's celebrated essay on Coleridge contains but few sentences which might not have been written by a follower of that philosopher instead of by the leader of the opposition. And though a remarkable instance of the quality I speak of, it does not stand alone. Tennyson, the other great influence on Sidgwick's intellectual life, embodied the side which made him an "enthusiastic doubter," in whom faith in the cause of truth, in spite of intellectual doubt, went with an underlying religious faith, the inalienable birthright of the "man in men."

Sidgwick, however, perhaps stood almost alone in the pleasure he took in self-analysis while passing through many different moods, a characteristic which makes the present volume a remarkable illustration of Newman's saying that mere "reason is ever undecided." He carried this habit further than did the author of *In Memoriam.* His moods changed more and extended to opposite poles. He was "prejudiced against his own prejudices," says a friend. If there were two points outside the range of his normal sympathy, they were Voltaireanism and Roman Catholicism; yet we find him scenting a momentary whiff of Voltaire's spirit in himself and imagining himself a Roman Catholic, and even a Jesuit. "I am haunted by a dread," he writes, "that it is only a wild dream, all this scientific study of human nature, a dream as vain and unsubstantial as alchemy. At such moments, if I had been brought up a Roman Catholic, I might become a Jesuit in order to get a definite object in life." In the prime of his life he regarded Christianity as untenable intellectually, though irreplaceable sociologically. Later on we find him approaching it again, and endeavouring, in respect of theism as held by Christians, to find some such bridge between speculative doubt and practical conviction as Kant built in his *Critique of Practical Reason*.

But the impression left on the present writer by the Memoir is that the philosophic creed of Mill, with its strong empirical element, was responsible for Sidgwick's earlier assumption that his speculative doubts ought also to be practical doubts; and that he was at all times in religion not really far removed at heart from the other great guide of his intellectual life—Tennyson.

Sidgwick's microscopic criticism naturally enough employed itself on his own mental constitution, and we have some very interesting letters in the collection before us dealing with some at least of the characteristics I have noted above. His absolute candour and fidelity to fact led him not to spare himself, and in a letter written to H. G. Dakyns in his twenty-ninth year he appears to be intensely conscious of his own habit of indecision. He gives a precise account of the fluctuations in his mental barometer during the space of a few months, which apparently leads him to contemplate the possibility of working towards an exceptionally comprehensive philosophical system based on his own alternate moods of exceptional sympathy with very varying schools of thought:

> I have not progressed since I saw you except backwards. At my age it is a great thing even to progress backwards; it shows that one is not stagnating. I mean, in respect of thought I feel more like a young man (in all the points in which youth is inferior to age) than I did in June. In the first place I have less of a creed, philosophically speaking. I think I have more knowledge of what the thoughts of men have been, and a less conscious faculty of choosing the true and refusing the false among them.

> I wonder whether I shall remain a boy all my life in this respect. I do not say this paradoxically, but having John Grote in my mind, who certainly retained, with the freshness, the indecisiveness of youth till the day of his death. I wonder whether we are coming to an age of general indecisiveness; I do not mean the frivolous scepticism of modern Philistines (I almost prefer the frivolous dogmatism of ancient ditto), but the feeling of a man who will not make up his mind till mankind has. I feel that this standpoint is ultimately indefensible, because mankind have never made up their mind except in consequence of some individual having done so. Still there seems to me to be the dilemma. In the present age an educated man must either be prophet or persistent sceptic, there seems no *media via*. I have sold myself to metaphysics for "a time and half a time"; I do not as yet regret the bargain. Take notice that I have finally parted from Mill and Comte—not without tears and wailings and cuttings of the hair. I am at present an eclectic. I believe in the possibility of pursuing conflicting methods of mental philosophy side by side. I am at any rate in travail with an idea; whether it is worth anything remains to be seen.

Nearly twenty years later, however, he has settled down to a mental course in which, while ever bent on the search after ultimate truth, he has abandoned any optimistic hope of formulating a satisfactory system in his own lifetime. This is recorded in a remarkable passage in his diary, in which he gives expression to his passion for clear thought and true analysis apart from all hope of immediate results on a large scale. The interest of the work and the sense of the greatness of the quest after truth, however, kept him from practical pessimism. One effect on him of this attitude of mind was that he confined himself in his lectures to giving his pupils that habit of clear analysis of the views of others which they could eventually use in formulating their own conclusions. He taught them no system of his own, but exhibited with unrivalled clearness the various systems with which their academic course required familiarity.

The immediate occasion of the entry in his diary of which I speak is a letter of criticism, on his method as a teacher, from his friend Professor Alfred Marshall. Sidgwick's note in comment would be hard to parallel in its absolute candour and fidelity of self-analysis:

Henry Sidgwick

On Tuesday I received from him a long and very impressive letter, analysing my academic career. . . He contrasted my lecture-room, in which a handful of men are taking down what they regard as useful for examination, with that of [T. H.] Green, in which a hundred men—halfof them B.A.'s—ignoring examinations, were wont to hang on the lips of the man who was sincerely anxious to teach them the truth about the universe and human life. I have left out the partly courteous, partly affectionate—for Marshall is an old friend—padding of the letter, by which he meant to soften the pressure of these hard truths, but this is the substance.

I was much interested by this letter: reflected on my own life and career, and came to the conclusion that I would write down my own view of the causes of my academic failure—I mean my failure to attract men on a large scale.

First, my character and opinions. Once, in reading Bagehot's article on Clough, I noted a few sentences which struck me as applying also to myself. As follows:

"Though without much fame, he had no envy. But he had a strong realism. He saw what it is considered cynical to see—the absurdities of many persons, the pomposities of many creeds, the splendid zeal with which missionaries rush on to teach what they do not know; the wonderful earnestness with which most incomplete solutions of the universe are thrust upon us as complete and satisfying." (This represents my relation to T. H. G. and his work.) "'Le fond de la Providence,' says the French novelist, 'c'est l'ironie.' Mr Clough would not have said that, but he knew . . . what was the portion of truth contained in it. Undeniably this *is* an *odd* world, whether it should have been so or no; and all our speculations upon it should begin with some admission of its strangeness and singularity. The habit of dwelling upon such thoughts as these will not of itself make a man happy, and may make unhappy one who is inclined to be so."

I, however, am not unhappy, for destiny, which bestowed on me the dubious gift of this *vue d'ensemble*, also gave me richly all external sources of happiness—friends, a wife, congenial occupation, freedom from material cares; but, feeling that the deepest truth I have to tell is by no means "good tidings," I naturally shrink from exercising on others the personal influence which would make men [resemble] me, as much as men more optimistic and prophetic naturally aim at exercising such influence. Hence, as a teacher, I naturally desire to limit my teaching to those whose bent or deliberate choice it is to search after ultimate truth; if such come with vaguer aims, I wish, if possible, to train their faculties without guiding their judgements. I would not if I could, and I could not if I would, say anything which would make philosophy—my philosophy—popular.

As for "over-regulation" [another of Marshall's charges], it seems to me that there is an element of truth in it and an element of error. I have no desire to have my own way—not knowing sufficiently what way is my own—still less to coerce others. But I have a great desire in all social relations for definite understandings; not knowing what road is best for humanity to walk in, I want all roads that claim to be roads to be well made and hedged in. This impulse may no doubt mislead to pharisaism and mere schematism that devitalizes the courses that kind nature keeps—perhaps it has misled me.

The union of a certain speculative pessimism with practical contentment, and even optimism, is a very interesting trait in Sidgwick's character. "I have to fight against optimism rather vigorously," he writes; "my individual efforts are still rather baulked in most directions. Spiritualism is *in statu quo;* I see no sound methods for attacking philosophical problems; I am growing daily more sceptical in educational methods; politics are a blind free fight. With all this I am horribly and disgracefully conscious of *bien-être.*"

It was the predominant optimism of one who feels everything in life to be intensely interesting, quite apart from personal success, although a sufficiency in this last respect no doubt helped, at least negatively, in his happiness. His keen idealization of the German student life, which he himself tasted for a time, was symptomatic in this respect. He told his friends that he felt in Germany almost as in his own home.

The note of contentment is prominent also in the later letters of Benjamin Jowett. But with Jowett it was far more the contentment which comes of attainment. Jowett idealized his work and the position he had achieved as Master of Balliol, and saw many cherished dreams realized at Oxford. Sidgwick had rather the *joie de vivre* of the intellectual epicure—of a nature with the very keenest perceptions—a joy in pursuing and criticizing apart from the joy of attainment. He exulted in his strength. His intellect was a fine machine which was well in hand, and he revelled in its use as a Rubinstein may rejoice in the execution of a *tour de force* on the pianoforte. His intellectual grasp, his critical candour, his independence of thought, all gave pleasure in their exercise, and one subject of admiration to the present writer in Sidgwick's use of these gifts was his firm stand against popular fashions in thought or criticism, as when he at once detects the one-sidedness of the Tübingen school, and the exaggerated praise bestowed on Stephen Phillips's *Paolo e Francesca.* His interests were almost universal, and one special charm of his letters is the wide range of subjects on which he gives his friends criticisms at once delicate and illuminating. The "magnificent senility" of Tennyson's later poems—*Vastness*, for example—is appreciated by him as keenly as the mellow wisdom of *In Memoriam*, the poem of his prime. Novels, from the tragedy of Tolstoi's *Anna Karénina* to the pictures of placid home-life in the pages of Miss Yonge or the sparkling humour of the *Dolly Dialogues*, give him keen pleasure. Politics and economics have their full share.

To a Catholic correspondent he writes on the *Fioretti* of St Francis of Assisi, and though the book was quite new to him, the students of Franciscan literature will appreciate the acute perception shown in his remarks:

> I send back the *Fioretti*. . . I am ashamed of having kept it so long . . . but I found my Italian a little more rusty than I had supposed, and only managed to read slowly. I am sincerely obliged to you for directing my attention to it. It has—or rather, the first portion of it has for me—a quite unique and remarkable charm. By the first portion I mean rather more than half the first volume, i.e., the chapters that relate to St Francis himself. When one passes in reading to the narratives relating to miracles and visions of other "frati," I find that the peculiar attraction of the Franciscan stories has vanished, it seems to depend on the individuality of the man. Compare the preaching to the birds in Chapter XVI and the preaching to the fishes in Chapter XL. I do not quite know why the effect of the former is powerful and moving, while the latter is irresistibly comic; but so I find it.
>
> I also much prefer the *naïveté* of the earlier chapters to the more elaborate and precise style of the *Considerations* in the second volume

with their somewhat insistent glorification of the saint and his Order. But this is, of course, the view of an outsider who cannot approach the topic of the stigmata without a rather definite scientific presumption.

The great variety in Sidgwick's tastes and interests removes him far from the category of the typical metaphysician. He had in this respect something in common with a thinker whom he failed to appreciate—Cardinal Newman, whose mind J. A. Froude has described as "world-wide," and whose perceptions, physical and artistic as well as intellectual, were so delicate and keen.

With all his lack of enthusiasm for systems Sidgwick was capable of great enthusiasm for persons. Of Tennyson he writes from Freshwater: "The occasional contemplation of the Laureate affords one of the purest pleasures our fallen nature has to give"; and when Tennyson dies it is to Sidgwick "like the end of a reign—only there is no concluding 'Vive le roi.' It is impossible," he writes, "that any one's thoughts and words should be so entwined with the best moments of the spring and summer of our lives. To us he seems the last."

More characteristic still, and more touching, is his admiration for Fawcett's heroic constancy under his blindness. He writes as follows on hearing the news of Fawcett's death:

> Just now I think most of the wonderful success and example of this life, which is now beyond the reach of time and change. Some lines of Tennyson run in my head:
>
> O well for him whose will is strong!
> He suffers, but he will not suffer long;
> For him . . .
> Not all Calamity's hugest waves confound,
> Who seems a promontory of rock,
> Tempest-buffeted, citadel-crowned.
>
> He was a hero of a peculiar type, without any outward air of self-sacrifice or suggestion of idealism in his ordinary talk, and yet one felt that his determination to live the ordinary life of a man, and a successful man—who gives pity and aid more than he takes it—required a continual sustained effort which did not draw its force

> from self-love alone; it continually demanded and obtained the further force given by the consciousness of the power of serving others; and the needs of this struggle gave to a nature, which, though large, healthy and generous, was not originally characterized by high moral aspiration, an elevation it would not otherwise have had.
>
> In spite of all that I have read of saints and sages, I feel that if grievous physical calamity came upon me, yet one that left the springs of physical energy unimpaired, I should turn for strength to this example. I wonder how many blind feel that he has opened the door of their prison-house and shown them the way back to ordinary life: steep, yet one that might be trodden by a steady and trustful step.

These sentences suggest to us something of the character of Sidgwick himself. He was indeed morally, as well as mentally, one of the great academic figures of our day, strenuous in effort, rich in sympathy, with high and simple aims, combining in his intellectual life a noble ideal with unrivalled powers of analysis and criticism, and above all with an intense passion for truth. On the stone at his grave those who knew and loved him best have put the words, "In Thy light he shall see light." Few philosophers have ever desired more earnestly to see that light; yet the very multiplicity of the points of view he realized so vividly made it harder for him than for most to concentrate his gaze upon it.

WILFRID WARD

MATILDA of TUSCANY

Donizo: Vita Matildis. Anonymus: Vita Matildis. Muratori: Rerum Ital. Scriptores, Vol. V. Mediolani. 1723-51.
Voigt. Hildebrand als Papst Gregorius, und sein Zeitalter. 1846.
Sir J. Stephen. Essays in Ecclesiastical Biography. London. 1849.
Villemain. Histoire de Grégoire VII. Paris: Didier et Cie. 1873.
W. Martens. Gregorius VII, Sein Leben und Wirken. 1894.
Amédée Renée. La Grande Italienne. Paris. 1859.
J. W. Bowden. Life and Pontificate of Gregory VII. London. 1849.
Mrs Huddy. Matilda of Tuscany. London: Long. 1905.

MATILDA, Countess of Tuscany, was a remarkable character in a remarkable age, the age of Gregory VII, of William the Conqueror, of Henry IV of Germany, of Robert Guiscard. She ruled her States with wisdom, justice and clemency. She commanded armies and won victories. She built bridges and made roads, where there had been only fords and mule-tracks. She collected libraries and promoted learning, by example as well as by patronage. Her court was a pattern of refinement and of morality. Her charity to the poor and her munificence in public works were boundless. She devoted her whole life with unswerving constancy to two lofty ideals, the freedom of the Church from Imperial oppression, and the freedom of Italy from German invaders.

It is much to be regretted that few first-hand and contemporary records of her life are to be found. The best authority is perhaps a barbarous Latin poem by her chaplain, Donizo, whose grammar and prosody are both very defective, but whose rude hexameters give the impressions of an eyewitness, and have the merit of obvious sincerity.

Matilda's father, Boniface, was created Margrave of Tuscany by the Emperor Conrad, and was the most powerful feudatory of the Empire in Italy. His grandfather, Azzo, had been Lord of Modena and Reggio; and he it was who built and fortified the famous castle of Canossa, which figures largely in Matilda's story. From Azzo's two elder brothers descended the houses of Este and Brunswick. These ancestors of Matilda had all been faithful vassals of the German

Emperors and fought in their wars, not only in Italy, but in Burgundy and on the Rhine. Boniface married Beatrice of Lorraine, whose maternal aunt, Gisella, was wife of the Emperor Conrad and mother of the Emperor Henry III. They had three children, of whom the only one that survived childhood was Matilda, born in 1046. Boniface died, assassinated, in 1052. By a special provision, unusual in the feudal system, the Emperor Conrad, in making Tuscany an hereditary fief at the time of Boniface's marriage with Beatrice, had provided that failing male issue it should revert to Beatrice. Beatrice thus became margrave of Tuscany, with right of succession for her daughter Matilda. Her dominion included Tuscany, Modena, Mantua, Reggio, Spoleto, Parma, Lucca, Genoa, Nice and Sardinia.

The teaching Matilda received in childhood was well fitted to form her character. She was taught to ride and even to take part in martial exercises. She learnt to speak German, French and Provençal, as well as her native Italian. Hildebrand, who was to play so large a part in her life, had early placed near her and her mother a pious and learned man, Anselm, afterward Bishop of Lucca. He and Chaplain Donizo instructed her in theology and made her familiar with Latin. Her mother taught her, both by precept and example, to visit the poor, to relieve the sick, and to fulfil all her religious duties with assiduity and pleasure. The child responded generously to this training. She grew up with increasing graces of mind and body; and she exhibited a lively, cheerful temper, and a high spirit not unworthy of her martial race. Beatrice, her mother, surrounded by turbulent and warlike neighbours, married again when Matilda was nine years old. Godfrey of Lower Lorraine had rebelled against the Emperor and had been deprived of his duchy. He took refuge in Italy and, suddenly presenting himself to Beatrice, who was his cousin, induced her to marry him. The Emperor, Henry III, was much incensed at this marriage. He entered Tuscany at the head of an army and marched upon Canossa in 1055, pretending that Beatrice had been compelled by violence to marry Godfrey. Beatrice went out of Canossa to meet the

Emperor. She asserted before him and his chief vassals that her marriage had been voluntary, that she wished to give a protector to her children in the distracted state of Italy, and had done no more than every woman was entitled to do. The Emperor wished to summon witnesses to prove that the marriage had been procured by force; but his council would not allow this to be done, declaring that the word of a noble lady must be accepted. The Emperor, however, detained Beatrice and sent her as a prisoner into Germany. It seems doubtful whether she was accompanied by her daughter or by her mother, who was also named Matilda. In either event, whether she shared her mother's captivity or remained separated from her in Italy, this tyrannical violence no doubt strengthened in Matilda's mind her aversion to German rule. The imprisonment of Beatrice was not of long duration. The Emperor Henry III died in October, 1056, leaving a son, who was only seven years old. The turbulent vassals of the Empire were not much disposed to submit to the rule of a child, under the regency of his mother, the Empress Agnes. But Pope Victor II, who had come to Germany on the invitation of Henry III, and who was present at his death, succeeded in inducing the nobles to acknowledge the young sovereign as King of Germany under the name of Henry IV. Pope Victor also obtained the reconciliation of Godfrey of Lorraine to the imperial house. Godfrey swore allegiance to Henry IV, and his wife Beatrice was allowed to return to her Italian territories. There she enjoyed an interval of rest and quiet; and Canossa became a centre of refinement and hospitality. Amongst the visitors she entertained were several future Popes, Hildebrand, Gerard, Bishop of Florence, Anselm, Bishop of Lucca, and her brother, Frederick of Lorraine. There, too, came Hugo, Abbot of Cluny, and Peter Damian, whose ardent temperament, remarkable abilities and purity of character gave him a high place in the esteem of his contemporaries. There also was seen Anselm of Aosta, a saintly man whose virtues afterwards adorned the See of Canterbury. Pope Victor died in 1057, and the Cardinals in Rome made haste to elect as his successor

Beatrice's brother, Frederick of Lorraine, who was brought almost by force from his monastery and crowned Pope as Stephen X. Pope Stephen survived his election only a few months and died, 1058, in Florence, where he had gone to visit Beatrice and Godfrey.

The lawless temper of the time is well shown in what followed. A few Roman nobles, headed by the Count of Tusculum, assumed the right to name as Pope the Bishop of Velletri, whose only recommendation was his wealth, in spite of the opposition of the Cardinals and Bishops, whom they drove out of Rome, and without the assent of the Empress or King. They seized upon the Archdeacon of Ostia, and compelled him, by threats of instant death, to consecrate their nominee as Benedict X. But Hildebrand and Peter Damian did not allow this scandalous usurpation to continue long. Hildebrand in concert with Godfrey and Beatrice suggested Gerard, Bishop of Florence, a man of great virtue and learning, according to Peter Damian, as a fitting successor to Stephen. An assembly of Cardinals and Bishops, and of many lay nobles, including Godfrey and Matilda, was convoked at Sutri, and Gerard was elected Pope under the name of Nicholas II. The consent of the Empress Agnes, on behalf of her son, was obtained; and Nicholas II, escorted by Godfrey's troops, proceeded to Rome, while Benedict, the antipope, retired into a monastery, where he died soon after. It was considered by Hildebrand's contemporaries that by this election he had transferred to the Counts of Tuscany whatever rights the German Emperor may have claimed in nominating a Pope.

The primitive law and custom of the Church was that the election of a Bishop of Rome rested with the clergy and people of the diocese, but the German Emperors treated the Bishopric of Rome as if it were a fief of the Empire, which they could confer on whom they pleased. Henry III more than once assumed this privilege. He placed Clement II, a German Bishop, on the Papal throne by his own choice and without any canonical election. Clement II died after a few months, and Henry named a prelate of his court to succeed, and ordered the Margrave of Tuscany to escort him to Rome, where he took the title of Damasus II, but died after twenty days. Henry III then, in a synod at Worms, selected his relative and Chancellor, Bruno of Hapsburg, to succeed Damasus. But Bruno had met and admired Hildebrand, who happened to be at Worms when this synod was held. He invited Hildebrand to accompany him to Rome. Hildebrand refused, giving as his reason that Bruno was about to lay his hands on the Roman Church without canonical institution, and merely by royal and secular authority. Bruno was so struck by this reproof that he declared before the assembly at Worms his intention of not accepting the Pontificate unless the Roman clergy and people freely elected him. He entered Rome as a pilgrim, barefooted, and submitted himself absolutely to the clergy and people. He was unanimously elected and was known as Leo IX. In strange contrast to these pretensions of the German Emperors was the admitted doctrine of public law that the Pope alone could confer the proud imperial title and succession to the Roman Cæsars, which since Charlemagne had been the ambition of the German sovereigns.

Hildebrand deeply resented this usurpation of the German Emperors. At the first council which followed the election of Nicholas II, in April, 1059, he procured the enactment of a decree regulating Papal elections. On the death of a Pope the Cardinal Bishops were to assemble first and nominate a successor. The Cardinal Priests were then to be called upon to vote upon this advice, and lastly the people were to be asked if they assented.

This decree was signed by 113 Bishops and a great number of clerics and laymen. It withdrew the election of a Pope from the turbulent popular assemblies, influenced by the intrigues and violence of Roman nobles, as well as from the arbitrary selection of the German sovereigns. It gives no recognition to their usurped claim to nominate the Pope.

Nicholas II died in 1061. Hildebrand urged the immediate election of a successor. There was, however, a party in Rome favourable to imperial pretensions, consisting of German Cardinals and of nobles whose habits of violence and disorder led them to prefer dependence on a distant sovereign. This party wished the election deferred until the imperial pleasure had been expressed. To avoid conflict, Hildebrand consented to send a message to the young King Henry IV and his mother the Dowager Empress Agnes. But the deputy of the Roman clergy was not even received at the German court; and after waiting in vain for some days he returned to Rome, carrying back his letters. Hildebrand then urged the Cardinals to act upon their rights, and Anselm, Bishop of Lucca, the friend of Beatrice and instructor of Matilda, was elected Pope under the title of Alexander II. The Empress Agnes thereupon convoked a diet at Basle, at which her son, aged twelve, took the title of Patrician of the Romans, and at which Cadalous, Bishop of Parma, was elected Pope and took the title of Honorius II. Well might Peter Damian write to Cadalous and ask how he could venture to be elected Bishop of Rome without the knowledge of the Roman Church, not to speak of the Senate, the inferior clergy and the people. Cadalous, however, was provided with money and troops by the Lombard Bishops, and he advanced at the head of a small army, intending to reach Rome through Tuscany. But on the frontiers of Tuscany he was met by a force which Beatrice had assembled in defence of Alexander II. After the death of her husband, Boniface, Beatrice had retained in her service a certain number of knights and men-at-arms from different countries in Europe, who formed the nucleus of what might be called a standing army. Joined with these were irregular levies of Tuscan peasants who readily flocked to the royal standard at the summons of their sovereign. The young Matilda, barely fifteen years old, rode at the head of this army, beginning thus early the long series of her heroic actions. She fell upon the German troops and routed them. Cadalous then made his way to Rome through the Marches, followed by straggling detachments of his troops, who by various routes ultimately assembled before Rome. Rome had been warned of the coming danger by Matilda. The gates were shut and the walls manned. Cadalous had not sufficient force to attempt an assault. He withdrew some distance from Rome and awaited reinforcements from Lombardy. To guard against this impending danger, Beatrice was prepared to send troops to Rome; but it was necessary to have some more experienced commander than Matilda. Beatrice applied to her husband, Godfrey, to undertake the command. Godfrey was half-hearted in the cause of the Church. He only consented to lead the Tuscan troops on condition that Matilda married his son Godfrey, surnamed the Hunchback from his physical deformity. This was perhaps the greatest sacrifice that Matilda was called upon to make for the sake of the Church. Her young life was to be darkened by an unwelcome marriage, in which there was no pretence of mutual affection, and no other purpose than to secure the rich dowry of Tuscany for the dispossessed Duke of Lorraine. With the simple heroism that marked her character, Matilda consented to the marriage, stipulating only that she should never be asked to live in Germany, but should always remain in Italy.

Godfrey, having secured his bargain, marched to Rome, where the German army had now arrived. Two days of severe fighting took place, in which Matilda took part and exhibited her wonted courage in the field and her humanity to the wounded. Neither side obtained a decided success; and ultimately a truce was agreed to by Godfrey. Both Pope and antipope were to withdraw to their former dioceses and await the decision of a Council and of the Emperor and King on their respective claims.

The Romans were fired with such enthusiasm by the presence of Matilda that they demanded to be led against the Normans, who had recently invaded Apulia and Campania. Godfrey and Matilda marched out of Rome and met the Normans at Aguino. The combat was long and obstinate. The Normans had never before encountered such resolute foes. After nineteen days' fighting their entrenchments were carried, and they sued for peace. Matilda returning to Rome was received with great honours, but her dearest reward was to have given in this war such proofs of "Christian virility."

A Council of German and Italian Bishops was held at Augsburg in October, 1062, which decided in favour of

Alexander II; but Cadalous did not even then resign his pretensions.

Matilda on her return from Rome to Tuscany fulfilled her promise and married Godfrey the Hunchback, who immediately after the ceremony left Italy for Germany, and never saw his wife again until his death-bed. Both he and his father went over before long to the side of the Empress and abandoned the cause of Alexander. Alexander succeeded in assembling a second Council at Mantua, at which his election was confirmed and Cadalous was anathematized. Cadalous, however, by lavish expenditure of money made partisans for himself in Rome. He entered the city and was sheltered in the Castle of St Angelo by Cincius, the governor of the Castle. He was besieged there by the supporters of Alexander, and the siege lasted two years, during which Alexander was holding Councils in the Lateran, while the antipope remained in a Roman fortress. At last the fortress was surrendered. Cadalous escaped in disguise, and retired into Lombardy, where he died penitent. Alexander visited his death-bed, received his submission, and reconciled him to the Church. Alexander himself did not long survive. He revisited Lucca, where he was the guest of Beatrice and Matilda, and died there in April, 1073. His election and pontificate had laid the foundation of the liberation of the Church from the yoke of Imperial control.

This great work had always been foremost in the mind of Hildebrand, who as archpriest and archdeacon of Rome had guided the policy of Alexander and of his three predecessors. Hildebrand was now himself to assume the burden of the tiara. At the funeral of Alexander an extraordinary outburst of popular enthusiasm in his favour swept everything before it. By the acclamations of the people and the unanimous voice of the Cardinals Hildebrand was elected Pope, and took the title of Gregory VII.

His pontificate was destined to be one of incessant conflict. There were two chief abuses prevailing in the Church which he determined to reform: the marriage of the clergy and simony in the grant of ecclesiastical benefices.

The ancient canons enjoining celibacy of the clergy had come in course of time to be disregarded. A great many of the clergy in Lombardy and in Germany were married. They resisted with great energy the attempts that had been made before Gregory's accession to enforce the rule of celibacy. The consequence of this abuse had been to introduce worldly habits and secular interests among the clergy. The patrimony of the Church, which should have been wholly devoted to the maintenance of public worship and the support of the poor, was treated as an hereditary possession, and the married clergy generally provided for their children out of the proceeds of their benefices. Men who thus lived in disregard of canons which were binding on them were often conspicuous for contempt of other precepts of the moral law.

Simony was another grave evil prevailing in France, Germany and Lombardy. It was largely due to the custom of lay investiture, which had grown up since the time of Charlemagne. The sovereigns of France and Germany treated the Bishoprics and Abbeys in their dominions as if they were temporal fiefs of the Crown, and assumed the right of deposing the holders for some supposed breach of feudal obligation, and of appointing successors whom they invested with the sacerdotal ring and pastoral staff. The episcopal character was thus merged in the baronial character. The temporal sovereign, who could at most confer civil rights and privileges, usurped the symbols of spiritual prerogative. These lay investitures were too often made without any canonical election, and were still oftener tainted with simony. The sovereign was prone to demand, and his nominee was willing to pay, a heavy price for a valuable benefice. The applicant who made the highest bid was likely to be preferred without any regard to his spiritual fitness. The great feudatory vassals, such as the Dukes of Burgundy, Bavaria and Lorraine, followed the example of the sovereign and trafficked in sacred offices as incidents of their secular dignity. The annals of the time give many proofs of the extent of the evil. Leo IX in 1049 held a Council at Rheims, at which the universal prevalence of simony was made manifest and many Bishops were deposed.

Hildebrand himself was sent by Victor II as Legate to France, and at a Synod held at Lyons, an Archbishop, forty-five Bishops and twenty-seven other dignitaries confessed themselves guilty of simony and resigned their benefices. The Emperor Henry III, addressing an assembly of the Bishops of Germany in 1047, accused them and his own father Conrad of being open to the reproach of simony. Henry III himself was said to have received a large sum for appointing a Bishop of Florence. Henry IV of Germany was a frequent offender, putting up benefices to auction and selling them to unworthy persons.

These two crying evils Gregory set himself to cure with all the energy of his lofty and fearless spirit. He convoked a Council in Rome in 1074, to which not only Bishops were summoned but lay Princes, including Beatrice and Matilda. This Council suspended Bishops and priests who had been guilty of simony or had transgressed the rule of celibacy. Some were excommunicated and some deposed. By letters addressed to the German people and by the action of Legates sent to Germany, Gregory actively pressed forward the reforms decreed by the Council in spite of the obstinate resistance of the German clergy.

Gregory had soon to encounter a more formidable adversary. Henry IV had now attained manhood. He had a handsome presence, considerable abilities, military talent and boundless energy. But a faulty education had marred all these gifts. The licentiousness of his private life was a public scandal. His extravagance led him to oppress his subjects with illegal exactions, to appropriate ecclesiastical revenues, and to traffic in benefices. He had driven the Saxons into rebellion by his oppression and punished their rebellion by devastating their country. The Saxon nobles submitted on the terms that they should not suffer either in person or in property. But as soon as Henry had them in his power, he exiled many of them to Burgundy, Bavaria and Lombardy, and seizing their property distributed it among his favourites. At a Council held in Rome in February, 1075, a decree had been passed declaring that whoever received from lay hands a Bishopric, Abbey or inferior ecclesiastical office, should be excluded from the Church until he had abandoned the post thus irregularly and sinfully acquired; and that any Emperor, Duke, Marquis or other secular power who presumed to give investiture of a Bishopric or other ecclesiastical dignity thereby incurred anathema. Henry was informed of this decree, which struck at all lay investitures, irrespective of any simoniacal taint. He made no protest, but soon after appointed a supporter of his own to the vacant See of Bamberg without any canonical election. While the result of the struggle with the Saxon rebels was still doubtful, he had written in terms of humility to the Pope. "Guilty and unhappy that I am," he wrote, "partly by the suggestions of youthful thoughtlessness, partly by the seduction of my absolute and tyrannical power, partly through flatterers whose advice I followed, I have sinned before heaven and before you, and am not worthy to be called your son. I have not only laid hands on Church property, but have also sold churches to most unworthy men, tainted with the gall of simony. But now, since I alone cannot without your authority reform the churches, I humbly pray of you counsel and support in this and all other matters. Your instruction shall be followed with the utmost care."

When Henry had quelled the Saxon revolt, his tone was altered. He took upon himself without reference to the Pope to appoint his chaplain, Theobald, to the Archbishopric of Milan, and soon after deposed the Bishops of Spoleto and Fermo, and appointed successors.

Both Henry and the Saxons now appealed to Gregory. Henry called upon the Pope to depose the Saxon Bishops who had taken part against him in the recent rebellion. The Saxons called upon the Church to help them in their need. They said that avarice and insolence ruled the land. All were reduced to serfdom except a few who had become lords by robbery and murder. The King's vices were inexpressible; his advisers were disreputable persons of both sexes, with whose help he chose Bishops, Prelates and Abbots; he had sacrifices and festivals in honour of Venus; such a king was unworthy of the throne. They prayed the Pope and people of Rome to see that the realm was better governed and that a king better worthy of such an office was chosen in an assembly of princes of the Empire.

Gregory on receipt of these appeals took a step for which there was no precedent. He sent Legates to Henry to summon him to appear before a Council to be held in Rome in the Lent of 1076, and answer the charges made against him. The imperial party maintained that a sovereign could not be called to account by the Church. But Gregory asserted that prince as well as peasant was subject to the jurisdiction of the Church over morals.

Henry drove away the Legates with contumely. He summoned the German Bishops and Abbots, many of whom were excommunicated or suspended, to meet in Council at Worms. At that Council, held in January, 1076, the most extravagant accusations were made against Gregory. He was accused of simony, of witchcraft, of intercourse with devils, of plots to murder Henry, of many other enormities. These charges were contained in a paper read by Cardinal Hugo Candidus, who had been more active than any other man in bringing about the popular acclamations which hurried Gregory to the Papal chair. The assembly was invited to depose the Pope. Many Bishops objected that it was illegal to depose even a Bishop who was absent, without regular accusers, without evidence, and without critical investigation of the accusations; and much more was it illegal for a provincial synod to proceed thus against a Pope. But great pressure by the King and the Bishop of Utrecht overcame all scruples; and the Prelates signed a formula deposing Gregory from the Papal throne.

A little before this strangely uncanonical proceeding Gregory had been subjected to a still more outrageous act of violence in Rome. He was celebrating midnight Mass in the Church of St Maria Maggiore on Christmas Day, 1075. It was a dark and stormy night, and few worshippers were present. Suddenly a band of armed men led by Cincius burst into the Church. The Pope was dragged from the altar, stripped of his vestments, struck and wounded in the forehead, flung upon a horse and carried off to Cincius' tower. Cincius, it will be remembered, was the turbulent noble who had supported the antipope Cadalous against Alexander II. He had been pardoned and allowed to return to Rome on taking an oath to keep the peace. He occupied a fortified tower near the Tiber, where he had collected a following of men-at-arms. The news of this outrage spread rapidly in Rome. The people assembled in arms, and at break of day surrounded Cincius' tower, beating down the walls with battering rams and lighting fires against the gates. The assault was so furious that Cincius quailed. He threw himself himself at the Pope's feet and with pretended penitence implored the Pope to forgive him and to appease the angry mob. Gregory, who had endured all this treatment with serene intrepidity, making no resistance, asking for no mercy, and not speaking a word, now said to Cincius that he freely forgave the injury done to himself, but for the outrage on the Church Cincius must make a pilgrimage to Jerusalem and on his return submit himself to the Pope. The fortress was then thrown open to the people. Cincius escaped in the confusion. His followers were spared by the Pope's order. Gregory himself, wounded and exhausted as he was, returned to Sta Maria Maggiore and finished the Mass which had been so rudely interrupted. There is no direct evidence to show that Henry IV sanctioned this outrage. Cincius had written to Henry some time before, offering to seize the Pope and bring him into the King's presence, but Henry's answer is not known. Guibert, Archbishop of Ravenna, Henry's warm supporter, seems however to have been privy to Cincius' design, and Cincius after his failure went to Germany, where he was received with honour by Henry, and accompanied him to the assembly at Worms, where Gregory's ruin was attempted by other means.

The Council convoked by Gregory to judge Henry IV met at St John of Lateran in April, 1076. One hundred and ten Bishops were present, besides numerous Abbots and ecclesiastical dignitaries. Italian nobles and princes attended, and amongst them Beatrice and Matilda with the faithful Donizo. On the second day of the Synod a messenger from Germany was announced. This was Roland, a priest of

Parma, who brought letters from Henry to the Pope and to the Roman Senate and people. Roland entered the hall, announced that he came as an envoy by order of the King, delivered his letters, and turning to the Pope said: "The King my master and the Bishops beyond the Alps and in Italy send thee this order: Thou shalt instantly quit the Roman Church and the usurped chair of St Peter, for it is not fitting that any one should raise himself to such a dignity without the Imperial permission." Then turning to the clergy he said: "You, my brethren, are ordered to present yourselves before the King next Pentecost to receive from his hands a Pope and Father, for this man has been found to be not a Pope but a devouring wolf." This insolent language roused the assembly to fury. Swords were drawn, and it would have fared ill with Roland if the Pope had not thrown himself between him and the angry nobles and had him conveyed away in safety.

The next day Gregory read Henry's letters to the Synod. The letter to the Pope was headed: "Henry, not by usurpation but by the grace of God King, to Hildebrand, not Pope but false monk." It recited the decision of the Assembly at Worms, and finally ordered Gregory to descend from the pontifical chair of Rome, of which Henry was the Patrician by the gift of God and by the admission and oath of the Romans. Henry's letter to the Roman Senate and people exhorted them to drag Gregory from his chair, but not to kill him, because life after his deposition would be a greater punishment than death, and to receive a Bishop chosen by the King for the Apostolic See.

The reading of these letters aroused the indignation of the Council, which unanimously called upon Gregory to excommunicate and depose the King as a criminal and a tyrant. Gregory accordingly pronounced in solemn form the sentence of excommunication against Henry, absolved his subjects from their allegiance, and suspended him from the exercise of royal power and privileges. Among those who witnessed this impressive scene were not only Beatrice and Matilda, Henry's cousins, but also his mother the Empress Agnes, who had soon repented of her action in favour of Cadalous, had come to Rome to implore the pardon of Alexander II, and lived there in retirement.

Modern critics have been prodigal of censure on Gregory VII for having struck this blow against the most powerful sovereign in Europe; but they have not been so ready to censure Henry IV for his attempt to depose the Bishop of Rome. Henry was invading the spiritual domain and seeking to make the Church of Christ a vassal of the German crown. Gregory was deciding a mixed question of morals, which fell properly under the jurisdiction of the Church. Almost all moral writers are agreed that there is some point of oppression and misconduct at which subjects are justified in throwing off their allegiance to a sovereign whose rule has ceased to be legitimate by his misdeeds. There is, however, a great diversity of opinion and great difficulty in ascertaining when that point is reached. In England, by the Bill of Rights, all subjects are "absolved from their allegiance" if the sovereign joins the Church of Rome or marries a Catholic. In our own days we have seen anti-vaccinationists and passive resisters claim the right of a partial repudiation of allegiance by disobeying Acts of Parliament which offended their religious or conscientious scruples. During the last hundred years every country in Europe has been the scene of revolts against governments and constituted authorities, and in many cases it would be difficult to find sufficient moral justification for these breaches of allegiance. The methods employed have been violence, insurrection in arms and bloodshed, with one solitary exception in the recent separation of Norway from Sweden. Gregory thought that this difficult and delicate question should be decided not by excited crowds, not by secret meetings of conspirators, but by the calm and deliberate judgement of the Church. Nobody doubted in the eleventh century that the Church of Christ had jurisdiction over private morals; and it was scarcely questioned that she had jurisdiction over political morals, which are only the morals of a great number of individuals who have a common purpose in view. Dr Martens, in his work on the life of Gregory, has shown that the Pope's decision in 1076 was one, not of deposition but of temporary suspension of the royal office. Gregory always intended to reserve the question of a final deposition of Henry and the election of a successor for the decision of a German Diet, presided over by himself. He obstinately adhered to that intention until the assembling of such a Diet was proved impossible by the action of Henry himself.

Not many days after the Council at Rome Matilda's husband, Godfrey Hunchback, was attacked by an assassin in Antwerp and mortally wounded. He had recovered his Duchy of Lorraine and had become a partisan of King Henry, to whose cause his valour and his talents gave valuable support. Matilda is said to have undertaken the long and perilous journey to Antwerp, and to have tended him in his dying moments. She certainly interceded for him with the Pope, for Gregory wrote not long after to the Bishop of Metz: "As to Godfrey I wish you to know that, unworthy as I am, I often recall his memory before God. I have forgotten his hatred and my resentment. I listen only to my fraternal friendship for Matilda. I yield to her entreaties, and offer up prayers for his salvation." Soon after Matilda's return to Italy she suffered another and more trying loss. Beatrice, her mother, died in 1076, and was buried at Pisa. Her remains were placed in an ancient pagan sarcophagus, from which, according to Vasari, Nicolò Pisano copied many of his figures, and which still stands in the Campo Santo of Pisa. Matilda was therefore now sole Countess of Tuscany and of the other territories held by Boniface her father.

Meanwhile Henry IV persisted in the conduct which had led to his condemnation. His tyrannical oppression drove Saxony once more into armed revolt. Many of the Bishops who had taken part in the Council of Worms and in the deposition of Gregory craved forgiveness from the Pope for what they had done under coercion by the King, and submitted themselves to the Holy See. The news of Henry's excommunication spreading through Germany made his subjects shrink from communication with him. The great vassals of the crown, alienated by his arbitrary and treacherous acts, determined to summon an assembly of the princes and nobles of the Empire to take counsel for the common welfare of the realm. The assembly took place at Tribur, near Mayence, in October, 1076. It included the most powerful of Henry's feudatories, Rodolph, Duke of Suabia, Welf, Duke of Bavaria, and Berthold, Duke of Carinthia, as well as many nobles from all parts of the Empire and many Bishops, some of whom had recently been partisans of the King, but now turned against him. The deliberations of the assembly lasted a week. Accusations of every kind were made against Henry: his private life had been scandalous for immorality; he had lavished honours and favours on low-born men to the exclusion of his nobles; he had left pagan nations at peace and turned his arms against his subjects; he had razed churches and monasteries and appropriated ecclesiastical revenues to the pay of his soldiers; he had built fortresses, not to repel barbarians but to oppress his Christian peoples; he had taken the bread of orphans, widows and the poor; he had no respect for the Church; there was no remedy but to set him aside and to elect another king. Henry had come to the Castle of Oppenheim, on the other side of the Rhine, and sent daily messengers to the assembly promising to reform all abuses, to govern in accordance with the advice of his nobles, to give whatever hostages and pledges they might require. The assembly answered that they could trust no pledges of his, that he had too often made solemn engagements, and as soon as the peril was past had broken through them as though they were spiders' webs; and that by their long forbearance the peace of the Church and the majesty of the Empire had been destroyed. Ultimately they offered him these terms: that they would refer the charges against him to the judgement of the Roman Pontiff, whom they would invite to come to Augsburg in the ensuing month of February, and there preside over an assembly of the princes of the Empire, in which the accusations against the King and his defence should be heard, and judgement of condemnation or of acquittal should be given. They warned him, however, that by the law of the land he forfeited all his dignities if he were not released from the sentence of excommunication passed upon him within a year and a day of its date. Until the Pope's judgement was given, he was to live in retirement and exercise no royal function. Henry accepted these terms, by which at least he gained time and a respite. Both sides sent ambassadors to the Pope to inform him of what had been agreed. Gregory accepted the office of arbitrator, and undertook to be in Augsburg at the time fixed, only requiring that an escort should be sent to conduct him safely through the passes of the Alps. The credit of this pacific solution belongs to the Pope. The nobles at Tribur would have proceeded to depose Henry by force but for the action of the Papal Legates who strongly urged arbitration between the King and his offended subjects. Gregory thus anticipated in the eleventh century peaceful methods which in the twentieth century are still struggling to obtain acceptance.

In the winter of 1076 Gregory set out from Rome to go to Augsburg. He was escorted by Matilda and received with splendid hospitality in all the towns through which he passed. He had nearly reached Mantua when news arrived that Henry had crossed the Alps. By Matilda's advice he fell back on her impregnable fortress of Canossa, where he remained awaiting events. Henry had indeed undertaken a desperate journey in order to free himself, if possible, from the sentence of excommunication, and to prevent the Pope from coming to Augsburg. Accompanied by his wife and infant child, Conrad, he crossed Mont Cenis in January, 1077. The winter was one of unusual severity, and the passage of the mountain was beset with difficulties and perils. In many places the travellers had to crawl on hands and feet. In some the Queen and child were wrapped in hides of oxen and lowered down precipitous descents with ropes. Before reaching Canossa Henry wrote to his cousin Matilda begging her to grant him an interview. Matilda met him outside the walls of Canossa accompanied by Albert Azzo, Margrave of Este, her uncle, by Hugo, Abbot of Cluny, and other Italian nobles. Henry asked that he might be released from excommunication, promising submission and penance, and urging that the German barons had accused him out of envy and hatred, and hoped to depose him without trial by the lapse of a year and a day from the date of his sentence. Gregory replied that it was contrary to justice and to the law of the Church to decide in the absence of the accusers; that Henry must appear before the Diet at Augsburg; and that he, the Pope, would there hear both sides impartially, and decide according to the right.

The strange scenes that followed have been often told. Henry was admitted by Matilda within the outer circle of the ramparts of Canossa. There he stood three days in the bitter January weather, barefooted in the snow, clothed in a penitent's garb, and craving forgiveness and reconciliation. Gregory remained inflexible in his determination to abide by the agreement that the Augsburg Diet alone should finally decide between the King and his subjects. The King was about to retire in despair. He went into a chapel of the castle dedicated to St Nicholas, and there found Hugo, Abbot of Cluny, and Matilda. Hugo declined to intercede for him. The King knelt before Matilda. "Unless you help me," he cried, "I shall never break shield again, for the Pope has struck me. Oh, my cousin, make him bless me—go." Matilda did intercede, and her intercession was successful. The Pope consented to receive Henry, who threw himself at the Pope's feet, and with tears repeatedly implored forgiveness. Gregory reversed the sentence of excommunication, and admitted Henry to the communion of the Church, but on the express condition that the King should appear before the Imperial Diet and submit to its decision whatever it might be, otherwise the absolution granted to him should be null and void. The King bound himself by oath to observe these conditions, and Matilda and the other nobles who were at Canossa also bound themselves by oath as sureties for the King. Canossa must have seemed in the eyes of Europe to be the culminating point of the moral revolution which had been progressing for many years. The supremacy of the Empire over the Church was abandoned by the heir to the Imperial crown. The independence, if not the supremacy, of the Church seemed established beyond the possibility of doubt. But the event proved that the struggle between the sceptre and crozier was by no means at an end. Henry's vows were writ in water. He had no sooner rejoined his followers and adherents in Lombardy than he found that his degradation had aroused their contempt and shaken their fidelity. He formed a treacherous plot to seize the person of the Pope, and invited him to attend a Council beyond the Po. The Pope accepted the invitation, and crossed the Po. Luckily, Matilda with an armed force accompanied him. Either by her natural sagacity and sharp-sightedness—for Donizo says she was *multis oculis oculatam*—or by the receipt of some intelligence, she discovered the plot, and led the Pope hastily back to Canossa. Henry, though foiled in this plot, barred the Pope's passage across the Alps; and Rodolph of Suabia, who had undertaken to send an escort for the Pope, was unable to do so as the passes were guarded by the adherents of the King. The Diet at Augsburg could not be held, and Gregory returned from Canossa to Rome. Before he left, Matilda, who was now a childless widow, with no nearer relation than Henry, made a donation of all her possessions to the Holy See as her heir. Donizo states distinctly that this donation was made at Canossa and in writing. Doubts have been cast on his statement because, when the donation was renewed many years after, the deed of gift recited that the original donation, which had been lost, was executed in the palace of the Lateran before witnesses who were armed. The explanation of the discrepancy probably is that a preliminary written document signed at Canossa was afterwards confirmed by a more formal instrument executed in Rome.

The German barons issued a fresh summons for a diet to be held at Forsheim, in Bavaria, in March, 1077. Henry was summoned to attend, but refused to appear. He also refused to give Gregory a safe conduct into Germany, or to allow him to cross the Alps. The papal legates present at Forsheim in vain counselled delay. The diet at Forsheim unanimously voted the deposition of Henry, and elected as king in his place Rodolph, Duke of Suabia, Henry's brother-in-law and his most powerful adversary. This decision was concurred in by all three orders of which the diet consisted: the order of nobles, the order of deputies of the people, and the ecclesiastical order.

Both Henry and Rodolph busied themselves in enlisting their partisans and preparing for hostilities. Gregory was untiring in his efforts to avert the calamity of civil war. He sent letters addressed to the Archbishops, Bishops, Dukes, Counts and all the laity of Germany, announcing his readiness to hold the inquiry which both Kings had asked for, and to decide which of the two had right and justice on his side, and deploring the loss of life and all the miseries which war would bring with it. He held two Councils in Rome in 1078, and another in 1079, at each of which envoys of the two Kings were present. Henry's envoys asked that Rodolph might be excommunicated as a traitor and a rebel. The Council refused to condemn Rodolph before the case had been heard. Henry's envoys swore on behalf of their master that deputies should come to Rome and conduct the Legates of the Holy See safely to Germany, and that the King would obey the decision of the Legates in all things. This oath, like so many others of Henry's, was disregarded. He was determined not to allow the arbitration between himself and Rodolph to take place. He did not send an escort for the Legates, and guarded the passes into the Tyrol. Gregory seems to have been at last convinced that his attempts at conciliation and at a peaceful settlement of the great quarrel were doomed to failure. He had received a remarkable letter from the Saxon Bishops complaining bitterly of the neutrality of his conduct; of the letters in which he spoke of two Kings, whose respective claims he was ready to examine; of his request to Henry to supply an escort into Germany; of the miseries caused by this encouragement given to both parties, civil war, great slaughter, destruction of churches, pillage of ecclesiastical property; and declaring that, as ignorant and simple men, they could not understand the subtle wisdom which had dictated this policy. In a Council held at Rome in March, 1080, a Council more numerously attended than any preceding one, Gregory took the final step. Envoys of Rodolph appeared before the Council and appealed to it for justice against Henry, who had invaded the kingdom from which he had been excluded, had devastated it by sword, fire and pillage, had driven Archbishops and Bishops from their Sees and had distributed their dignities, as though they were fiefs, among his partisans, had slaughtered many thousand men and burnt or destroyed many churches. The Council was unanimous in demanding that Henry should be deprived of his kingdom and excommunicated. Gregory accordingly delivered a solemn judgement excommunicating Henry, taking from him all royal power and dignity, and granting to Rodolph, whom the Germans had elected King, the kingdom of Germany.

To the minds of the eleventh century—even to so acute and far-seeing a mind as Gregory's—the idea of two separate powers, the spiritual and the temporal, each supreme in its own province and independent of the other, had not occurred. The whole of society was organized on the feudal system, in which successive grades of dependence linked all classes together: vassal depended on lord, lord on the greater barons, and these on the King. The Emperor of Germany claimed to have the Pope as one of his feudatories. Gregory's reply was that the Head of the Church was supreme lord over earthly monarchs.

Henry lost no time in asserting his own view of the relation between Church and State. He convoked an assembly at Brixen in the Tyrol, which was attended by many German and Lombard barons, but by no more than thirty Bishops, all of whom were hostile to Gregory, and for the most part had incurred his censures. The assembly, under pressure from Henry, passed sentence of deposition against the Pope, and elected as his successor Guibert, Archbishop of Ravenna, who took the title of Clement III.

The King's partisans in Lombardy had increased in number and in audacity. The excommunicated priests and the German vassals of Matilda combined against her. As many as thirty Bishops declared for the antipope, and on the arrival of an army under the command of Henry's son, almost the whole of Lombardy rose in arms. The combined forces invaded Matilda's states. Matilda assembled what troops she could collect, and marched at their head against the Germans. She met them at Volta, near Mantua, and was defeated. On the same day in October, 1080, Rodolph, victorious in a fierce battle in Saxony, received a mortal wound from the hand of Godfrey of Bouillon, the nephew of Godfrey Hunchback, and died soon after. This double disaster struck terror into the Church party; but the undaunted spirit of Gregory never quailed, and Matilda displayed equal fortitude. Henry himself, in the spring of 1081, crossed the Alps and invaded Tuscany. Matilda was unable to withstand Henry's army in the field. Henry laid Tuscany waste, burning villages and destroying palaces. He besieged Florence. Matilda defended the town for a month. When capitulation was inevitable, she retired to other towns; but these also surrendered to Henry, and she took refuge in Canossa and other mountain fortresses. The details of her combats are not recorded. Donizo says that if he were to recount all her noble deeds of arms, his verses would outnumber the stars. Enthusiastic tradition has gathered round her achievements. Medieval monuments represent her on horseback, clad in a long red robe, holding a grenade in her hand. No other chief of her troops is mentioned, and it seems clear that she commanded in person, and was the soul of the obstinate resistance to the German invader. Henry marched against Lucca, where he had many partisans. The gates were opened to him. Anselm, the holy Bishop of Lucca, was obliged to fly; and Henry, with his usual disregard of all ecclesiastical order, deposed him, and put a turbulent deacon into his place. Anselm escaped to Canossa, and Henry laid siege to that fortress, but was repulsed by a skilful sortie of the garrison under Matilda, who captured the royal standard. Henry then turned against Rome, where he hoped for an easy victory. But Matilda, divining his purpose, had anticipated him. She collected troops and sent them to Rome. She stripped her basilicas, her monasteries and even her chapel at Canossa of church plate, and sent it all to Rome to aid Gregory in his defence. When Henry reached Rome he found the citizens prepared and armed, the walls and bastions guarded. He encamped in the spot called Nero's Field, under the walls of Rome. The siege lasted two years.

Matilda harassed the royal army by frequent sorties, in which her troops were supported by many Roman nobles who had rallied to the Church and by the inhabitants of the city, to whom German domination was always hateful. In the summer months malarial fever broke out among Henry's troops, and he was obliged to withdraw from Rome to some healthier spot. In the second year of the siege, unable to enter Rome, he went through the ceremony of being crowned Emperor by the antipope Guibert in his camp outside the walls. He endeavoured by excursions into Tuscany to draw Matilda away from Rome, and he unsuccessfully besieged Florence and Canossa. At length, in the spring of 1084, he succeeded in entering Rome. In some accounts this success was said to have been attained by the treacherous surrender of one of the gates; in others the Leonine city is said to have been taken by assault by Godfrey of Bouillon, who served in the King's army. Gregory shut himself up in the Castle of St Angelo; but the Lateran and St Peter's were in the possession of the King. The antipope Guibert was consecrated and placed in the chair of St Peter in the Lateran, and Henry was crowned Emperor in the Vatican. In this dark hour of disaster Gregory's principles had a remarkable triumph. Guibert convoked a Synod in St Peter's, and the decisions of this Synod condemned simoniacal and married priests. The Synod consisted mainly of Bishops whom Gregory had excommunicated. It was presided over by his rival. He himself lay besieged and helpless in the Castle of St Angelo; and yet the Synod felt obliged to recognize the principles of ecclesiastical discipline which he had laid down in Councils formerly stigmatized by Guibert as the Synagogue of Satan.

Help now came to Gregory from another quarter. Robert Guiscard, the Norman, marched with an army from Apulia on Rome. Henry did not venture to try conclusions with this formidable adversary. He left Rome with his troops and with Guibert the antipope and retired to Siena. Many of the Romans had espoused Henry's cause, and feared the punishment that the Normans might inflict. The gates of Rome were therefore shut against Guiscard.

But he took the city by assault, and for three days Rome suffered more than she had done at the hands of Alaric. Whole regions were devastated by fire. Massacre and pillage were universal. Churches with all their treasures were burnt. The Pope's entreaties to Guiscard at last checked these horrors. Guiscard, who was in haste to return to the East, where he had undertaken the conquest of the Greek Empire, left Rome eight or ten days after the sack. Gregory left Rome with him accompanied by some Bishops and Cardinals, and retired to Salerno, whence he was never to return.

Matilda, indefatigable as ever, collected troops in Tuscany and Lombardy, sent emissaries in all directions, and wrote letters to Germany to stimulate resistance against Henry. All the energy and undaunted courage of Gregory seemed to have passed into her soul. Alone she stood against the Emperor of Germany and Italy, and with a deliberate valour, resting on trust in Providence, she maintained an unequal struggle. Henry had assembled an army in Lombardy with which he proposed to take vengeance on Matilda before he returned to Rome. The army, commanded by the Margrave Obert, laid waste the county of Modena. They attacked the fortress of Sorbara near Modena, and encamped round its walls. Matilda, learning the danger of her fortress, collected the flower of her men-at-arms. She approached the enemy's camp on a hot Italian night of July. With loud cries of "St Peter, help thine own!" Matilda and her men fell upon the sleeping Germans. The Margrave Obert was mortally wounded. Great numbers were killed. Six of the chief captains and hundreds of knights were taken prisoners. The camp, the horses, the arms, the tents, the baggage fell into Matilda's hands, and the King's army ceased to exist as a fighting force.

This victory put fresh heart into the supporters of the Church, and even her enemies learnt to admire and respect the masculine energy of Matilda. Soon after this success Matilda lost her old and faithful friend Bishop Anselm who had succeeded his namesake Anselm (Pope Alexander II) in the See of Lucca. He had been her director and her constant supporter. He was trained in all the learning of his time, and remained an earnest student all his life. He was eminent for piety, virtue and devotion to the duties of his See. He had the confidence and respect both of Alexander II and Gregory VII. Even the antipope Guibert had written to Anselm urging him to detach himself from Matilda, but Anselm answered that "she had been confided to him by Holy Church, and that he hoped for a great reward in heaven for having kept guard over one who was ready not only to sacrifice all her worldly possessions in defence of justice, but to shed her blood for the glory of the Church."

The strenuous life of Gregory was also drawing to a close. Although exiled and a fugitive at Salerno, he was constant still in mind and unshaken in his faith. He wrote to Christian princes, William the Conqueror and the King of France, in the same tone of lofty superiority as in his most prosperous days. He sent Legates to Cluny with letters to be distributed among all the faithful, in which he said not one word of his departure from Rome, but deplored and condemned the assaults made on religion by princes, priests and laymen who attacked him because he would not keep silence on the peril of the Church or yield to those who sought to enslave her.

His strength gradually failed, and he died at Salerno, May 25, 1085. His last words were, "I have loved justice and hated iniquity, therefore I die in exile." A Bishop who was by his bedside answered, "How, Lord, can you say you die in exile, since as Vicar of Christ and of the Apostles you have received all nations as your inheritance, and the universe is your domain?" It is doubtful whether the expiring Pope heard these words which were not unsuited to the lofty purpose of his life. He had received frequent messages, if not a personal visit, from Matilda, and he sent her a last blessing before his death, hoping that God would at length "give peace to the dear daughter of Peter, and faithful servant of Christ." In his last moments he urged that the election of his successor should be postponed until Matilda could be present.

Matilda did enjoy an interval of peace of which she made a noble use. Her dominions had been ravaged by Henry, and the towns especially were in ruins. Matilda went from town to town repairing the mischief that had been done, and rebuilding the houses of her people. Schools, hospitals, churches and convents were erected by her orders. She repaired roads and opened new ones. She built bridges over the Arno and other rivers, and restored the dykes which protected the country from inundation. By all these undertakings, the cost of which was defrayed from her own purse, she restored prosperity to Tuscany. Wherever she went, she administered justice, and the humblest suitor was sure to receive at her hands protection against wrong. She gathered round her in Canossa a brilliant court, in which nobles and warriors, poets and artists, all men of distinction in learning or in literature were made equally welcome.

The election of a successor to Gregory had been delayed for a twelvemonth. Under pressure from Matilda the Cardinals at last assembled and elected Desiderius, Abbot of Monte Cassino, who took the title of Victor III. Matilda herself escorted him into Rome. The antipope Guibert had returned there before Gregory's death, and was in possession of the Lateran. He sent soldiers to attack Victor who was about to officiate on Easter Day. Matilda's troops defended Victor. After a violent conflict Matilda placed Victor in safety in the Castle of St Angelo, and Guibert's men were driven back to the Lateran.

Matilda's next enterprise was based on Gregory's policy: to unite discordant Christian communities in some common enterprise. The Mohammedan pirates of Africa infested the Mediterranean, and even the rivers of Italy. Matilda organized a crusade against them. She induced Pisa and Genoa to forego their constant quarrels, and to combine in furnishing transport for the expedition which was intended to attack the pirates in their homes. The crusaders landed near Tunis, attacked and defeated the Saracens, and brought to Italy the Christians who were detained as slaves among them.

Victor III, a saintly but feeble man, survived his election to the chair of Peter a few months only. He died at Monte Cassino whither he had retired from Rome. Matilda, fully conscious of the advantage that a long interregnum might give to the antipope Guibert, sent repeated messages to the Cardinals, and induced them to assemble at Terracina, where Otto, Bishop of Ostia, was elected Pope under the title of Urban II. Urban inherited the principles and the spirit of Gregory VII. He assembled a Council in Rome, and renewed the anathemas against the antipope, the Emperor and all their partisans. The antipope, who was not wanting in energy, succeeded in making a diversion by fomenting insurrections in Lombardy and in Tuscany. Matilda was obliged to leave Rome hastily in order to quell the rebellion in her own dominions. She applied herself to this task with her usual energy, and speedily restored order. But the disturbed state of Lombardy, the presence of the antipope in Rome, the support he had from many of the Romans, the prospect of further intervention by Henry IV, who had now brought Saxony into subjection, all these adverse circumstances made Urban desirous of strengthening the situation of Matilda, who was his only staunch ally. He urged upon her, as a matter of public duty, to marry Guelph, son of the Duke of Bavaria, whose forces, united with hers, might be strong enough to withstand all enemies of the Holy See. Matilda's hand had been sought by many illustrious suitors, among others by Robert, son of William the Conqueror. She had refused them all. She was now 43 years old, and Guelph was only 18. Such a marriage was one merely of policy. Matilda reluctantly yielded to Urban's persuasions, and was united to Guelph in 1089. She again stipulated that she should never be asked to leave her beloved Italy.

Henry IV was sorely troubled by this marriage. He seized all that Matilda had inherited from her mother in Lorraine, and crossed the Alps. He laid waste the country round Mantua, and attacked Mantua itself where Matilda and Guelph were both present. Repeated assaults upon the town were repulsed by Matilda, and Henry turned the siege into a blockade. Matilda then left Mantua, and harassed the Germans by constant skirmishes, while she also succeeded in throwing reinforcements into the town. Henry then had recourse to the same expedient that had enabled him to enter Rome. By bribery and promises he won over some of the leaders, and the gates of Mantua were treacherously opened to him (in 1091) after a year's siege. Guelph escaped with difficulty. Henry then took possession of nearly all the country beyond the Po. Matilda dogged his steps, fortified and provisioned the places which still held out, occupied the passes, and with unfaltering courage kept up the struggle. Her forces suffered one reverse among the marshes of the Po. She addressed her beaten soldiers: "Fortune varies," she said, "victors yesterday, we are vanquished to-day; courage alone lives through every day." Henry besieged Monte Bello; but Matilda threw succours into the fortress, and prolonged the defence, until Henry, weary of the siege, proposed to make peace on condition that the antipope Guibert should be acknowledged, in which case he would restore Tuscany to Matilda, and give her his friendship. Matilda would have rejected these proposals at once; but her followers were weary of the war, and pressed acceptance. Matilda then stipulated that a conference should be held of theologians and doctors representing both sides. Matilda was present at the conference, and propounded the question, "Was it lawful to accept the proposed conditions and to purchase the peace of the Church by acknowledging the antipope Guibert?" Herbert, Bishop of Reggio, a learned and exemplary prelate, opened the debate, and urged that the hour for peace had come, and that the misfortunes of the times made it a necessity. But the hermit John then stood up. "No peace," he cried, "peace would be war declared against Father, Son and Holy Ghost. How, great and powerful countess, daughter of Peter, can you consent thus to lose the fruit of so many toils? No, continue to combat for the cause of Christ. Do not hesitate. If the earth fails you, heaven will support you, and will give the victory to the prayers of those who remain faithful to God's Church." This manly counsel prevailed, and the offer of peace was rejected.

The tide now began to turn against Henry. He hoped to overcome the resistance of Monte Bello by constructing a colossal machine which should enable his soldiers to climb over the walls. Matilda, at the head of her best troops, came to the assistance of the besieged at the moment when they were making a sortie. She cut her way to the machine and burnt it. One of Henry's sons was killed in this encounter, and Henry raised the siege. He then made a feint march towards Parma, but doubled back upon Canossa. Matilda divined his purpose, and hurried to assist Canossa. She reached it on a day in October, when a thick fog covered the plain and prevented the Germans from seeing how small was the number of their assailants. She attacked the imperial camp, which was thrown into confusion soon ended in flight. The royal standard was carried by the son of that Margrave Obert who had been defeated by Matilda at Sorbera. He fell from his horse, and the standard was captured. Matilda continued the campaign. She recovered many of the places that Henry had occupied. She sent her husband, the younger Guelph, to Germany, and he and his father revolted against Henry, and obliged him to send back part of his army to Germany Henry made a last effort, and laid siege to the fortress o Nogara; but Matilda, by a skilful movement, cut his communications and obliged him to make a hasty retreat, leaving all the treasures of his camp behind him.

Disasters of another kind awaited Henry. His second wife, Praxedes, terrified and disgusted by his licentious outrages, escaped from Verona, where she was virtually a prisoner, and took refuge with Matilda. Conrad, Henry's eldest son, who as an infant had been carried across the Alps to Canossa, abandoned his father's cause, and sought shelter under Matilda's wings. He was shortly after crowned King of Italy at Monza. Urban II paid the greatest honours to Praxedes, whose misfortunes excited universal sympathy, and turned the minds of men against Henry. Accompanied by Praxedes and Matilda, Urban went to Piacenza and commenced to preach the crusade, which Gregory VII had planned years ago before the times were ripe. Urban then went into France, and at the Council of Clermont issued his summons to all Christians to join in the holy war. The assembly replied by the enthusiastic cry, "God wills it," and the first crusade was begun. This wonderful uprising of Christendom in one common purpose told strongly against Henry and in favour of the Papal cause. The crusaders were necessarily soldiers of the Church and of her acknowledged head.

When Urban returned from France to Rome, the antipope Guibert soon had to leave the city, and seek retirement at Ravenna, where he died impenitent. Henry himself withdrew from Italy across the Alps, defeated by the energy, the constancy, and the courage of a woman. Urban died in 1099, and was succeeded by Cardinal Regnier, who took the name of Pascal II. Conrad died of fever in the same year; and Matilda gave him a royal funeral and monument at Florence. But Henry IV's second son, who was also named Henry, revolted against his father, took him prisoner, and treated him with great cruelty. The aged King was called upon to confess publicly that he had unjustly persecuted Hildebrand and supported Guibert. Two letters of his remain, one addressed to Louis the Younger, King of France, whose aid he implored, and the other addressed to Hugo, Abbot of Cluny, in which he gives a lamentable picture of the hopeless misery and degradation of his lot. He died as he was attempting to raise forces against his son, and his remains, which at first were buried in the Cathedral of Spires, were exhumed by his son's order, and placed in an unconsecrated spot outside the cathedral. Thus ended the long struggle in which Henry IV had identified his cause with the thraldom and corruption of the Church, and with resistance to her efforts for liberty and reform.

Henry V, the undutiful son of Henry IV, made a raid upon Rome, took prisoners Pope Pascal and many Cardinals and Bishops, and extorted by threats from the Pope concessions which were bitterly repented and afterwards withdrawn by him. Before leaving Italy he paid a visit to Matilda at Bibianello. Matilda was then 65 years old, but she retained much of her youthful beauty ennobled by the great deeds and high purposes which had filled her life. The Emperor enjoyed her hospitality for three days, treated her with the utmost respect, called her his mother, and made her Vice-Queen of Ligaria. Donizo tells us that he spoke to her in German; but she, although familiar with that language, answered him in the language of Italy for which she had done and suffered so much.

One last trouble awaited her. Mantua rebelled; and the Mantuans got possession of and destroyed the fort of Ripalta. Matilda was ill when this outbreak occurred. When she had somewhat recovered and learnt what had happened, she at once armed her vassals, and advanced against Mantua. The rebels lost heart at her approach, and sent envoys to tender their submission and to implore her forgiveness. Matilda forgave them and was received in triumph in Mantua. This last effort was too much for her strength. On her return from Mantua she was obliged by a fresh attack of illness to stop at Bondero, near Reggio. She insisted on being carried into the chapel to hear midnight Mass on Christmas Day. She took cold there, and never rose from her bed again. Her vigorous constitution fought for seven months against death. She received the last sacraments from the Bishop of Reggio, and expired July 23, 1115. Her last words, as she kissed the crucifix, were: "O Thou whom I have served so long, I pray Thee now wipe out my sins."

Donizo's grief at the death of his mistress is touching in its sincerity. "The honour and glory of Italy descend with her," he says, "into her grave. Her death is a calamity to to all who live rightly. Cruel men and tyrants put on an appearance of justice because they knew she would be just. But now the poor will be denuded, churches will be despoiled, and there will be no one to inflict punishment. Soldiers will seek to overmaster their accustomed lords, and clerics will spend in sumptuous living what should belong to the poor. The nobles, who are humble now, will help one another in wrong-doings, as thief helps thief."

Matilda was buried in the Church of St Benedict attached to a monastery at Mantua, founded by her ancestors. In the year 1635, by the order of Urban VIII, her remains were transferred to Rome, and deposited in St Peter's beneath a monument which still stands there. The inscription on the monument speaks of her as "a woman worthy of eternal praise," and "a Protectress of the Apostolic See."

Sir James Stephen says truly that Matilda "bequeathed to the world a name second in the annals of her age to none but that of Hildebrand himself." For upwards of thirty years she maintained an unequal contest in defence of the liberty of the Church and of Italy. To her masculine gifts and military achievements she added all the tenderness and gentleness of her sex. She had fought against Henry IV; but after he had died in defeat and misery, she implored Paschal II to remove the interdict upon him, and thus obtained for him Christian burial in the Cathedral of Spires by the side of his wife Bertha. Her charity was boundless, and her piety sincere. Donizo says of her that "she carried little children in her arms, supported the needy, surpassed priests in the love of Christ, and was assiduous day and night in sacred offices." Her love of literature was remarkable for that illiterate age. She collected manuscripts and formed a library at Lucca unsurpassed by any other in Italy. Her library comprised not only illuminated manuscripts of the Scriptures, but books on all the liberal arts. She translated classical authors and worked herself at the copying of manuscripts. By her orders Anselm, Bishop of Lucca, undertook a commentary on the Psalms and a compendium of Canon law. She also studied the Roman civil law under the guidance of able tutors, and became proficient in that arduous subject. She was acquainted with the works of Plato and Aristotle, and, besides her mastery of modern languages, she could speak Latin to priests and scholars, and wrote Latin letters to the several Popes whose reign she witnessed, and to the Patriarchs of Jerusalem and Constantinople. Her great public works have already been mentioned. Her justice as a ruler was conspicuous. Donizo declares that "she never forgot to observe all useful laws... She was lofty to the proud and gentle to the humble... Prosperity did not change her, nor did misfortune disturb her. Judgement and wisdom walked with her in all her steps." The affectionate respect felt for her by Gregory VII appears constantly in his letters. He writes to her and to her mother Beatrice: "I have in you not only vicars, but another self, if I may so speak. That does not surprise me; if I am loved by you as much as I love you, nobody will rank before me in your heart." Again he writes to them: "There is nothing we detest so much as exaggeration and idle praise; but it is mere truth that we rely with more confidence on your noble devotion than on the promises and support of all the kings in the world; and this confidence is inspired by your words, your actions, your zeal, your piety, your faith and your constancy." In another letter he expresses a wish to see them, for "your counsels are the counsels of beloved sisters, of daughters of Peter, and we invoke them in all the affairs and difficulties with which we are assailed." I have already quoted the testimony of Anselm to Matilda's heroic constancy.

All the chroniclers ascribe to Matilda a striking beauty and a stately carriage. Donizo says her countenance was cheerful and her voice was sweet. She had dark hair in great profusion, dark eyes, and a dark Italian complexion inherited from her father. No authentic portrait of her exists. In the Vatican library there is a manuscript copy of Donizo's poem to which a miniature is attached, and this is the original of various portraits of Matilda that are contained in later works. Cimabue painted her more than a century after her death, in warlike costume, riding a fiery horse, and carrying a pomegranate in one hand, symbol of purity. Dante, on the border line of Purgatory and Paradise, sees a beautiful woman walking near the banks of the river Lethe, singing and gathering flowers. She precedes the mystic chariot of Rome, on which Beatrice is riding. She typifies the union of the active and contemplative life; and to her Dante gives the name of Matilda, thus placing the great Countess next after Beatrice herself. Some have thought that Tasso intended to paint Matilda in the person of Clorinda, the warlike virgin, who was baptized on the field of battle by her conqueror. Matilda's name lived on in the popular imagination, as well as in the verse of poets, and she remained to her countrymen the "Great Countess," the "Great Italian."

LLANDAFF

IN A LIBRARY

LONG rows of books in figured backs
Of gleaming leather, dimly lit;
A ticking clock, whose soft attacks
Upon the silence deepen it;

No other sound in all the house
But the low fluttering of the fire;
To stab the stillness and arouse
The ghosts of anger or desire:

Within, the warmth of these four walls
Yields warrant, then, for quiet mirth;
Without, the chasm of night appals,
The full moon grins upon the earth.

Her frozen signal of decay,
As a dead tree in summer, tells
That the whole universe one day
Shall speak of death and nothing else.

And all who wrote these books are dead,
Yet of their laughter and their tears
We are not disinherited;
These walls have stood six hundred years.

Ancestral legends lichening
The parapets of long ago
Enchant them with strange dreams that sing
Of deeds our childhood seemed to know.

And from these books departed souls
Shoot out their radiance into mine,
As heat, incarcerate in coals,
From suns that ceased long since to shine.

Nor may I well believe that thus
In brute appliances alone,
Such souls communicate with us
From darkness, whither they are gone.

In a Library

But, as the virtue of a star
Thrills through the ether to our eyes,
Their love, vibrating from afar,
Pierces our night's immensities;

And here, where ancient wit and worth
Have still so much of life to tell,
Like blinder forces of the earth,
Seems also indestructible.

I feel their souls without a sound
Growing and glowing nigh and nigher
Within the shadows closing round
The somnolencies of the fire:

Until, possessed by memories
Of men who conquered lust and strife,
I am persuaded that there is
A life persisting after life.

G. W.

CRINAGORAS OF MITYLENE

Crinagoræ Mitylenæi Epigrammata edidit, prolegomenis, commentario, verborum indice illustravit Maximilianus Rubensohn. Berolini. 1898.

F. Susemihl. Geschichte der Griechischen Literatur in der Alexandrinerzeit. Leipzig. 1891.

Anthologia Græca Epigrammatum Palatina cum Planudea: edidit Hugo Stadtmueller. Vol. I. Lipsiae. 1899. Vol. II. pars prima. 1899.

Epigrammatum Anthologia Palatina: ed. Firmin Didot. Paris. 1871

WHAT would you say if, on consulting the *New English Dictionary* about the usage and authority of any particular word, you were vouchsafed no more information than a reference to Palgrave's *Golden Treasury*, page 57? Would you not fall to railing against Dr Murray and all his associates for so slovenly and unsystematic a plan? But a scholar who turns up his Liddell and Scott is often fobbed off with a similar looseness of method; under δουπέω, e.g., I find this entry: "A. Pass. ἐδουπήθην in Anth. P. IX, 283."

Now, knowing the *Golden Treasury* to be chronologically arranged, "p. 57" does give me some clue to the date of the usage cited, and English poetry has but some five hundred years' range down to the editor's day. But in the Greek Anthology from Sappho to Constantine Cephalas is 1700 years, and to Planudes wellnigh 2000; and to read that my word occurs in Book IX, merely tells me that it is one of the *Epigrammata Demonstrativa*, and gives me no more precise note of time than this astounding gulf of seventeen or twenty centuries.

I trust this blemish may be removed from the new edition of the Lexicon; and I would not have alluded to any such obsolete practice as taking count of the dates and usages of words—when you might be a light-hearted antiquary building castles in the earth—except that I wanted to show by this example how grievously those whose duty it is to provide the reader with roads and bridges to travel about literature conveniently, have neglected this rich vast wilderness of the Anthology. Let me amend my metaphor and call it, not a wilderness, but a congested district; the neglect is none the more excusable. Another witness to the same accusation may be found in the *apparatus criticus* to the admirable new Teubner text of the Anthology. Hardly an English name is ever recorded as a contributor to the work of correction, with the illustrious but lonely exceptions of Professor R. Ellis and Mr J. W. Mackail. The Germans have done everything. The Anthology is virtually an unread book in this country.

It used not to be so; our own epigrammatists of the seventeenth, eighteenth and earlier nineteenth centuries testify to that. What is the cause of this change in the fashion ? This would be much too large an inquiry. It would be well worth while indeed to discover, and then try and combat, the causes which have banished Plutarch and Athenæus—to say nothing of all the Greek and Latin Christian poets and all the Renascence humanists—to the dusty top shelf of old-fashioned libraries. But the thing would grow into a whole treatise on the principles of literary education; and it is time we were getting away into the small corner in which this paper professes to move. I will merely suggest then that a pretty and convenient form for such a treatise would be an invective against the late Dr B. Jowett as chiefly responsible for this furious toadying of literary masterpieces, which professing to popularize classics has in fact led us into the worst kind of pedantry.

While the greater classics have been so pawed all over by commentators in the last generation that one longs with a kind of sickness and suffocation for a text, a whole text, and nothing but a text, books like the Anthology (or books that might be constructed out of the Anthology, for there is nothing canonical in Cephalas' arrangement) are unread for want of modern editing.

This paper is designed to lay the approaches towards an acquaintance with a Greek minor poet, who survives in the Anthology—neither the best nor the worst of the Anthology minor poets, Crinagoras of Mitylene. Any such paper which goes to swell the plague of books about books, can yet justify its existence if it gratify anybody's curiosity; and yet more, I would say, if it succeed in exciting anybody's curiosity. Those who climb to the top of the wall which fences this garden, the Anthology, are very welcome to kick down their ladder afterwards.

But why, you may ask, should anybody feel any curiosity about Crinagoras of Mitylene—I mean the preliminary curiosity which alone gives a book its first chance? Shall I say, "Because he must have spoken with Virgil and Horace and moved in that Roman world which is and must always be some way ours because it was theirs"? I will tell you candidly how I first conceived the curiosity to explore him; it was by reading in the index to the Paris edition of the Anthology that there were some fifty pieces of his preserved. His grand merit is that he has survived; he exists; he is straw for my bricks. Then every poet without a biography has a little of the charm which haunts an unsigned masterpiece; only one degree removed from anonymity, he realizes in his life and some way transfuses into his work that most wonderful of all qualities which the great masters can embody in their masterpieces—the enigmatical.

Till we come to the Anthology itself we have no more of Crinagoras than a bare mention in Strabo and an obscure reference in the *Etymologicum Magnum*. In 1888, while Rubensohn's book (the standard complete edition—a pamphlet of some 120 pages) was in the press, a lucky find of inscriptions at Mitylene by Cichorius added the fragment of evidence which completes a few arcs in the broken circle of our information. We learn from it that Crinagoras was the son of Callippus; we meet with his name among the ambassadors sent by the Republic of Mitylene to treat with Augustus in B.C. 28; and a scrap preserved of a letter which Augustus wrote to the Mityleneans from Tarraco in Spain, also embodies his name among the list of their envoys.

Now we have the clue to explain why Crinagoras in the Anthology writes epigrams in praise of Augustus, Marcellus, Antonia and Germanicus; now we can understand why Crinagoras writes epigrams dated from Spain.

But it is time to trace such slight outlines of his life as can be derived, when all is said and done, from these scanty indications. The earliest date afforded by the poems themselves is the year 44 B.C., if we are right in referring the occasion of Ep. XXXII * to the colony of *Liberti* planted at Corinth by Julius Cæsar. It runs thus:

> O piteous change of dwellers, these for those!
> Alas for Corinth, and for Hellas' woes!
> Better be some mean islet reef half drowned,
> Some barren sandy waste of Libyan ground,
> Than have this crew of chattels here set free
> To crush the bones of the old Bacchiadæ.

There is nothing in these lines that promises the future court poet, but then times were difficult; Lesbos had been strongly Pompeian in sentiment; and even the ductile Horace made the mistake of fighting on the wrong side two years later than this. Probably this epigram belongs to Crinagoras' youth; at least he must have wished it to be thought a juvenile outburst if ever it came to his patron's ears in Rome afterwards. He made two voyages to Italy; for in Ep. XLIII,† where he says he is looking for a Handbook of Navigation, and invokes his friend the geographer Menippus to draw him a map on a globe, he gives as the reason of his voyage the desire to see his friends again, from whom he has been long absent. We have seen that he was an envoy in B.C. 28. It appears that he was there a year or two earlier than this, but there is nothing to show when he attached himself to the court of Octavian; whether, as has been conjectured, he came to make his fortune at Rome and gained such a position as tutor to the imperial family that his countrymen therefore made him their representative, or, coming first on State business, was induced to stay at Rome on business of his own. In Ep. XLVII he urges a sedentary friend, not named, at least to visit Attica and see the Eleusinian mysteries; there is just the possibility that this belongs to the year 31 B.C., when Augustus was initiated. Anyhow we may conclude that Crinagoras was himself an adept when he wrote it, and we may guess that Athens was his half-way house to Italy. Some would also attribute the Corinthian piece (before quoted) to this journey. When the second journey was made is a question we have no means to determine. And it will now suffice to say that he appears to have lived on at Rome certainly as late as B.C. 7, when he writes in celebration of Tiberius' triumphs in East and West.* If the earthquake of which he expresses his terror in Ep. XLIV† is that which is recorded to have happened in A.D. 4, we should have an interval of forty-eight years between his first and his last datable pieces, and the whole would fall within an average human span of life and of literary activity.

---

* A.P. ix, 284.

† A.P. ix, 559.

I have called him a Greek poet at the court of Augustus. Rubensohn tables his court pieces as follows:

Addressed to Augustus, Nos XXVI, XXXIV, XLV.
Tiberius, No. XLIX.
Germanicus, No. XXXI.
Tiberius and Germanicus, No. XXXIII.
Marcellus } Children of Octavia } Nos XI, XLI.
Antonia } Children of Octavia } Nos VIII, XXIX.
Cleopatra (Minor), also called Selene (died B.C. 4), No. XXVIII.

Rubensohn is reasonable in suggesting that Crinagoras was probably tutor to Octavia's children. Ep. XLI accompanies a present of a copy of Callimachus' *Hecale* to Marcellus, Ep. XXIX a present of Anacreon to Antonia. There are a couple of epigrams by Germanicus preserved—not at all interesting and smacking strongly of school; perhaps Crinagoras was the schoolmaster. Octavia had a great fancy for Greek men of letters—so Plutarch tells us;‡ and Tiberius' similar tastes in poetry are recorded by Suetonius.

But having justified my title I need not detain you with this aspect of Crinagoras; these make up only a quarter of his legacy; and perhaps they are not even the greatest of court poets whose court pieces are their greatest poems. It will be enough to present a specimen or so of this kind when we come presently to taste his verses as literature.

The so-called Book IV of the *Palatina* is a curious document: it displays like a sample in section the strata of the whole work, consisting of the poetical prefaces of the sundry selectors whose anthologies are embedded in the general block. First that of Meleager's *Garland*, which was completed before Crinagoras began to write, perhaps before he was born; next that of Philippus' *Garland*. This is Philip of Salonica, who lived a century after Crinagoras' death and brought the collection up to his own date. Philip's supplement is also called Στέφανος, and he feels bound to mimic Meleager's fancy of symbolizing each poet under the emblem of a flower. Doubtless a bit of mere traditionalism on his part, for after he has made out a dozen couplets on the καὶ ὁπλοτέρων τὴν ὀλιγοστιχίην, he winds up with this perfunctory conclusion: "*And as for the rest, you may liken them to any fresh blooming flowers you please!*" It would not have been worth while to stay for Philip at all, were it not that these verses of his contain, I believe, the only ancient literary judgement upon Crinagoras. His place in the Στέφανος is between Antipater and Antiphilos, and his emblem is the corymbus of ivy. Meleager had chosen the corymbus of ivy to figure Leonidas of Tarentum. I cannot pretend to determine where the point of similitude falls, even in Meleager; and still less whether Philip intended any precise symbolism. But at least he must have known that he was hinting a comparison between his corymbus and Meleager's, between the Leonidas who was friends with Theocritus, and the Crinagoras of 250 years later.

---

* XLIX, Plan. iv, 61.   † A.P. ix, 560.   ‡ Popl. Vit. 17.

Now, to take his poems in the Anthology classification, he has 2 *Amatoria*, 11 *Dedicatoria*, 13 *Sepulcralia*, 21 *Demonstrativa*, 1 *Hortatorium*, 1 among *Convivia et Irrisoria*, and 4 more *Hortatoria* which we owe to the appendix of Planudes.

Crinagoras is not an erotic poet; one of the two registered under this head is really a little *epicedion*;* the other deserves no more mention than to remark that Propertius perhaps imitates it, and that the lady's name Gemella proves it to have been written in Italy.†

The category of *Dedicatoria* is patient of a large interpretation: it includes several occasional verses written to accompany a present which the poet sends to a friend. Here are half a dozen samples: this first is written for Antiphanes, son of Antiphanes, who dedicates the torch he won with when he ran in the *Lampadephoria.*

---

* Rubensohn, I, A.P. v, 108.

† R. II, A.P. v, 119.

Antiphanes' namesake, the lad his son,
To Hermes dedicates the prize he won.
He in that race—where boys in emulous band
Commemorate the fire Prometheus stole—
Devoutly victor, bore his torch to goal
And laid it here yet flaring from his hand.*

This next is a piece which announces or convoys a present of a silver pen, which he makes to one Proclus, a boy who has just learned how to write. It is a birthday gift; birthdays seem to have moved Crinagoras to his most happily turned trifles.

A silver pen with polished stick for shaft
I send to Proclus for his birthday gift.
The nib's two horns in fine-slit fissure meet,
The tip glides smoothly o'er the flying sheet.
A poor thing, Proclus, (not from any thrift
Of love in me,) to help your new-learnt craft.†

The next is addressed to a certain Lucius. Both for the subject and the style it reads like an anticipation of many an epigram in Martial; and a more skilful version would bring it out like a bit of Matthew Prior in English. The gift is a toothpick.

Lucius, a crook-billed eagle's plume I send,
Dyed blue and sharply-pointed at the end.
Should morsel stick between your teeth at dinner,
This shall with mild compunctions rout the sinner.
Love has no limits, but the pocket has,
This trifle take from—Yours Crinagoras.‡

The next is again a proper dedication of garden stuff to Priapus; an epigram which has the lickerish smack of Herrick, but very Greek also in its luxuriant enumeration of those natural dainties which tickle the eye as well as the palate:

Clusters ripe with unborn wine;
Brown kernel-marrows of the pine;
Slices of the red pomegranate,
So ripe it cracked ere you began it;

---

*R. III, A. P vi, 100. †R. IV, A. P. vi, 227. ‡R. V, A. P. vi, 229.

Crinagoras of Mitylene

Almonds delicate, which plead,
"Bite us not hard; there is no need";
The ambrosial juice my bee-hive makes;
A high heap of griddle cakes;
Garlic cloves, the drink to garnish:
Pears, rich-glazed with golden varnish;
Plenty to make the jaws go quicker
And reconcile the lips to liquor.
A little meal for that great god
Who flaunts his horn and sports his rod;
O Garden-God, accept of these
Tributes from Philoxenides.*

I like to fancy that that was written for a country neighbour in Lesbos, before Crinagoras went into the great world and wrote for princes or corrected their exercises. The next shows us Crinagoras the courtier. It was written in honour of the young Marcellus, "the darling of the Roman people," whose name is a household word, thanks to one of the most famous passages in Virgil. The occasion of this piece was Marcellus' home-coming from the Spanish War (aged only 16 or 17 even then), and solemnly dedicating his first growth of beard. He was dead within three years. I quote it, not as being of Crinagoras' best work, but as affording a specimen of his manner as laureate, and gaining an adventitious interest from the person of the youth whom Virgil and Propertius have canonized for posterity as the type of princely promise cut short.

Marcellus, ere, enriched with spoils of Spain,
From western wars he crossed the Alps again,
Had never shaved his cheek. To fight for Rome
A boy went forth, a man she welcomes home.†

I have saved the plum of this part for the last; an epigram (perhaps the only one of Crinagoras') which, in strict competition of merit, might deserve a place in the Anthology of the world. They are lines written to a lady on her birthday, being also the eve of her marriage, and accompany a gift of winter roses.

In April I had roses;
In midwinter too
My rose-bush uncloses
Her crimson buds anew.

---

* R. vi, A. P. vi, 232.

† R. xi, A. P. vi, 161.

Buds on your birthday breaking,
They smile and they say:
"*We wake for the making*
To-morrow's bridal gay.
Her lovely brows entwining
Is far better fun
Than to pine for the shining
Of April's tardy sun."*

And so to Book VII, in which book—the *Sepulcralia*—it might be maintained, is secreted the most essentially Greekish flavour of anything in Greek. For they have such a natural dignity and delicacy of feeling about death that no change of nationality or even religion can estrange us wholly from them. What else is the achievement of Greece than this, that her people thought beautifully and justly, and expressed their thought in a most sure-fingered adequacy of form, about matters which flesh and blood can never cease to be concerned with, all apparent revolutions and progresses of civilization notwithstanding? About all such bottomless contrasts as the difference between town and country, night and day, sea and land, youth and age, life and death, nobody writes the better for all the development of human ingenuity.

There are many finer things in the Book of Epitaphs than Crinagoras' contribution, but when a great school of any art has been well formed, the Epigoni continue to produce good work and help to complete the expression of their race or civilization even long after the central fires of inspiration are quenched. Just as in France to-day there is too well established a school of writing to make possible there the kind of stuff that we gulp down and call it plays and novels; so this form in particular, the epitaph, among all epigrams (as again, the epigram among all forms of poetry) continued among the Greeks as a trick so well mastered that for century after century it does not fall below adequate performance. Μέγα βιβλίον μέγα κακόν was a wise and true saying of Callimachus for his age and for the genius of a decline; but mere art might long sustain the task of producing quatrains, though to write epics any more was an infatuated perversion.

---

* R. vii, A.P. vi, 345.

However, this digression begins to run beyond all patience or excuse. It was really enough to have said that Crinagoras' *Epitaphia*, though not equal to Simonides', are worth quoting in a sample or two; as I now proceed to do.

The first shall be one written for a servant who died abroad with Crinagoras. He died of a sunstroke, but we are not told where. The fate which befell Virgil at Megara might be anybody's fate anywhere in the world where Crinagoras' travels took him. To understand the piece, we must remember the connotation of *terræ filius* as a man *sans père et sans proches*.

Earth, so they told me, was my mother;
And earth is this which wraps me now instead.
I find this no worser earth than t'other
Which suffered fiery suns to strike me dead;
Long here I'll make my lodging and my bed.
This headstone o'er my grave,
This alien stone, has only this to tell:
INACHUS, MUCH-MOURNED SLAVE,
WHO SERVED CRINAGORAS, HIS MASTER, WELL.*

The next ranks among those few hints of the poet's history which we have seen his work afford. The epigraphic evidence confirms what this poem indicated, that it belongs to Crinagoras' second mission, and records the death of one of his fellow-envoys, the young and talented Seleucus, in Spain, perhaps at Tarraco.

Why will we trust our idle hopes, and why
Range far afield, forgetting that we die?
Finished in every grace of heart and tongue
Seleucus lived—Seleucus died, so young.
To furthest Spain from Lesbos—the far cry!
An alien, ne'er a kinsman buried nigh,
In these interminable sands to lie! †

The next speaks to me with something of the gallant grandeur of one of our own cavalier poets. The subject is that princess whom such a romantic presumption as might be expected of her parents surnamed Selene, the Moon—unless it was only the obsequious fancy of Egyptian courtiers. Crinagoras was not a Roman; he felt none of the

---

* R. xv, A.P. vii, 376.

† R. xix, A.P. vii, 636.

Roman rage which burns in Propertius and Horace against the Oriental Enchantress; he seems in this epigram to perceive something of the tragical splendour in this girl's parentage, which, since Shakespeare, has dazzled the imagination of the world: for she was the child of Antony and Cleopatra.

> The very moon rising at eventide
> Muffled in funeral mists her light denied,
> To see this well-beloved earthly Moon
> Sink towards the darkness in her mortal swoon.
> She lent her namesake beauty to adorn her,
> And now puts out her lamp in death to mourn her.*

The following is only a *genre* epitaph; it is a pastoral in miniature; it is yet another voice in the endless chorus of denunciation which the Greeks uttered against the sea, the neighbour who was rarely out of their sight and whom they could not live without; and it is these motives improved by a touch of the pathetic, and deftly executed in the form of an epitaph supposed to be spoken by a shipwrecked man, buried under the edge of the cliff, to a shepherd up on the down.

> Ah, lucky shepherd, had I but fed my flock,
> Like you, along the green downs beneath the glittering rock,
> Content to mock the ram's bleat with mimic bleat of mine,
> And ne'er dipped a rudder in the sour sea brine!
> The great seas have drowned me, and here within your reach
> The whirling East-South-Easter spewed me out upon the beach.†

Epigramma Demonstrativum too is of elastic significance, hardly less elastic than our "Occasional Verses"; and as this is the biggest class in Crinagoras' budget, it seems strange that one should find it harder to offer specimens here than elsewhere. But harder I do find it. Some are wearisome variations on a commonplace, like the piece about the disturbance of Nicias of Cos,‡ his bones, after burial; or *jeux d'esprit* on some wire-drawn paradox like the "Washerwoman who was Drowned";§ or inspired by some such occasion as the discovery of that astounding sheep in Armenia, which has hair like a goat, a voice like a new-born calf, is an excellent milker, and lambs three times a year.[*] One can see the proprietor of a Zoo commissioning a trifle on this surprising freak, but he alone need be much interested in the result. Again we have anticipated some of this section on account of their biographical or historical bearing. But I must try to muster another pennyworth of text to this intolerable deal of exposition. It shall be neither the complimentary verses addressed to Praxagoras,[†] a physician; nor those to Sallustius Crispus, which such as are curious about this Horatian personage will find numbered XLVIII; nor the praises of Bathyllus[‡] the mime and Philonides, who wrote his pieces for him. But I will conclude by quoting one for an example of a laureate's less dignified duties, one that relates to an observation of manners and customs made in his journey to Spain, and lastly, by way of epilogue, one that has a faint lyrical touch of sincerity and feeling.

---

* R. xiv, A.P. vii, 371.
† R. xx, A.P. vii, 636.
‡ R. xxv.
§ R. xxx.

The first immortalizes a goat which had the honour to supply milk to His Majesty the Emperor while aboard ship—I leave you to picture Mr Alfred Austin sitting down to court inspiration on an analogous theme. The lines are intended to inscribe on the base of this privileged animal's effigy.

> O'er all the goats that ever brimmed a pail
> In copious flow of milk did I prevail.
> My luscious creams great Cæsar's lips did meet,
> And he attached me to his naval suite.
> Soon to the stars! Great Jove on goat's milk throve,
> I've given the teat to one that's more than Jove.[§]

Now for his *impression de voyage*. On his road to Spain from Italy he went through Liguria, a country of notorious thieves, liars and tricksters. One knavish art in particular moved him to record it in verse. Unluckily, the manuscript wavers at the critical point of the description, so we are left in doubt as to the precise nature of the trick practised by the knaves in the exercise of their mystery. The opening quotation, ἔρδοι τὴν ἔμαθέν τις, was perhaps a current catchword at Rome just then. Propertius uses it too: *Qua pote quisque, in ea conterat arte diem*. I dare not suppose an acquaintance between the two poets merely on this evidence. Yet they were at Rome together; and Propertius, deeply penetrated by the Hellenic tincture as he was, even when he wrote on the most national themes, and familiarly versed as he was in all the epigrammatists from Asclepiades to Meleager, might well enough be friends with Crinagoras.

---

[*] R. xxxvi.

[†] R. li.

[‡] R. xl.

[§] R. xxvi, A.P. ix, 224.

> *Let each man ply his art.* The furthest Alps
> Harbour a ruffian crew of shaggy scalps,
> Thieves to their trade; the art they chiefly ply
> Is how to give a watch-dog the go-by.
> They'll smear themselves with kidney-fat and then'll
> Outwit the sharpest nose in all the kennel.
> Rogues of Ligurians, shame that so much wit
> Be spent, and nothing useful made of it![*]

And for tail-piece of all such a palinode of regret and disillusion as, if we found it anywhere in Horace, would help us to lift Horace somewhere nearer to the Pindaric elevation of spiritual dignity. Crinagoras is a pigmy perhaps, but even the pigmy has a little sanctuary in his mind where, in Pindar's words, he can live to himself and not to another. So he turns in his old age (the poem surely belongs to his old age) from his patrons to his art in this recantation:

> How long, poor silly soul of mine, how long
>   On winged illusion towards the cold clouds mounting
> Wilt thou be limning dreams of wealth that throng
>   Vision on empty vision beyond counting?
> Possession follows not as fancy chooses.
>   Nay, leave such bodiless phantasmagory
> To empty heads, and get thee to thy muses;
>   They last when all grows dim and transitory.[†]

And so Crinagoras rings down the curtain on himself.

J. S. PHILLIMORE

[*] R. xxxix, ix, 516.   [†] R. xxvii, A.P. ix, 234.

CATHOLIC SOCIAL EFFORT IN FRANCE

IN a striking address recently delivered to the students of the Catholic Institute at Toulouse, Mgr Batiffol considered the prospects of the French clergy under the new regime which must succeed upon the dissolution of the Concordat. The situation which will thus be created is a serious one; but it is not without very decided advantages. The Concordat, as Mgr Batiffol points out, has been a prolific source of disorganization. By recognizing only a part of the Catholic activity of the country—by confining its official sanction to certain establishments and certain ministers—it has done much to produce friction and misunderstanding within the Catholic body itself. The ecclesiastical *fonctionnaires* had become, with the growth of population, notoriously inadequate for the religious needs of the people; their work had to be supplemented by a host of other agencies—"patronages" and religious orders, congregations and societies—all more or less outside the provisions of the Concordat. In other words the State confined its patronage to a part only of the Catholic organism, treating the rest with disdain and suspicion. In such an anomalous condition of affairs it was impossible for the Catholic body to co-ordinate its efforts or be actuated by a common feeling of solidarity. But with the severance of Church from State will come, it is to be hoped, a complete fusion of the Catholic elements hitherto kept apart by State barriers. Where all are oppressed equally, a fellow feeling is more likely to spring up than where some are singled out for special treatment.

Another evil of the Concordat was that it led the clergy to think that their spiritual efficacy rested upon their official position in the eyes of the State. A regrettable misapprehension thus arose as to what constituted the real power of the clergy. The mistake is no new one in the history of the Church. But its correction is so necessary to Catholic progress that we must welcome Mgr Batiffol's spirited exhortation, "Expurgeons le vieux ferment fonctionnariste!"

And, finally, the very spirit in which the rupture of the Concordat has been effected by the French government is eminently calculated to widen the outlook and increase the apostolic zeal of the French clergy. Ecclesiastics are, it seems, to be evicted rather than released from engagements. Even though left in temporary possession of their churches, they are to be made as ineffectual as possible. Above all, their social influence is to be minimized. They are not to "go to the people." And since the people, with the spread of the secularist spirit, will gradually cease to go to them, the government hopes to secure the complete stultification of all Catholic action. The design is so patent that the clergy will certainly endeavour to foil it by reconquering that influence which the Concordat has done so much to weaken.

Such, briefly, are the hopeful signs which Mgr Batiffol discerns in the new order. To many it will come as a surprise that the present position of the Church of France can furnish any grounds for hope at all. It might seem as though all Catholic life were being slowly and deliberately strangled out of the country. We are bound to admit that the political position of the French Church is, at present, simply deplorable; nor can any notable improvement be expected in it for some years. Secularism is likely to be dominant in high places for a long time to come, and it will assuredly go to greater lengths of tyranny. Resistance, to be effective, should have been offered before. Had a firm and united stand been taken when the Associations Bill was first introduced, the Government could have done little. As it is, one position after another has been surrendered, in spite of the fact that the authors of the measure openly avow their ultimate purpose to be the crushing out of Christianity in the country—an avowal which, by the way, is persistently ignored by the English press. The campaign against religion in France has, so far, realized all the hopes of those who have conducted it. It is difficult to see what can prevent them from carrying out the rest of their programme.

Politically speaking, then, the battle seems lost for the present generation of Catholics. Yet it is important to notice how much less significant such a political defeat is in France than it would be in England. Among ourselves, political influence is commonly associated with a certain amount of social influence. The men who carry on the work of legislature do not form a despised clique, but are representative of society in a sense which implies something more than a triumph at the polls. Their own social standing and intellectual capabilities, their connexion with the older universities, their influence in commercial or professional or industrial circles—such ties as these give our legislators a definite sense of solidarity with a great section of society and some feeling of responsibility to the nation as a whole.

But in France it is very different. The country's representatives are singularly unrepresentative. The main currents of French social and intellectual life flow onwards little influenced by politics. The Government, though it supports an immense army of *fonctionnaires* all over the country, and is thus enabled to exercise inquisitorial functions upon their private lives and religious practices, nevertheless cannot shape or direct French thought or penetrate to French literary circles. M. Waldeck-Rousseau's rejection by the *Académie Française* is symptomatic of the aloofness from the best national life of the men who rule by expelling nuns. M. Waldeck-Rousseau was a really great statesman who towered head and shoulders above his supporters: he was one whom the *Académie*, under other circumstances, would have delighted to honour. But his identification of his views and methods with those of the dominant party in the Chamber put him, so to say, outside the pale. Mr Bodley* has brought home to English readers how all classes in France unite in disparaging the men who constitute the Chamber of Deputies: how the country "now chooses the vast majority of its parliamentary representatives from among the least worthy exponents of the life of the nation." Indeed, politics has come to be looked upon as a dirty business only suitable for men such as those at present engaged in it. "We are marching," says M. Salomon Reinach, "towards the formation of a narrow caste of politicians, side by side with the abstention, growing daily more complete, of thinkers and and of men who make others think."

---

* *France*, vol. II, pp. 141 seq.

This divorce between the *élite* of the nation and its governors may blind us to the real hold that Catholicism has on the country. Thus the eminent Dominican Père Sertillanges, speaking a few years ago to a non-Catholic audience in the hospitable rooms of a well-known canon of Christ Church, Oxford, somewhat astonished his hearers by the hopeful view he took of Catholicism in France. He pointed out that the intellect of the country was not represented by its rulers, but showed in many respects a marked tendency in the direction of Catholic ideas. He instanced the sympathy with those ideas displayed by such leading journals as the *Revue des Deux Mondes* or the *Journal des Débats*, and the way in which many men of insight and experience are coming to regard the Catholic Church as the source of social welfare.

This comparative unimportance of politics in France of which Père Sertillanges speaks must be kept in mind if we are to venture upon any forecast of the future of Catholicism in that country. Our own press in its treatment of French affairs generally confines its attention to political events, thus giving them an exaggerated importance. Hence we are apt to overlook more significant movements and more representative tendencies in the body of the nation. Of such tendencies and movements we are now to speak. The present article will endeavour to show that in spite of political defeat the French clergy are beginning to throw themselves into the current of the best national life, and are thus in a fair way to regain their waning influence.

Clearly their efforts are on the right lines. Salvation can only come to France through an appeal by the Church to the people. Were the Catholics by a *coup d'état* to defeat the *bloc* and capture the Chamber of Deputies to-morrow, it would profit them little so long as the people remained hostile or apathetic. Whereas the Catholic social action which is now in progress, though it produce little immediate stir in the political world, is yet preparing the way for an enduring reform.

Catholic Social Effort in France

Such social action was, as we have intimated, considerably hampered by the Concordat.* Indeed, the régime of the Concordat—even though the Government had been willing to abide loyally by its provisions—had become singularly unsuited to modern economic conditions. The spiritual provision which sufficed, more or less, for the needs of the people a century ago, is necessarily inadequate in these days. The growth of industry and the consequent rush to the towns have shifted the social centre of gravity by creating an immense proletariat, the very conditions of whose labour preclude their being accessible to the religious influences amid which their forefathers were brought up. The giant Demos, strong for all his helplessness, is gradually growing articulate. Urged by the evil spirit of materialism, he wanders through places without water, seeking rest and finding none. His cry is all for guidance. If the Catholic Church can, by setting forth her social mission in a more active and enterprising propagandism, succeed in impressing herself upon his consciousness, he will be tamed and satisfied. Her traditions of disinterested devotion to the poor and suffering point to her as the only power which is able to avert the perils of the new situation. The State can do little, for against materialism and socialism alike it has not the power to make an effective protest. Such protest may only come from an organized body which can show claim to penetrate to man's spiritual core and influence his thought and his will.

Hence it becomes a matter of the greatest interest for us to examine the efforts which are being made by French Catholics to face the new situation. In the following pages we shall attempt to give, not indeed a complete survey of all that is being done, but a slight sketch of certain typical endeavours which may give us some idea of the strength of the movement.

---

* No doubt the Concordat has, in its day, been productive of much good. As long as the Government applied it in a reasonable spirit, as, for instance, between the years 1848 and 1870, and from 1871 to 1877, it offered many real advantages which could not easily have been otherwise secured. The present disorders are the result, not so much of the Concordat as of the sectarian spirit in which its provisions, or supposed provisions, have been applied. Nor need it be pointed out that the rupture of the Concordat by the French Government is a flagrant violation of justice.

We need not now differentiate the various schools of Catholic social theory which are striving to embody themselves in the different organizations. The important matter is the organizations themselves, as indicative of enterprise, enthusiasm and an appreciation of modern needs; as a realization, in short, of the social mission of the Church. We are here concerned to gauge Catholic initiative and zeal rather than to consider disputed points of theory.

Perhaps the most hopeful symptom of all is the growing enthusiasm for social work among the young Catholic laymen. These form, as the late Cardinal Perraud observed recently, a true apostolate. They have initiated a movement which is likely to have most momentous results. "Your Catholic young men," cried Leo XIII to a French pilgrimage in 1902, "will be the salvation of your country." Indeed, it is difficult to see from what other quarter salvation can come. Scarcely from the middle-aged, for these are ever apt to regard the present social order as unalterable and to reconcile themselves to making the most of a bad situation. After the pathetic manner of captive beavers, they endeavour to construct a dam on the old pattern, without reference to new environment. We are reminded of a saying of Mr George Meredith's: "Middle age is the time of a man's delusion, when his mind becomes inaccessible to the urgency of the greater questions." The young man does not acquiesce so readily. He sets out cheerfully to reform the world, and should he fall in with a sufficient number of other young men similarly minded, it is not improbable that he will do it. That Catholic France should produce in these dark days scores of thousands of unselfish, devoted and high-minded young laymen, bent upon the task of reforming modern society upon Catholic principles, is a fact which is as significant as it is astonishing. This must be our excuse for confining out attention almost exclusively to social works inaugurated or carried on by young men, One of the most important of these is the *Association Catholique de la Jeunesse Française*, founded in 1886 by Count Albert de Mun and half a dozen young men. They held their first meeting at an old house in the Rue du Bac where the saintly Mgr Ségur had worked and died. The Association spread rapidly. In fourteen months it embraced some twenty groups, representing about a thousand members. In a very few more years we find eight thousand of its members gathered for a religious celebration in Notre Dame, and fifteen hundred on a pilgrimage to Rome. In 1894 came a Brief of approval from the Holy Father; while the last three years have been marked by important congresses, of which more hereafter. It now numbers some fifteen hundred groups and seventy thousand members.

Its organization and programme have become more clearly defined as its numbers and influence have increased. It consists of a federation of autonomous groups in town and country. Each group yearly elects one of its members to represent it upon the federal council. The council, in turn, elects every second year a general committee consisting of a president, a vice-president, a secretary, an almoner, four "chiefs of sections" and other officials. The "chiefs of sections," upon whom most of the work falls, deal respectively with exterior communications, intercourse between the groups, finance and literature. This central machinery, together with the excellent fortnightly publication, *Annales de la Jeunesse Catholique*, keeps the groups in touch and gives unity of spirit and aim to the whole body.

Yet the groups retain their autonomy, and even support a score of local publications. They represent every stratum of society in town or country. The Association is, in fact, not so much an *œuvre*, as a grouping of young and active good wills throughout the country. It encourages its members to take up any social work for which their character and environment fit them.

The tendency of the Association towards social work has become more and more pronounced every year. Even in its earliest statutes we find its purpose thus defined:

> Its object is to co-operate in the re-establishment of the Christian

social order. Its principles are submission to the authority of the Church and perfect adhesion to her teachings, especially in all matters connected with the social and economic orders. Its methods are Christian devotion, and mutual study and support among its members.

From the first it was associated with the Catholic *Cercles* and set itself to study social and economic questions. But it was only after some years that it succeeded in penetrating to the people. Its tone has become increasingly democratic. The commercial and industrial classes to-day supply 35 per cent of its members, and the agricultural no less than 45 per cent. It is frankly republican in tone, in spite of the fact that from the social position of some of its founders it was originally suspected of royalist tendencies. Its members are making a real effort to consolidate the Catholic body; and they display their reverence for tradition by doing not precisely what their fathers did, but what their fathers would have done had they lived in these days: an interpretation of the principle of tradition which may safely be commended. Above all they lay great stress on the need of social study. They have formed an immense number of *cercles d'études*, little groups of about a dozen young men who set themselves to investigate and discuss the various social questions of the day under the guidance of some experienced priest or layman. Great stress is laid upon co-operation with the local clergy.

The results of the investigations conducted during the year by the *cercles d'études* are collected and summarized at the annual congresses. These congresses will certainly rank as events of considerable importance in the history of social science. Each year some large and important subject is proposed for discussion. The work of inquiry is divided up among the various *cercles*, and the result is a great body of carefully ascertained facts which is of the utmost value in shaping the programme of the association. Thus the Congress of Chalon, in 1903, presented the outcome of inquiries into the working of fourteen hundred syndicates. That of Arras the following year dealt with the question of societies for mutual assistance. It lasted for three days, and was attended by four thousand young delegates. Last year the congress held at Albi under the presidency of Archbishop Mignot, discussed the conditions of labour among children. The results of this congress, in which the Holy Father displayed the warmest interest, were even more instructive and important than those of the two preceding. The report is, in fact, a document of considerable value. It points out clearly the need for the legal protection of those engaged in certain occupations and trades at present exposed to the full force of economic pressure. It gives numerous instances where young boys have had to work for fifteen or sixteen hours out of the twenty-four, and this under physical and moral conditions which are a disgrace to a civilized country. It demands that certain occupations should be altogether forbidden to children, reiterates its appeal for the enforced cessation of work on Sundays, and claims State aid for the purpose of organizing technical training.

Besides these general congresses a certain number of local congresses are held each year. Every month witnesses several such gatherings, some of which are attended by two or three thousand people. As for conferences, lectures, pilgrimages, and the like, their number is almost incredible. A hundred and fifty meetings were held on the same day to protest against the rupture of the Concordat. Sixteen hundred discourses were delivered during the course of last year in a single one of the thirty districts embraced by the association. And it is edifying to see the number of young men of the professional and commercial classes who devote all their holiday time to working up new groups or making expeditions to various parts of the country in order to give lectures or organize congresses. Nor must it be imagined that the efforts of the association are confined to study and speech-making. On the contrary, it devotes much of its attention to the foundation of co-operative societies, popular libraries, labour bureaus, workmen's gardens and the like all over the country.

A more recent and even more striking instance of enthusiasm for social work among young men is afforded by the movement known as the *Sillon*. In this case the initiative came directly from the young men themselves. The story of its origin is too interesting—one might almost say too romantic—to be passed over in silence.

Marc Sangnier, a brilliant young student at the Collège Stanislas in Paris, somehow developed a burning interest in social reform. Inexperienced as he was, he realized that the flood of infidelity which is overwhelming modern society is due in great measure to the iniquitous social conditions which have come to prevail; that whole classes of the population have been allowed to drift out of touch with Christianity; and that unless they are reached by a positive effort and penetrated by Catholic principles, society will be submerged in anarchy. That vision is haunting many thinking men to-day, and it seized upon Marc Sangnier and drove him to set it before all who would listen to him.

The young student possessed an extraordinary power of attracting others, much intelligence and very considerable eloquence. And when he asked permission to gather together some of his fellow-students and talk to them about the cause which he had at heart, it was readily granted. The boys accordingly used to meet in a room known as the crypt, situated in the basement of the college. These "crypt" reunions soon became a regular institution, and the stirring appeals of *l'ami Marc* drew ever larger audiences. Young men from the working classes were invited to take part in them, social questions of practical import were ardently discussed, and popular conferences were given. By the year 1899 the institution was becoming known to Catholic Paris as the *Sillon*.

The infectious enthusiasm of the founder and the irresistible spirit of comradeship that pervaded the new movement soon carried it across the length and breadth of France. M. Sangnier continues to be the leader of the movement despite his endeavours to merge his individuality in the common impulse. He is an untiring platform orator, and is to be heard almost daily at one or other of the meetings which are now usual throughout France.

But what *is* the *Sillon?* The question is forcing itself upon the public notice with peculiar insistence. *Qu'est-ce que le Sillon?* is the provocative heading of posters and pamphlets in town and village throughout the country. And the answer is given that the *Sillon* is *une amitié, une vie.* It is not so much a plan or a programme of social studies as a spontaneous and widespread impulse towards the realization of certain great social ends. The *Sillon* may roughly be described as a work of democratic education. It seeks to raise up an *élite* among the working classes which may, by its sympathetic study of social evils and its enthusiastic propagandism, succeed in impressing upon society the principles of the Gospel. Its motto is, *Il faut aller au vrai avec toute son âme.* The members are required not merely to pay an annual subscription but to give themselves wholeheartedly to the work of the *Sillon.* And that work, as M. François Veuillot explains to us, consists first of all in "rendering the Christian life within us more clear and intense and in penetrating ourselves more and more profoundly with the spirit of the Gospel and the social force of Catholicism." The next step consists in spreading among friends, among strangers, among the enemies of the Church if possible, the knowledge of Christianity and its social principles.

The formation and instruction of the members themselves is secured by *cercles d'études* and congresses similar to those already described in connexion with the *Jeunesse Catholique.* The work of capturing public opinion is effected through the *Instituts Populaires*, clubs of various kinds founded and maintained by the members. These clubs are not strictly denominational but are open to all. Their organization varies considerably. In towns they may take the form of literary and musical societies, daily classes for shorthand, English or drawing, debating clubs and the like. In the country they meet less frequently, and generally occupy themselves with lectures on agricultural or industrial topics. In every case the *Instituts* endeavour to meet the social wants of the district. Although they are not exclusively Catholic, every occasion is taken to bring before those who attend them the truths of Catholicism and its social sympathies. Besides these *Instituts Populaires* the *Sillon* has founded a number of co-operative societies in various parts of France, and an *Office Social.*

The fearless propagandism which marks the *Sillon* has drawn upon it considerable criticism. It has certainly produced some astonishing scenes. Public disputations are held by the members, at which socialists, atheists and *défroqués* are invited to express their views in order that they may be refuted with the most elaborate courtesy. Unfortunately the same restraint is not always shown by the supporters of the anti-clerical speakers. Hostile crowds have been known to post themselves outside the lecture hall and attack the Sillonists as they emerged. At least one serious fight has taken place in the streets of Paris in which knives and revolvers were employed. Such scenes are, however, becoming less common.

To protect itself from such attacks and to secure a patient hearing for the hostile speakers, the members have founded a species of militia. The *Jeune Garde* consists of a strong body of youths from sixteen to twenty years of age, dressed in picturesque uniforms, who regard themselves as a kind of *chevalerie moderne*, and inaugurate their service by a "vigil of arms" in night-long adoration before the Blessed Sacrament, generally in the Basilica of Montmartre. They are only enrolled after a period of probation culminating in a spiritual retreat.

About the political sympathies of the *Sillon* there has never been the least room for doubt. Its members are almost obstreperously republican. Their republicanism is, as they lose no opportunity of informing us, an affair of the most intense conviction, and is not assumed as the result of external pressure. They caused some amazement during their pilgrimage to Rome by marching through the streets of the Eternal City and singing robustiously to the tune of the Marseillaise: *Ohé! les bourgeois de la cité, v'là le Sillon qui passe. . .* The *Sillon* desires, as M. Sangnier himself tells us,* to place the social forces of Catholicism at the service of modern democratic aspirations. Not that it wishes to subordinate the former to the latter; but believing democracy to be the form of social organization which tends to develop to the highest degree *la conscience et la responsibilité civiques de chacun*, it sets itself to raise up in France a really democratic republic, and to this end it desires to employ the moral force which its members as Catholics possess. It claims the right, not indeed of forcing upon others, but at least of manifesting to the world its own predilection for a form of government which the Church is far from condemning. The *Sillon*, urges M. Sangnier, though not strictly a Catholic institution, is an institution founded by Catholics, and one which has done much to propagate Christianity in the country.

---

* *Guide Social de l'Action Populaire*, 1906, p. 128.

Despite the fact that the Pope, the five Cardinals of France and a number of Bishops have explicitly encouraged its efforts, the *Sillon* has met in some quarters with considerable opposition from Catholics on the score of its alleged tendency towards religious liberalism and impatience of authoritative advice. Whether this criticism is deserved or not we need not here consider. The question is a complex and difficult one. We may leave it to those who have authority in the matter to detect in the movement whatever infiltrations from unwholesome sources may lurk there. What we are concerned to admire is the undoubted love of Christ and zeal for His Church which sends the *Jeune Garde* to night-long vigils at Montmartre, and leads young men of wealth and position to devote themselves to the cause of the poor and suffering. We may remember, too, that the necessary work of readjustment in Catholic social theory as in Catholic philosophy seldom proceeds without producing a certain friction and arousing apprehension even among those whose approbation cannot but be valued. And where a number of perfervid young men are engaged in battling against gigantic social evils, we may well exercise the forbearance which, as M. Georges Goyau points out, has characterized the action of the Holy See in a special manner since the definition of papal infallibility.

Il existe à l'heure présente, dans le sein du catholicisme [he says] un mouvement extraordinaire des esprits et des œuvres; il n'y a plus de catholiques émancipés, il y a toujours des catholiques qui s'aventurent; leur témérité résulte de la ferveur et n'entraîne pas la révolte. . . . Ces dévouements aventureux ne déplaisent pas à la papauté.—*Le Pape, les Catholiques et la Question Sociale*, p. 57.

"To know one's social duty," said a speaker at the congress of Albi, "is not a matter of intuition but of study." We have seen how far this truth is realized in the two associations just described. In each case the cell of the organism consists in the *cercle d'études.*

During the last quarter of a century French Catholic publicists have been elaborating a programme of social reforms based upon the encyclicals of Leo XIII.* Yet it is only within quite recent years that anything resembling a general effort has been made among Catholics to secure these reforms by means of legislation or voluntary association. The fault has lain not in the theories themselves, but in the lack of machinery by which they might be popularized and impressed upon the mind of the public. They should have been embodied in popular literature, tracts, pamphlets and the like, and brought before the public in an attractive form. Above all there was need of practical direction which would enable individuals to set about the formation of professional associations, a work of great importance in view of the apathy of the Chamber towards social reform.

It is a matter for considerable congratulation, therefore, that a Catholic organization has come into being which is already doing much to supply the want here indicated.

L'Action Populaire is the united effort of a number of distinguished publicists and sociologists to encourage and promote all healthy forms of associations among all classes of workers. It seeks to follow the advice of the present Pontiff, and to "take its stand within the domain of practical matters where an understanding with all men is easy. . . It is only in this way that we can organize a country which would otherwise be organized by socialism."

---

* Thus, for example, the review *L'Association Catholique* has done pioneer work in the application of Catholic solutions to social problems.

Such association is necessary if society is to be set upon a firm basis and the working classes rescued from lapsing into the ever-growing class of the destitute and hopeless.

L'Action Populaire, though it has only been in existence for three years, has secured the collaboration and the sympathy of a considerable number of distinguished workers, and its efforts have already met with much success. Its methods are threefold: it writes, it lectures and it organizes. We may here confine our attention to its literary output. One of the greatest services rendered by the new movement is its publication of an annual *Guide Social.* This volume is one of quite extraordinary interest. It gives a conspectus of all the social work that is being done or projected in France, together with some useful information about social progress in other countries, and an excellent bibliography. Among its list of contributors we find such well-known names as the Count de Mun, MM. Turmann, Goyau, de Lamarzelle, de Seilhac, Benoist, Fagniez, Joly, Sangnier and Lamy.

The *Guide Social* is an invaluable reference book. But more than this was wanted. The great need in France was a series of cheap and handy booklets, dealing separately with the various fields of social work and giving practical advice which might enable readers in every position of life to contribute towards the work of reform. What was wanted in fact was a deluge of practical tracts which should inform every one precisely how to begin. The efficacy of such popular literature had already been seen among their neighbours in the case of the *Volksverein*, which had distributed thirteen million of its publications in the course of a single year and was rapidly organizing the German Catholic body into a social power of very considerable importance.

To this work the *Action Populaire* accordingly set itself. It began to issue a series of twopenny booklets, each containing thirty or forty pages. Of these a hundred thousand copies were sold in the first few months, and the demand for them has steadily increased. They appear three times a month, and over a hundred of them are now published. They may be divided according to the nature of their contents into two categories. The first takes some one definite class of society, trade or occupation, and gives a detailed account of the social conditions of life among those who belong to it. Such an account, based on sympathetic inquiry, is of course indispensable for the guidance of social workers, who may there learn what are the precise grievances of the class described and how they may be remedied. Thus, for instance, light is thrown on the pitiful lot of the little Parisian baker-boys, who are unprotected by law and condemned to a struggle for existence under the most iniquitous conditions. It is pointed out how a little consideration on the part of customers may do much to alleviate their condition. So of the various industries in turn.

The other set of tracts gives instructions how to found and carry on various social institutions—associations, clubs and societies of all kinds. The writers are, for the most part, priests or laymen who have had actual experience in such work. Of exceptional interest are the accounts given by various curés in different parts of the country of their efforts to promote the local welfare. In many cases the result has been the complete transformation of their parish. Indeed, some of these accounts bear a striking resemblance to Yves le Querdec's charming *Lettres d'un Curé de Campagne*. We read of improved dwelling houses and cottage gardens, of savings banks and benefit societies, of lectures and entertainments, all culminating in the rout of socialism and discontent. It may be pointed out to those who would question the propriety of such social action on the part of the clergy, that these initiatives have been warmly approved and encouraged by the Holy See. They give the priest an opportunity of coming into contact with many whom he could not otherwise reach, and they become in his hands, as the Abbé Ch. Antoine tells us, "instruments of Christian regeneration."

Did space permit we might describe many other manifestations of the social movement which is asserting itself among the Catholics of France. There is, for example, the *Action Liberale*, led by M. Piou, which has a social as well as a political side, and which is meeting with considerable success. Again there is the remarkable impulse towards social work on the part of Frenchwomen, with which M. Max Turmann deals in his latest work, *Initiatives Féminines*. Or, once more, there are the *Œuvres des Campagnes*, which are doing so much to promote a healthy social life in rural parishes; or the annual *Semaine Sociale* held last year for the second time at Orleans—a kind of peripatetic university, the notion of which is borrowed from Germany. But enough has probably been said to give some idea of the vigour which characterizes the new movement. We conclude by raising the question how far our own social conditions make it advisable to adopt the methods which French Catholics are beginning to employ with such success.

About the desirability of promoting an interest in social work among ourselves there can be no manner of doubt. The Holy See has made it abundantly clear that we all, clergy and laity alike, have in these days, a special responsibility in the matter. The Catholic Church is called upon to face the new and unique situation created by the growth of the proletariat and the pressure of economic liberalism. She has to set about the conquest of enormous masses of men, who find themselves, through no fault of their own, as remote from Christian influences as the most inaccessible savages; men who have no spiritual ideals, no background to life; men whose existence is one of aimless and hopeless drudgery—a dull acquiescence in meaningless routine. It is not easy to exaggerate the peril to the race which springs from this fundamental spiritual poverty. The note of warning is sounded on every side. The remedy must partly lie in education, but not in such education as the State can provide. What is wanted is a discipline of mind and heart which will draw the severed classes together into conformity with the principles of the Gospel. This the Catholic Church alone can fully provide. Yet how is the Church to come into contact with these classes? "The labourer of to-day," writes Mr F. W. Head,* "does not look for real help to the Church. The labour leader, the political leader, the free-thinker will command his attention, for he believes that with them lies the power to do him present good."

---

* *The Heart of the Empire*, p. 269.

"To do him present good"; "*Pietas ad omnia utilis est.*" Here is the only ground on which we can approach the problem. "Christianity," says Dr Barry, "is not a thing that you can put into commission or get done by contract. If I am asked how it is to be brought to the masses, I reply, show them how they can be saved by it and enabled to live a true and human life in this world; then perhaps they will believe."

Seldom, perhaps, in the history of the Church has there been such an opportunity for wholesale conquest. The working classes are looking for guidance. One economic panacea after another has failed them, and they will surrender themselves to an institution that comes to them with knowledge, sympathy and authority. But action must be prompt, or the flood of rationalistic literature which is sweeping over the country will make conquest impossible.

With regard to method, we cannot do better than follow the lead of the French Catholics and insist upon the necessity of study. In particular we would recommend the creation of the *cercles d'études* which are such a potent means of producing effective enthusiasm. Little groups of interested workers may be created in every variety of circumstances. Informal meetings held weekly by three or four Catholics with, if possible, the active co-operation of a priest may produce great results. We have university men among us who might give impetus to such a movement. Organization and intercommunication between the groups would come later. The first thing to secure is interest and spontaneity. The need is to create apostles rather than committees. It is possible too that more might be done in our Catholic colleges to interest the bigger boys in work of this kind. Lectures, debates and essay competitions might be employed to arouse interest in the subject. But of even greater efficacy would be some personal intercourse between the boys and those teachers who realize the possibilities of Catholic social action.

THE SYRIAN CHRISTIANS IN INDIA

India and the Apostle Thomas. By A. E. Medlycott, Bishop of Tricomia. London: Nutt. 1905.
The Travancore State Manual. Trivandrum. 1906.

THE canonical book of the Acts of the Apostles is mainly a narrative of the doings of the three Apostles, St Peter, St Paul and St Barnabas, and any information which may be sought regarding the journeys of other Apostles in various regions of the then-known world must be obtained from other sources. St Thomas is enumerated as one of the eleven present in Jerusalem before the election of St Matthias, and about his further movements Scripture is silent. Some writers say that at the dispersion of the Apostles the Parthian Empire was the field allotted to him, and in the works of the Fathers there are several passages which allude to the labours of St Thomas in India as well known. Thus St Gregory Nazianzen in a homily says: "What! Were not the Apostles foreigners? What had Paul to do with the Gentiles, Luke with Achaia, Andrew with Epirus, John with Ephesus, Thomas with India, Mark with Italy?" St Ambrose says: "Even those kingdoms which were shut out by rugged mountains became accessible to the Apostles, as India to Thomas, Persia to Matthew." St Jerome says: "Our Lord dwelt in all places: with Thomas in India, with Peter at Rome, with Paul in Illyricum, with Titus in Crete, with Andrew in Achaia, with each apostolic man in each and all countries."

The tradition of these early centuries was that St Thomas suffered martyrdom in India and that his relics were carried to Edessa, the frontier town of the Roman Empire in Mesopotamia. In a hymn written by St Ephraem of Nisibis, who died 373, the writer represents Satan as exclaiming: "The Apostle whom I slew in India has overtaken me in Edessa!" For the reception of the relics of St Thomas a large church was built in Edessa, and the relics were solemnly transferred to this church in 394. The festival of the translation of these relics was kept by the Eastern Churches on July 3. This information was known to our English saint, the Venerable Bede, who writes: "The Apostles of Christ received their allotted charges in distinct parts of the world. Peter receives Rome; Andrew, Achaia; James, Spain; Thomas, India; John, Asia." Again in his Martyrology the Venerable Bede notes on December 21:

> XII kal. Jan. Natale S. Thomas Apost. qui passus est in India, lancea quippe transfixus occubuit. Hujus etenim corpus translatum est apud Edessam civitatem. Translatio non. Jul.

The apocryphal Acts of Thomas narrate with much detail the story of the Apostle's journey and death. Christ appears to Thomas and orders him to go to India. The Apostle is willing to go to any other country but not to India. At this time King Gondophares sends his messenger Habban to bring an architect who can build a palace. Christ sells Thomas to Habban as a servant, and Habban carries off Thomas to India. They arrive during the festivities at the marriage of the King's daughter and go to the banquet. A cupbearer strikes Thomas, who foretells the man's speedy punishment. The cupbearer goes out to draw water and is killed by a wild beast. Dogs devour his body, and a dog brings into the banqueting hall the arm that had struck Thomas. The King, convinced of the sanctity of Thomas, takes him to the inner chamber to bless the newly married couple. The Apostle blesses them and counsels them to keep continence. Afterwards Thomas builds a palace for the King, but his counsel to keep continence causes him to fall into disfavour at court, and he is put to death.

These apocryphal Acts of various Apostles and also the apocryphal Gospels possess some literary interest inasmuch as the legends contained in them supplied subjects to the artists of the middle ages. There are in France two cathedrals, at Bourges and Tours, with windows which depict the life of St Thomas with incidents taken from the apocryphal Acts, and the sculptured portal of the cathedral at Semur in the Côte-d'Or does the same. But hitherto it has been considered that these apocryphal Gospels and Acts have no value whatever from an historical point of view, and that they are romances of the first or second centuries written by Gnostic heretics in order to spread their tenets.

Bishop Medlycott, who was for some years Vicar Apostolic in India among the Catholics of the Syro-Malabar rite, has recently published a work of much research, *India and the Apostle Thomas*, in which he sets forth all the passages in early writings or ancient liturgies which mention the death in India of St Thomas. He is disposed to take a more favourable view of the discredited apocryphal Acts. The Bishop suggests that the heretics who put into circulation this romance as a vehicle of Gnostic tenets probably based it upon a previous narrative which contained some true facts in the life of the Apostle. Mention is made of King Gondophares, and it was thought that this name was imagined; but the inscription upon a stone now in the Lahore Museum, and the lettering on coins found during the past seventy years in the Indus Valley and Afghanistan, have shown Orientalists that there was a King Gondophares, whose reign began A.D. 21. Also, mention is made in the Acts of certain customs peculiar to Hindus, such as bathing as a ceremonial purification before meals, the use of carriages drawn by oxen, and prostration as a token of respect. Therefore the author of the original form of the Acts of Thomas must have known of the existence of King Gondophares and of these distinctive Hindu customs, and that original version must have been an historical narrative.

We fear that the evidence put forward will not support the deductions that are made from it. The coins of King Gondophares have been found in great numbers. He must have been a monarch of extended sway, and it is very possible that his renown reached Palestine and was known to the writer of the Acts. The three customs mentioned are not peculiar to Hindus, and it can easily be shown from the Bible that they were Jewish customs also. We are not persuaded that the Acts of Thomas carry any historical weight.

In discussing the question whether St Thomas penetrated to the peninsula which we now call India, it may at once be conceded that such a journey at that time was possible. There was some intercourse between the East and the

Mediterranean littoral. Coins of the Roman emperors have been found in Southern India. Milton, in the Temptation scene in the fourth Book of *Paradise Regained*, makes the tempter show embassies to Rome

> From India and the Golden Chersonese,
> And utmost Indian isle, Taprobané.

The Apostle could have made the journey. But in considering the passages which speak of St Thomas in India, it must not be forgotten that the India of those writers may not be the India of the present day. In the Bible the only mention of India is in the Book of Esther as the limit of the dominions of King Ahasuerus; and early writers may have used the name to denote the Indus valley or the country on the shores of the Persian Gulf which we now call Yemen. If there were nothing more than the evidence mentioned above, it would have to be admitted that there was no ground to believe that St Thomas journeyed east of the Indus.

Firmer ground is reached when we come to the local tradition of the ancient Church which still flourishes on the coast of India, to the north of Cape Comorin, in the States of Travancore and Cochin, and in the adjacent district of Malabar. These Christians are commonly called the Syrian Christians, because to this day they use a Syriac liturgy; but they call themselves the Christians of St Thomas, and they, one and all, most tenaciously maintain the tradition that the Apostle in the year 52 landed at Cranganore on that coast, that he converted their ancestors to Christianity, and that in the year 67 he suffered martyrdom on the East coast at Mylapore, a few miles south of the present city of Madras. This tradition, so dear to this ancient Church, is the excuse for a curious assumption of superiority over other Christian communities. The "Thomas Christians" say that Syriac, being the language which Christ Himself spoke when on earth, must be better than Latin or Greek or any other liturgical language, and that their unbroken descent from apostolic times gives them a seniority over Christians of a later date. This contention has given occasion for some amusing anecdotes. Mgr Zaleski, the Papal Delegate in India and Ceylon, gravely said that from that point of view he must take a low place, because he comes from a part of Poland which was converted by the Teutonic knights quite late in the tenth or eleventh century. The wife of the judge of Calicut visited a Syrian school in that town, and, in all simplicity, asked how and when they had become Christians. The indignant class replied to the good lady, "We were Christians when you were worshipping Druids!" But the tradition itself, so continuously held by this Oriental Church, is a fact to which the historical student must give weight.

This claim of a Christian pedigree from apostolic times finds an unexpected supporter in the Anglican Dr J.M. Neale, who in his *Primitive Liturgies* says that the Syriac liturgy used by these Christians was a liturgy much earlier than the well-known Chaldean Liturgy of All Apostles, a liturgy of most remote antiquity, which may have come down from the days of the Apostles. In the Liturgy of St James there is a passage, "gave to us His Apostles and disciples," which is cited to show that the liturgy was written by St James himself. So Dr Neale points out that in the liturgy used by these Christians on the Malabar coast there is a passage which has no parallel in any known Eastern rite, and may possibly have been written by the Apostle St Thomas. The passage is: "Grant, moreover, my Lord, that the ears which have heard the voice of Thy songs may never hear the voice of clamour and dispute. Grant also that the eyes which have seen Thy great love may behold Thy blessed hope."

Whatever may have been the origin of this Christian Church on the south-west coast of India, there are traditions that it received reinforcements from the Nestorian Churches of Persia and Mesopotamia, and there is documentary evidence to show that it was well established in the seventh or eighth century. There are extant, inscribed on copper plates, grants of that period, from the local King, of rank and privileges to the Christians; and in one of the Syrian churches in the Travancore State there are two stone slabs on each of which is cut a cross and an inscription of that period. On one stone is written in Pahlavi, the official language of the Sassanides dynasty in Persia: "He who believes in the Messiah and in God in the height and in the Holy Ghost is in the grace of Him who suffered the pain of the cross." The other stone bears, in Pahlavi, a portion of the same inscription, and in Syriac a version of the text, "Let me not glory except in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ." It is worthy of note that this is the period when the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* states that King Alfred the Great sent presents to the Christians of St Thomas and St Bartholomew in India.

Six centuries pass in which we have little information about these Christians. Marco Polo, about 1295, speaks of Nestorians on the Malabar coast and mentions the tradition that St Thomas died in India. John of Monte Corvino, Archbishop of Cambalec in Cathay, and John de Marignoli, another missionary to China, halted in India and speak of these Christians. Friar Jordan passed down the coast in 1323, and on his return to Europe published a book called *Mirabilia*, in which mention is made of them. Pope John XXII, at Avignon, consecrated this Friar Jordan in 1328, and sent him back to the East as Bishop of Quilon, but there is nothing on record showing the subsequent history of this prelate. In 1439 Eugenius IV, who took much interest in all Oriental Churches, sent out a letter addressed to the Christians of Quilon, but the bearers of this letter did not reach their destination. After this date all knowledge in Europe of the existence of this Christian Church in India seems to have died out.

Documents in the Vatican Library show that in 1490 the Christians of India sent three men, Joseph and two others, to the Patriarch of the East to beg for bishops. The Patriarch, who at that date was tainted with the Nestorian heresy, sent five bishops; and their report to the Patriarch states that they found 30,000 families "common in faith with us." Joseph, one of the deputation of 1490, sailed for Lisbon in 1502 with the Portuguese Admiral Cabral. From Lisbon he made his way to Rome, where he had audience of Alexander VI. This Syrian Christian aroused much interest in Rome, and from his talk was published in 1506 an anonymous pamphlet called *Navigatio Novi Orbis*, or *The Travels of Joseph the Indian*, giving his description of the

Thomas Christians. Among other things Joseph the Indian says that their principal festival is the octave of Easter, because on that day Thomas put his finger in the wounded side of Christ.

When Vasco da Gama anchored at Calicut in 1498, he was much surprised to find this Christian community of about 200,000 souls with bishops and priests, but he at once saw the importance of allies who could put in the field 30,000 fighting men, and he formally assured them of the protection of the King of Portugal.

Forty years later St Francis Xavier went to India, and his letters make some mention of the Syrian Christians. He describes them as steeped in ignorance and error, and suggests colleges for the education of their younger men; but he had a high opinion of the last survivor of their five bishops, Mar Jacob, who adhered to the Roman rite before his death in 1549 at the Franciscan monastery in Cochin. The vacancy caused by the death of this aged prelate was filled by bishops who were sent by the Chaldean Patriarch in communion with the Holy See, and for half a century these Chaldean bishops exercised jurisdiction over the Thomas Christians, the Portuguese bishops at Goa and Cochin restricting their authority to the Europeans and the converts from the Hindu religion on the coast.

Before long friction arose because the Chaldean bishops objected to any of their flock going over to the Latin rite, and also because the Portuguese ecclesiastics suspected these bishops of a secret leaning towards the Nestorian heresy. We have only the Portuguese account of the dispute, but one cannot avoid feeling that there is something to be said on behalf of the Chaldean Bishops. The Portuguese assumed throughout that the use of the Syriac liturgy covered a dangerous fondness for the Nestorian heresy, and that the safest course for the Thomas Christians was to come over to the Latin rite. Much of their denunciation is mere dislike of ritual to which they were not accustomed, and their ideas were far from the present discipline of Rome, under which Latin priests in the East are forbidden to win over to the Latin rite followers of Oriental rites which have been sanctioned by the Holy See. From time to time Rome attempted to restrain the zeal of the Goanese clergy in this matter, but without success. The friction increased until 1599, when, on the death of the last Chaldean bishop, the spiritual charge of the Thomas Christians, under orders from Rome, was assumed by Menezes, Archbishop of Goa, who came south to Cochin and convoked the celebrated Synod of Diamper.

At this synod the Thomas Christians formally made their submission to Rome and abjured the Nestorian heresy. Their service books were expurgated of all Nestorian expressions, and any Nestorian books of devotion in their possession were burned. The continued use of their Syriac liturgy was permitted, but Archbishop Menezes took pains to alter the order of prayers and ritual in their liturgy with the intention that it should no longer resemble the Syriac liturgy used by the Nestorian heretics in the East. The liturgy thus altered at the Synod of Diamper is the liturgy which is used to this day by the Thomas Christians of the Roman obedience, the Catholics of the Syro-Malabar rite.

At the same time the Holy See withdrew the Thomas Christians from the patriarchate of the Chaldean Patriarch and placed them under a bishop to be nominated by the King of Portugal. That monarch selected for this see a succession of the Jesuit Fathers who were at work on this coast, and thus from 1600 the Thomas Christians, although an Oriental Church with an Oriental rite, were under Latin bishops. This arrangement did not work smoothly. The Christians had a curious custom under which the temporal care of their Church was entrusted to one of their own priests as archdeacon; and, because the tendency in India is that every office becomes hereditary, the archdeacons were chosen from two families named Palomattam and Sankarapuri, which were said to have had the monopoly of this office from the time of the Apostles. Thus the post of archdeacon had descended from uncle to nephew among the Syrian clergy, and the Bishops who at intervals came from the Persian Gulf were regarded as distinguished visitors, useful to confer valid Orders but without any governance of the Church. These ideas were intolerable to the Jesuit Archbishops, trained in Europe, and the clash of conflicting authorities was continuous. The Viceroy at Goa attempted to effect a reconciliation but without result, and matters came to a head under Archbishop Garcia, who is said to have had a sarcastic manner which the Syrians much disliked. The archdeacon Thomas, a member of the Palomattam family, entered into communication with several Oriental Churches asking that an Oriental bishop might be sent to the Thomas Christians. In answer to these applications the Jacobite Patriarch of Antioch sent a bishop named Ahatalla, who landed in India in 1652. Before this prelate reached his destination, he was arrested by the Portuguese authorities and was deported to Europe. Enraged at this interception of their expected bishop, the Thomas Christians withdrew from Archbishop Garcia and, defying the Portuguese power, set up for themselves. Twelve priests solemnly laid hands on the archdeacon and thus set him apart as their spiritual ruler.

When the news of this revolt of the Thomas Christians reached Rome, Alexander VII sent out a party of Carmelite friars to the assistance of Archbishop Garcia. They went out by the Persian Gulf, and arrived in 1657. It was found that the majority of the revolted Syrians were ready for reconciliation with Rome but were not willing to submit to Archbishop Garcia. One of the Carmelites, Father Joseph, returned to Rome to report this state of affairs. He was consecrated bishop and was sent to the Thomas Christians as Commissary Apostolic. Under his guidance the Carmelites succeeded in reconciling two-thirds of the Syrians, and prominent among these was Alexander, the nephew of the archdeacon Thomas. While matters stood thus, the Dutch in 1663 took Cochin from the Portuguese and ordered all European priests to quit that coast. Bishop Joseph hurriedly consecrated the Syrian priest, Alexander, and sailed for Goa. There he received a friendly hint that the Viceroy had orders from Portugal to arrest him, so he continued his journey to Europe and ended his days as the bishop of an Italian see.

The Dutch tolerated Bishop Alexander and his Syrian priests, only exacting an oath that they should render no allegiance to the King of Portugal; and after some time the Carmelite fathers quietly returned. One of them, Father Mattheus, struck up an acquaintance with the Dutch Governor, Van Rheede, on the ground of a common study of botany, and he assisted the Governor in the preparation of his *Hortus Malabaricus*, a ponderous work in twelve volumes which was published at Amsterdam. Perhaps this explains why, in 1673, Father Mattheus was permitted by Van Rheede to build the first church that the Carmelites erected in India.

Bishop Alexander was desirous that his nephew, Matthew, be appointed to succeed him. The nominee was a fit person, and it is likely that his appointment would have delighted the Syrians, but Rome was of opinion that the hereditary succession to office must cease, and for two centuries the Thomas Christians were under European Carmelite friars as Vicars Apostolic.

The first of these Carmelite Vicars was Father Peter Paul, titular Bishop of Ancyra. He was the son of Prince Palma and nephew of Innocent XII, and he had influence sufficient to procure, in 1698, a friendly arrangement between the Emperor Leopold I of Austria and the Senate at Amsterdam, under which the Emperor tolerated the Calvinist religion in Hungary and the Dutch permitted a Carmelite Bishop and twelve priests to reside inland of Cochin. Under this agreement each Carmelite Vicar Apostolic presented, on arrival, a copy of his credentials to the Dutch Council at Cochin, and this etiquette continued so long as the Dutch occupied that coast.

Against this arrangement the Portuguese strenuously protested, contending that the Most Faithful King had been granted by Rome an exclusive patronage of missions to the East; but as the Thomas Christians still refused to submit to Portuguese ecclesiastics, and as the Dutch utterly refused to permit any Portuguese bishop to set foot within their sphere of influence, Rome was compelled to disregard the Portuguese protest and to maintain the Carmelite mission. The attitude taken by the Portuguese prelates brought about a curious episode in the history of Roman orders. On the death of the titular Bishop of Ancyra, another Carmelite friar was nominated to succeed him, and a Brief was sent from Rome empowering this Carmelite to receive consecration at the hands of any bishop. The Portuguese Archbishop of Goa and the Bishop of Cochin refused to officiate, as they considered that the nomination infringed the rights of the Most Faithful King, and in this difficulty the Carmelite had recourse to a Chaldean bishop in communion with the Holy See, who had come to that coast after the Mohammedans had driven him from his own see in Arabia. The Chaldean bishop consented, and the Carmelite nominee received consecration at his hands.

The administration by Carmelite Vicars Apostolic was not without its own difficulties. The hereditary tendency showed itself once more in the custom by which certain Syrian priests, who possessed libraries in their houses, maintained domestic seminaries for the education of candidates for the priesthood. This privilege of maintaining a domestic seminary descended with the library from uncle to nephew. In 1771 this custom was forbidden by Propaganda, but the efforts of the Carmelites to carry out this instruction caused so much disaffection that the Thomas Christians again made attempts to place themselves under the Chaldean Patriarch, and also approached the Rajahs of Travancore and Cochin, accusing the Carmelite missionaries of atrocious crimes. Moreover, towards the end of the century the political disturbances in Europe hindered communication and cut off all supplies of men and money.

As an instance of this difficulty may be cited the story of Bishop Francis Xavier of St Anne. Born at Genoa, he set out in 1798 for India, and at Siena obtained the blessing of Pius VI, then a captive in the hands of the French. Embarking at Leghorn in a neutral ship, he was carried into Elba by a French privateer. Released by the French consul there, the ship proceeded on her voyage, and was a second time seized by a French frigate and carried into Malta, where it was detained lest it should convey to Egypt news of the expedition which General Bonaparte was then preparing. Finding his further progress barred, the young priest escaped from Malta in a fishing boat, and was landed in Palestine at the foot of Mount Carmel. Thence he made his way by land through Aleppo and Bagdad to Bussorah, where a friendly captain of a British ship gave him a passage to Bombay. Landing in India, he was arrested by the British authorities as a French spy, but after some time was released and made his way to the Malabar coast, where, after many years' work as a priest, he became Vicar Apostolic among the Thomas Christians.

Undeterred by such difficulties the Vicars Apostolic continued their efforts to secure an educated clergy and to foster a solid piety among the laity. At length the domestic seminaries were abolished, and central seminaries were established. These are now amalgamated into one grand seminary, which is directly under the orders of Propaganda. Religious houses were founded, and there are now eleven monasteries and ten convents of Syrians who follow the rule of the Third Order of Carmel. These monks did good work in 1861, when they withstood a Chaldean bishop who was sent to that coast by the Chaldean Patriarch, and for that service they were thanked by Pius IX.

Notwithstanding all that the Latin Vicars Apostolic had done, there was still among the Syrians a deeply seated desire to have their own bishops. At length in 1896 Rome yielded to this oft expressed wish. The European Vicars, Bishops Medlycott and Lavigne, were withdrawn, and three Syrian priests were consecrated by the Papal Delegate to fill their places; so that the Thomas Christians after the lapse of two hundred years once more had bishops of their own race and rite. If these three priests had any illusion concerning the burden of the episcopate which they took up that day, it must have been dispelled by an incident which took place before the day was over. The selection of Father Matthew Makil as bishop for the Changanacheri Vicariate did not please a certain faction in that town, and that faction had the good taste to dispatch to the Papal Delegate this telegram: "In dishonour of this melancholy day we have hoisted a black flag on the cathedral."

Alongside of these Catholics with an Oriental rite there are large numbers of Catholics who are the descendants of converts made since the Portuguese went to India. These, of course, follow the ordinary Latin rite and are under the jurisdiction of the Latin bishops of the hierarchy in India, who exercise the ordinary territorial jurisdiction. There is nothing to hinder Catholics from satisfying the Sunday obligation by hearing Mass in either rite, but the Easter communion must be made in their own rite. Recently the Spanish Archbishop of Verapoly was in want of priests for his diocese and borrowed some from the Vicar Apostolic of Ernaculam, and these priests celebrate Syriac Masses in the Latin Churches of the Verapoly diocese. The Syriac Mass is longer and more ceremonious than the Latin Mass. Incense is used at every Low Mass, and at the preparation the priest turns toward the server holding the chalice upside down while the server censes so that the smoke rises into the down-turned chalice. After the Gospel the priest descends from the altar, and ascends again with three genuflections on both knees to say the Creed. The additions which have been made in recent centuries to the Latin Mass do not appear in the Syriac Mass, which ends at the blessing.*

Brief mention may be made of the story of the one-third of the Thomas Christians who after the revolt of 1653 refused to return to the Roman obedience. Twelve years later, in 1665, they obtained for the Archdeacon Thomas episcopal consecration at the hands of a Jacobite bishop, and since then they have remained out of the Roman communion, maintaining their episcopal status, either by uncle consecrating his nephew and successor or by recourse to other schismatical prelates. It does not appear why they adhered to the Jacobite heresy. Possibly the reason was that a Jacobite bishop was the first who came, and that in their eyes valid orders were of more importance than correct doctrine.

In 1709 the fourth bishop of this sect wrote a Syriac letter to the Jacobite Patriarch of Antioch, asking that learned clerics might be sent to his assistance. In describing his forlorn condition he uses a metaphor which comes home to all who know the shallow lagoons that fringe that coast, and compares himself to a boat without a pole. This Syriac letter was entrusted to the Dutch authorities at Cochin for transmission to Antioch; but when the letter reached Amsterdam, it was handed as a curiosity to the lecturer in Oriental languages at the University of Leyden, and he published it with a translation in 1714. Hence it appears in Asseman's *Bibliotheca Orientalis.*

---

* See Le Brun's *Explication de la Messe*, III, 374.

This bishop was succeeded by a nephew who made overtures of submission to Rome, and there is in the Vatican a letter which he wrote to the Pope, offering obedience on condition that the Holy See sanctioned the use of leavened bread in all the churches of his diocese. Upon this letter the Cardinal Prefect of Propaganda wrote in 1750 to the Vicar Apostolic that the tone of the letter raised doubts regarding the sincerity of the writer. There was not a word of sorrow for the separation from the Church or for the sacrilegious consecration. As for the use of leavened bread, that had been conceded to the Greeks, but could not be conceded to these Syrians who had at the Synod of Diamper accepted the use of unleavened bread.

The Bishop was in his turn succeeded by his nephew, the sixth in succession, and this sixth bishop in his turn made repeated overtures to Rome. In 1774 Propaganda offered him the rank of Protonotary with a money stipend and the temporal but not the spiritual superintendence of his subjects; but the Latin prelates on the coast reported to Rome that he stood out for the spiritual charge of all the Thomas Christians, not only of his own schismatic flock but of all the Romo-Syrians. The well-known author, Father Paulinus a Sancto Bartholomæo, was sent to interview the Bishop, but he put by any discussion of his conversion and would speak only of securing the succession to his nephew. *Novi feram ex cornubus!* says the Carmelite; "I knew the beast by its horns, and I went on my way." Thus matters stood when in 1795 the English took that coast from the Dutch.

The Syrian Christians in India

The Syrian Church before long attracted the attention of the Government of Madras, and the British residents at the courts of the Rajahs of Travancore and Cochin saw in it an opening for Protestant missions. At the invitation of the Resident some Anglican clergymen of the Church Missionary Society arrived in Travancore in 1816. The two-thirds of the Thomas Christians who were under the Roman obedience were left alone, but one-third, who were under a Jacobite bishop and by this time were at a low ebb of apathy and ignorance, presented a more promising field. For twenty years the Church Missionary Society's clergy worked amongst this schismatic flock, endeavouring to persuade them to give up the fragments of the Catholic faith and ritual which they had retained. The Holy Sacrifice, Confession, and prayers for the dead were the practices which the Protestants most strenuously attacked. One young missionary described the Jacobite Mass as "buffoonery." Another missionary, lecturing to a class of Syrian students, instructed them that Mary was the mother of a family born after Jesus. Quitting the room after his lecture, he had occasion to return; and he found a Syrian Jacobite priest making what reparation he could by teaching the class that the Catholic Church holds that Mary remained ever a virgin. The object kept in view by the Protestant missionaries was to remove all ritual and doctrine which could not be "brought to the test of the rule of Scripture," and they avowed "the design to raise this prostrate Church from its degraded condition, and weed it of the errors and superstitions which the Church of Rome had introduced into it."

The Jacobite Patriarch of Antioch, in 1825, heard of what was going on, and sent a bishop, named Athanasius, to put a stop to it. Mar Athanasius landed in Bombay, and was there stranded for want of funds, so had recourse to the Anglican Bishop of Calcutta, Reginald Heber, who was in Bombay on tour. Probably this was the first time that Bishop Heber saw an Oriental prelate. He treated him with extraordinary courtesy, and supplied him with funds to continue his journey. Arrived in Travancore, Mar Athanasius promptly threatened to excommunicate the local

Jacobite Bishops. This was more than the Protestant missionaries could bear. They induced the British Resident to persuade the Travancore Rajah to expel Mar Athanasius from his State. When Bishop Heber heard of this, he wrote indignantly saying that this was on a par with the conduct of the Portuguese, who had deported bishops across seas; but before the Resident received this letter, the deed was done and Mar Athanasius had sailed from Bombay.

At length the yoke of the Church Missionary Society's clergy became too heavy. They demanded that the accounts of every Jacobite church should be audited, and that the Jacobite bishop should ordain no candidate without a certificate of fitness given by one of themselves. These demands were considered by the Jacobite prelate to constitute a bondage to which no Christian bishop ought to submit, and in 1837 he severed all connexion with the Anglican missionaries.

However, the labour of the Protestant missionaries for twenty years was not without fruit. Some thousands of the Syrian Jacobites formally became members of the Church of England, and from the descendants of these men the Anglican mission in Travancore has obtained the best part of its native clergy. Also, a strong party among the Jacobites had been influenced by Protestant teaching and were opposed to the action of their Bishop in 1837, although they did not quit the Jacobite Church. As years passed, litigation arose between this party and the conservative Jacobites, who wished to adhere to Antioch. The final decision was against the party with Protestant leanings, and they now form a separate Church, still using a Syriac liturgy from which transubstantiation and prayers for the dead have been expunged. They are called the Reformed Syrians.

While that litigation between the two parties of Jacobites was in progress, the Jacobite Patriarch of Antioch, fearing the loss of a portion of his patriarchate, went to London in 1874 and had interviews with the Secretary of State, the Archbishop of Canterbury and other notables. During his stay in England he went down to Eton, and the head master invited him to address the school in modern Greek. The boys did not understand one syllable that he spoke, but his appearance in flowing Oriental robes and quaint headgear was picturesque; so whenever he paused in his speech to take breath, the school applauded loudly, and the Patriarch was much touched by the warm reception given him by the flower of English youth.

His visit to England procured a dispatch from the Secretary of State directing that the dispute must be left to the courts of law and that the executive Government must not intervene. As already stated, the decision was in favour of the conservative Jacobites, and they retained their endowments and the fabrics of their churches. Although they are called Jacobites, they now say that they abhor the heresy of Eutyches, and that they hold the whole Catholic faith, maintaining that the only difference between them and Roman Catholics is that they submit to the Patriarch of Antioch and do not acknowledge the jurisdiction of the Bishop of Rome. They follow the Old Style in their calendar and use the Syriac version of the liturgy of St James the Less.*

Some years ago the Jacobites in Travancore were joined by a priest named Alvarez, who came from the diocese of Goa, where he had some reputation as the editor of a Catholic journal. The Metropolitan of the Jacobites in Travancore consecrated Alvarez as bishop. Afterwards Bishop Alvarez left India and set up for himself in Ceylon, where he styles himself His Holiness Julius I, Metropolitan of the Independent Catholic Church of India and Ceylon, or of the Latin Branch of the Syrian Church of Antioch. This prelate, Alvarez, consecrated Vilatte, who, when passing through England, conferred the priesthood upon the Anglican deacon, Brother Ignatius.

There are several books in English which treat of the Syrian Christians in India, but these books are tainted at their source. The earliest book is Geddes's *History of the*

---

* Some of the Jacobite priests in Travancore even use the Roman edition of the *Missale Surianum juxta ritum Ecclesiæ Antiochenæ Syrorum*. Romæ: Typ. Cong. de Prop. Fide. 1843. This liturgy was originally written in Hebrew, but it has been translated into Syriac and Greek.

Church in Malabar. Michael Geddes was an Edinburgh graduate, one of the first batch of Scottish students who came to Balliol College, Oxford. In 1678 he went to Lisbon as chaplain of the English factory there. In Portugal he came upon Gouvea's work upon Archbishop Menezes and the Synod of Diamper, which supplied him with materials for his book. When William III came to the throne, and Burnett became Bishop of Salisbury, Burnett selected Geddes as Chancellor of Sarum, and there in 1694 he published his book. Burnett, in his *History of the Reformation*, III, 306, says of Geddes:

> He was a learned and a wise man. He had a true notion of popery as a political combination, managed by falsehood and cruelty, to establish a temporal empire in the person of the Popes. All his thoughts and studies were chiefly employed in detecting this.

As might be expected of a man who held those views, Geddes, in taking his facts from Gouvea, narrated them with a strong Protestant bias against the Portuguese. Writer after writer has followed his tone on this point, and it is regarded as commonplace in Indian history that Archbishop Menezes ill-treated the Thomas Christians. Every administrator can make mistakes, and, doubtless, the Portuguese solution of the difficult problems presented by this Oriental Church may be open to honest criticism; but the Portuguese were not as black as Geddes has painted them.

THE PLAINT of the KINE

The Second "Gāthā" of the Avesta

IN two preceding articles of this *Review*,[*] I ventured to offer the reader a free metrical rendering of the first and the greater part of the ninth "Gāthā" of the *Avesta*, the Sacred Book of the Zoroastrian or ancient Iranian religion. As there remarked, these "Gāthās" constitute by far the most archaic portion of that rather heterogeneous book, which itself is made up, as is well known, merely of fragments of a much larger collection that has long since perished: destroyed, as tradition says, by Alexander the Great. It is generally conceded that these ancient hymns or psalms very probably go back to Zarathushtra (called by the Greeks Zoroaster), the great Iranian prophet and reformer, himself,[†] or to his immediate disciples. Bartholomae[‡] thinks they were very probably versified summaries of the Prophet's prose sermons, made up and taught to his followers at the end of these discourses for the purpose of fixing the teachings in their memory. Be that as it may, they are certainly very primitive, and the language represents an archaic form of Zend or Old Iranian. As elsewhere remarked, the text is in many places very corrupt, and the meaning exceedingly obscure. For this latter reason they have been likened, not unjustly, to the Psalms of the Old Testament.

Like these, too, they exhibit wide diversity of subjects: "now devotional, now didactic, now supplicatory; at one time full of lamentation and complaint, at another defiant and militant."[§] The hymns chosen reflect this variety: the first is a spiritual and devotional prayer; the ninth "raises those great fundamental questions, partly cosmogonical, partly ethical, which in all ages are ever forcing themselves upon the minds and consciences of thinking men." The second "Gāthā," presented in this article, shows us quite another phase of the Zoroastrian reform: its social and economic side. The great Median prophet was not merely a religious reformer, substituting a very pure and elevated form of monotheism for the old polytheistic Aryan nature-worship; he was also a pioneer in the politico-social order. He found the people to whom he preached—Medians or Bactrians, whichever they were—warlike and nomad tribes, despising the arts of settled and civil life. He strove hard to make them agriculturists, settlers and tillers of the land, pastors and breeders of cattle. The exaltation of agriculture to the rank of a sacred and religious work of merit is fully one half of his doctrine. We must bear this in mind in order to understand the following hymn. It is in dialogue form, and its plot is thus to be explained.

---

[*] October, 1903, and October, 1904.

[†] Who flourished almost certainly about 660-583 B.C., so partly contemporaneous with Solon, Thales and Lao-tse.

[‡] *Die Gatha's des Awesta, Zarathushtra's Verspredigten*, p. v. (Strassburg: Trübner. 1905).

[§] *Dublin Review*, Oct. 1904, vol. cxxxv, p. 382.

One of the most characteristic figures in the Gāthic *dramatis personae* is the curiously-named spirit *Geush Urvan*, literally translated "Soul-of-Kine." According to the Zoroastrian cosmogony, Ahura Mazda, the good Deity, created a Primeval Man and a Primeval Ox. Both were treacherously slain by His wicked rival, Angro-Mainyus, the Evil Spirit. But the soul of the Primeval Ox was straightway taken up to heaven, and there became the tutelary genius of the bovine race, the guardian spirit of cattle. The machinery of this device for exalting the excellence and sanctity of cattle-breeding and farming is pretty conspicuous. In the present hymn this spirit laments the neglect of the care of cattle, the wretched condition in which the kine find themselves, the absence of all interest in, or effectual protection for, agriculture on the part of chiefs and nobles, even of religious teachers. So he cries aloud in his distress to the Creator and His attendant spirits, especially Asha, Spirit of Holiness. They confess that no chieftain is to be found who either patronises agriculture or protects and encourages the toiling husbandman. The prophet Zoroaster joins his supplication with that of Soul-of-Kine for help and redress. Then Ahura Mazda dramatically declares: "Thou art the man!" He goes on to state, in reply to further questioning, apparently by the people, that Zoroaster, as the one man who hath hearkened to the divine teaching, is to go forth as herald of the truth and is to receive the necessary gifts of eloquence to fulfil his task. As Moses and Isaiah protested their incapacity, when ordered by God to be the messengers of His word to the people, so here, not indeed the prophet himself, but, by a skilful device, the celestial genius, Soul-of-Kine, protests aloud: "What! A weakling, an unwarlike man, who has no influence, no material power; how can such a one protect us? We need rather a mighty temporal ruler, a warlike chief." And the faithful pray to Ahura and His archangels that they would grant the needed strength, the support, that is, of some mighty chieftain, to the chosen prophet. And Zoroaster himself closes the hymn with an earnest prayer to the same effect, reminding the Deity, whose apostle he is, that all this is needed in behalf of the "Great Work," the Reform, that He has sent him forth to accomplish.

Of the spirits, archangels, or genii, characteristic of the Gāthās, there appear in the present piece, besides Soul-of-Kine (*Geush Urvan*), also the Spirit-of-Holiness (*Asha*), the Spirit-of-Sovereignty (*Khshathra*), and Good Mind, (*Vohu Mano*), these last three belonging to the Seven Amesha-Spentas, or Immortal Holy Ones.*

Since my two preceding verse renderings appeared, a new prose translation of all the Gāthās has been published by the eminent Zend lexicographer, Christian Bartholomae (quoted above), which differs widely in many respects from other translations. I have consulted this interesting work very carefully, and in a few cases modified my own rendering. It impresses one, however, with the almost hopeless divergence of views of even the most qualified experts, when we find what strange discrepancies of translation each new attempt produces. Thus in the very first verse of this Gāthā, a word† which hitherto has been universally accepted as a substantive, and variously rendered as "drought" (Justi), "evil, prey" (Darmesteter), "desolation" (Mills), "filth" (Kanga), is by Bartholomae construed as the perfect of a verb meaning "to oppress"; and in verse 7, a word* hitherto taken as an adjective meaning "sixfold," is by him treated as a substantive meaning "milk"! In both cases I have with considerable hesitation followed him. I mention this, both to give some idea of the extreme difficulty of attaining a definite rendering of much of the Avesta, especially in the Gāthās, and as an anticipated excuse for any errors in my attempted version.†

---

* The others are: the Spirit-of-Wisdom (*Spenta Armaiti*), Spirit-of-Health (*Haurvatat*), Spirit-of-Immortality (*Ameretat*). See my remarks on all these genii in article, October, 1903, pp. 261-2. Ahura Mazda himself is reckoned among the seven.

† *āhishāya.*

I

To You‡ aloud cries Soul-of-Kine: "For whom
Have ye created me? Who fashioned me?
Me rapine dire and violence oppress,
Me cruel treatment with unkindness wrong.
No other herdsman mine but Ye alone.
O teach me what is for my pasture good!"

II

Then He,§ who made the Kine, to Holiness
Thus spake: "Where is the Kine's good friend and guide,
Whom, mighty Spirits, ye have made and given,
With pasture, bounteous feeders of the Kine?
What master for him have ye chosen out
The violence of the wicked to repress?"

III

Him answered Holiness: "There is no man
Of cruel soul but hateth kine. Not one
Just man is found who honest, thrifty folk
Doth cause to prosper. For, I ween, is he
Of all men noblest unto whom may come
The labouring man as suppliant in his need."

IV

[*Zoroaster speaks*]
"Lord Mazda's ever mindful of His words.
For whatsoever in the past was done
By men or demons, whatsoever things
By them in future time shall aye be done,
Of all these things shall Ahura judgement make.
So be it done to us according to His Will!

---

* *khshvīdā*.

† The reader is reminded that the middle syllable of Ahŭra is *short*.

‡ Ahura Mazda and the Spirit of Holiness (Asha).

§ Ahura Mazda consults Asha.

V

"Wherefore, with hands outstretched, thus pray we twain,
My soul and Soul-of-Kine, for both the Worlds,*
To Ahura, whom we fain in doubt would ask:
'Lo! is not ruin nowadays the lot
Of him who lives an honest life—the lot
Of thrifty husbandman 'mid wicked men?'"

VI

Then Ahura Mazda, Lord all-wise, thus spake,
Wondrous in knowledge: "Not a single lord†
Is to be found, nor e'en a trusty guide
In Holiness's path: wherefore THYSELF
I the Creator formed and set to be
For welfare of the industrious husbandman."

VII

This sacred maxim of prosperity
Hath Mazda made—with Asha one of heart—
And to the kine their milk hath given. He
To just men gracious in His precepts is.
[*The faithful speak.*]
"Whom hast thou then—and the Good Mind with Thee—
Ordained, by mouth to teach these things to men?"

VIII

[*Ahara Mazda speaketh*]
"Here is the Man that hath been found by me,
He that alone hath hearkened to our words:
Lo, Zarathushtra Spitama‡ is he,
All ready Our decrees to herald forth,
The precepts of the Lord and Holiness;
Wherefore all grace of speech to him be given."

IX

Thereat aloud lamented Soul-of-Kine:
"Whom give ye me? A master powerless
To help in my affliction? His the voice
Of an unwarlike man! Whereas I need
A kingly lord endowed with sovereign power;
For who can lend support to such a man?"

---

* For the blessings of the two Worlds—the material and the spiritual world—a frequent and favourite Zoroastrian formula.

† No temporal monarch as chieftain protects agriculture, not even a spiritual guide or religious chief.

‡ Of the Spitaman family or clan.

The Plaint of the Kine

X

[*The faithful speak*]

"Do ye, then, Ahura and Spirit of Holiness,
Give to these men[*] both strength and sovereignty
(And thou, Good Mind, as well!) whereby he[†] may
Bring happiness and joy; for well I ween
That from the beginning Thou, O Mazda Lord,
Of all things Master and Possessor art!"

XI

[*Zoroaster speaks*]

"Yet where to find the Spirit of Holiness
And the Good Mind and Royal Sovereignty?
O Spirit of Holiness and Mazda too,
I pray ye grant all this to me, that so
This the GREAT WORK[‡] may prosper. Help us, Lord,
And in Thy Spirit's grace O give us share!"

✠ L. C. CASARTELLI

---

[*] The prophet and his assistants.

[†] Zoroaster himself.

[‡] The Reform preached by Zoroaster as the apostle of Ahura Mazda.

THE CONDEMNATION OF POPE HONORIUS

J. B. Mansi. Amplissima Collectio Conciliorum. Vols x-xi. Florence. 1764-5.

C. J. Hefele, Bishop of Rottenburg. A History of the Councils of the Church. Translated by W. R. Clark, M.A., LL.D., D.C.L. Edinburgh. 1896.

MUCH ink has been spilt in the cause of Pope Honorius. Some writers have been chiefly occupied in defending or assailing the authenticity of the documents, others in attacking or supporting the orthodoxy of Honorius. But the inner sequence of events as described in the following sketch has never been given in all this voluminous literature.

Though it will, I hope, be made clear in these pages that much has been misunderstood or only half understood, yet the work of so many distinguished writers has no inconsiderable value. Certainty has been attained on some points. The authenticity of the documents is now above suspicion. It has been made clear that Honorius' meaning was far better than his expression, and that his real mind was confused rather than unorthodox.

This is not, however, a very important point, since at the present day no one is likely to teach that Honorius published his famous letters *ex cathedra*. The real difficulty has been worded with admirable precision by Bishop Gore in his *Roman Catholic Claims*. He says:

> Once again, whatever strong language may be quoted from a few later Oriental writers on behalf of the Roman See, as from St Theodore the Studite in the eighth century, nothing can override the evidence of the formal action of the sixth General Council in 689, when it condemned Honorius the Pope among the Monothelite heretics. "With them we anathematize," says the Council, "and cast out of the Catholic Church, Honorius, who was Pope of the elder Rome, because we found that he followed Sergius' opinion in all respects and confirmed his impious dogmas." Roman Catholic writers may endeavour to justify the actual language of Honorius, they may protest that the contemporary Pope never intended

to assent to his condemnation except for negligence in opposing heresy—we are not concerned at present with these contentions—but no one can possibly, with any show of reason, contend that the insertion of the name of the Pope in a list of formal heretics by an œcumenical Council does not prove that the Bishops who composed the Council had no, even rudimentary, idea of the papal infallibility. —Pp. 103, 104.

As the history of Pope Honorius has been written up till now by Catholic apologists, this indictment is unanswerable. Bishop Gore's admission with regard to St Theodore the Studite might have suggested to him that his conclusion was not certain, had not so many Catholic writers made it seem that the Council in condemning Honorius was resisting the Pope of its own day, and that the latter explained away a decision which he was afraid of refusing to confirm.

In reality, as the history will appear from the original documents, there is no difficulty at all. The Pope and the Council were in agreement as to the necessity of condemning Honorius, and they were certainly right in doing so under the circumstances.

It will also be made clear that there was no difference between Rome and the East with regard to the force of papal decisions. We do not of course look for the enunciation of the Vatican decree in set words by Eastern Bishops of the seventh century. But evidence will be supplied to enable us to judge the degree of development which the doctrine of papal infallibility had reached in those times, and the whole history will stand out as an interesting and curious page in the history of the evolution of the dogma.

I shall avoid controversy either with Catholics, Gallicans or Protestants. The facts will best speak for themselves, and I leave the comparison with the views of former writers to be made or not by the reader as he chooses, so as to avoid burdening the pages of this *Review* with tiresome arguments.

The origin of Monothelitism is thus told by Sergius.* The Emperor Heraclius, in a disputation held before him in Armenia in 622, had spoken of "one operation" in Christ, and had later asked Cyrus, Bishop of Lazoe in Phasis, whether this was correct.* Cyrus replied that he did not know, and referred the question to Sergius, Patriarch of Constantinople. Sergius was in favour of the expression, and sent him a letter said to have been addressed by the Patriarch Mennas, his predecessor, to Pope Vigilius, in which "one operation" was mentioned. Sergius declares that he intended no absolute decision on the matter. Cyrus, however, was satisfied. About 630 he became Patriarch of Alexandria, one of the strongholds of the Monophysites. These were very much divided among themselves, and Cyrus induced one considerable section of them to be reconciled with the Catholic Church by a sort of compromise, which was nicknamed "the watery union." The doctrine agreed upon was summed up in nine propositions, which profess to render the teaching of Chalcedon, but express themselves in Monophysite phraseology, borrowed indeed from St Cyril, but meant in a wrong sense by the heretics. The seventh of these propositions anathematizes all who do not confess that the same one Christ works both the divine and human works by "one theandric operation."

---

* Mansi, xi, 529.

---

* A few words will explain the theological question. Monothelitism bears the same relation to Monophysitism that the Spanish Adoptianism of the next century bears to Nestorianism. Those who embraced it held firmly the doctrine of the Council of Chalcedon that our Lord's two natures, divine and human, are united in Him without confusion, so that His humanity remains perfect and complete, just as the Adoptianists held firmly the doctrine of the Council of Ephesus that the two natures belong to one divine Person. But the Adoptianists did not see that adoption is not of a nature but of a Person, and therefore they wrongly taught that our Lord in His human nature might be called the adopted Son of God. And, conversely, the Monothelites could not see that activity and will belong to the nature and not to the Person, so that they held Christ to have but one motive power—*ἐνεργεία*, energy, activity, operation—and one will, whereas in truth there must be a perfect operation and will of each nature. As in the Trinity of three Persons in one Nature there is one operation, *ad extra*, and one will, so in the two natures of the one Person of Christ there are two operations and two wills—the divine will common to the Son with the Father and the Holy Ghost, and a human will, without which the human nature taken by the Son of God would be incomplete.

The danger and the attractiveness of this wrong argumentation lay in the fact that it went half way to meet the Monophysites. These heretics called the orthodox Nestorians, and declared that they divided Christ in two. The unity of will and operation was placed before the Monophysites as a proof that those who accepted the Council of Chalcedon safeguarded the oneness of the Person of Christ. The expression "one operation" was indeed a surrender of the perfect distinction of the natures, and therefore was not far off from the more moderate Monophysites, who professed simply to follow the doctrine taught by St Cyril against the Nestorians.

Nothing could be more pleasing to the Emperor and Sergius than such a union, and the latter wrote a joyful letter of congratulation to Cyrus. But the Palestinian monk, Sophronius, was in Alexandria at the time, and he disapproved of the teaching of "one operation" as contrary to the Chalcedonian doctrine. His reputation for sanctity was great, and Cyrus proposed that he should lay his objections before Sergius. Sophronius accordingly proceeded to Constantinople, and so far persuaded Sergius that he withdrew the "one operation" for the sake of peace, and Sophronius promised to say no more. It is evident that Sergius now distrusted this formula, but could not formally withdraw it without imperilling the union of the Alexandrian heretics.

In this dilemma he took the obvious course of laying the whole matter before the Pope.

His famous letter to Honorius begins by saying that he would desire, were it possible, to bring all his actions day by day to the Pope's cognizance and receive his advice. He relates the circumstances, how very hard it seemed to destroy the recent joyful union effected by Cyrus, with all its promises of peace, "of those who once would not hear the name of the divine Leo and the Council of Chalcedon, but who now proclaim them in a loud voice in the holy mysteries." Sophronius, he says, was not able to quote explicit testimonies of the ancients for two operations; but it seemed that the term "one operation" was novel, and he, Sergius, had therefore written to Cyrus to permit neither one nor two operations to be spoken of, when once the union of the Monophysites with the Church had been effected. Sophronius had agreed to this. At the end of the letter

Sergius quotes the celebrated words of Pope Leo, *Agit enim utraque forma cum alterius communione*, which obviously imply two operations; and he seems to have been orthodox enough in meaning, though his expressions are incorrect. He has started from the Chalcedonian doctrine, but has made a sorry conclusion. He does not openly support one will, which he only mentions in connexion with the supposititious letter of Mennas to Pope Vigilius, but he thinks "two operations" to be a misleading expression. He concludes:

> We have thought it fitting and also necessary to give an account to your Brotherhood and concordant Blessedness, by the copies which we are sending, of what we have partially related above; and we beg your Holiness to read the whole, and, following its meaning with your God-pleasing and full charity, if there be anything wanting in what has been said, to fill this up with the charity which God has given you; and with your holy syllables and with your desirable assistance, to signify your opinion on the matter.*

The letter of Honorius, in reply,† praises Sergius for his circumspection in disapproving the new expression, "one operation." So far so good. But he goes on to admit one will, because our Lord took to Himself a human nature free from the curse of original sin. The reason given implies that our Lord has a human will, only not also a corrupt lower human will. This is in answer to Sergius, who had argued that if two operations were admitted there would follow two contrary wills. The Pope declares that to teach one operation will seem Eutychian, while to teach two will seem Nestorian. Both expressions are consequently to be avoided.

Honorius is thus logically and theologically as much astray as Sergius, though both are orthodox in intention. It would no doubt be uncharitable to regard either the Pope or the Patriarch as a "private heretic."

---

* Hefele says (p. 27, note): "One can see he was a Monothelite, and wanted to mislead the Pope." I think it clear, on the contrary, that he was puzzled by an involved problem, and wished to get the Pope's help. He seems to have done his best to think and act rightly, but he was no more exempt from error than a Cyprian or an Aquinas.

† Mansi, xi, 537.

Unfortunately these letters were afterwards treated as if they were definitions of faith. As definitions they are obviously and beyond doubt heretical, for in a definition it is the words that matter.

It is, of course, absurd to regard the letter of Honorius as a definition *ex cathedra*, as was done by Hefele, Pennacchi and others. It was natural to exaggerate at the time of the Vatican Council, but to-day its decree is better understood. If the letter of Honorius to Sergius is to be *ex cathedra*, *a fortiori* all papal encyclicals addressed to the whole Church at the present day must be *ex cathedra*, *quod est absurdum*.*

The decision of Honorius was nothing more and also nothing less than an approval given to the disciplinary arrangement suggested by Sergius. Both believed that "one will" had been said, and said in an orthodox sense, by the orthodox Mennas, unrebuked by Pope Vigilius, and neither was aware that "two operations" and "two wills" could be shown to have been consecrated by the usage of the Fathers. Sergius was at least doubtful, and set the matter before the Pope. Honorius had a higher responsibility; he decided in haste to agree with the conduct of Sergius, and he decided wrongly. The result of his letter was the so-called heresy of Monothelitism, which up to this point can scarcely be said to have as yet existed, except as an opinion under discussion.

At the time when these two letters were written, St Sophronius had already been promoted to the patriarchal Chair of Jerusalem, and on the occasion of his enthronization had published the defence of two operations and two wills which Sergius had demanded from him, but which the latter had not yet received when he wrote to the Pope. It is a long document, afterwards read and approved by the sixth Council, and it has the remarkable merit of being the first complete exposition of the orthodox doctrine of the two wills and natures. It was sent to all the patriarchs, and Sophronius declares that he is ready to receive corrections. For our present purpose his reference to St Leo as speaking with Peter's voice is of interest.*

---

* The Vatican decision explains *ex cathedra* to mean: *Cum* [*Papa*] *omnium Christianorum pastoris et doctoris munere fungens, pro suprema sua Apostolica auctoritate doctrinam de fide vel moribus ab universa ecclesia tenendam definit.* In this case not even the first condition is certainly fulfilled, for Honorius addressed Sergius alone, and it is by no means evident that he intended his letter to be published as a decree. Further, he does not appeal, as Popes habitually appealed on solemn occasions, to his apostolic authority, to the promise to Peter, to the tradition of his Church. Lastly, he neither defines nor condemns, utters no anathema or warning, but merely approves a policy of silence.

> And also equally with these holy writings of the all-wise Cyril I receive as holy and honoured together with them, and as propagating the same orthodoxy, the God-given and inspired letter of the great and illustrious and saintly Leo, the light of the Roman Church, or rather of the Church beneath the sun, which he, moved clearly by the Holy Ghost, wrote against the wicked Eutyches and the hateful and perverse Nestorius to the praiseworthy Bishop of the royal city, Flavian, which I denominate and define to be the pillar of orthodoxy (following the holy Fathers, who rightly called it thus) as teaching us all orthodoxy and destroying all heresy and driving it away from the God-protected halls of our holy Catholic Church. And together with these inspired syllables and characters, *I accept all his letters and teachings as proceeding from the mouth of Peter the Coryphæus, and I kiss them and salute them and embrace them with all my soul.* Receiving these, as I have said, the five holy and divine assemblies of the blessed Fathers and all the writings of Cyril the all-wise, and especially those against the madness of Nestorius and the letters of the oriental Bishops, written to the same most divine Cyril, and by him acknowledged to be orthodox, and whatever Leo, the most holy pastor of the most holy Church of the Romans, has written, and especially what he composed against the Eutychian and Nestorian abomination, I recognize the latter as definitions of Peter and the former as those of Mark, and besides, all the heaven-taught teachings of all the chosen mystagogues of our Catholic Church, etc.—Mansi, xi, 461-509.

If St Sophronius extends the idea of Peter speaking by Leo to St Cyril, so that he embraces the words of that doctor as the words of St Mark, this does not detract from the importance of his testimony as an Eastern Bishop that the words of a Pope are to him as the words of a greater than Mark—of the Coryphæus of the Apostles.

---

* After detailing his assent to the five General Councils, he adds that he accepts the divine writings of Cyril and the letters of Eastern prelates which were received by Cyril.

The Saint lived only until 638. Before his death a memorable scene occurred which has been vividly described for us by the other actor in it, Stephen, Bishop of Dora in Palestine, within the Saint's patriarchate. He speaks as follows in a document which he presented in person to Pope St Martin at the Lateran Council of 649. He is speaking of the troubles brought upon the patriarchate of Sophronius by Monothelitism.

> And for this cause, sometimes we asked for water to our head and to our eyes a fountain of tears, sometimes the wings of a dove, according to holy David, that we might fly away and announce these things to the Chair which rules and presides over all, I mean to yours, the head and highest, for the healing of the whole wound. For this it has been accustomed to do from of old and from the beginning with power by its canonical or apostolical authority, because the truly great Peter, head of the Apostles, was clearly thought worthy not only to be entrusted with the keys of heaven, alone apart from the rest, to open it worthily to believers, or to close it justly to those who disbelieve the Gospel of grace, but because he was also first commissioned to feed the sheep of the whole Catholic Church; for "Peter," saith He, "lovest thou Me? Feed My sheep." And again, because he had in a manner peculiar and special, a faith in the Lord stronger than all and unchangeable, to be converted and to confirm his fellows and spiritual brethren when tossed about, as having been adorned by God Himself incarnate for us with power and sacerdotal authority.—Mansi, x, 893.

Nothing could be more confident than this beautiful exposition of the writer's faith in the promises of Christ to Peter. It is noticeable that all the three principal Petrine texts are quoted, showing that then as now they were recognized as the *loci classici* upon the point. And Stephen goes on to assert that this was the faith of St Sophronius himself, as, indeed, was indicated by the words of that saint.

> And Sophronius of blessed memory, who was Patriarch of the holy city of Christ our God, and under whom I was Bishop, conferring not with flesh and blood, but caring only for the things of Christ with respect to your Holiness, hastened to send my nothingness without delay about this matter alone to this Apostolic and great See.

Sophronius had nobly resisted the heretics while he lived, but only succeeded in raising against himself a storm of detraction. But for all this he was confident as a lion.

> Being full of divine zeal and courage, he took me unworthy, and set me on holy Calvary, where for our sakes He who by nature is God above us, the Lord Jesus Christ, voluntarily deigned to be crucified in the flesh, and he bound me with bonds not to be undone, saying: "Thou shalt give an account to the God who was crucified for us in this holy place, in His glorious and awful advent, when He shall come to judge the living and the dead, if thou delay and allow His faith to be endangered; since, as thou knowest, I am myself let, on account of the invasion of the Saracens which has come upon us for our sins. Swiftly pass, therefore, from one end of the world to the other, until thou come to *the Apostolic See, where are the foundations of the holy doctrines.* Not once, not twice, but many times, make clearly known to all those holy men there all that here has been done; and tire not instantly urging and beseeching, until out of their apostolic wisdom they bring forth judgement unto victory. . .
>
> I, therefore, trembling and confounded at the tremendous adjuration laid on me in that venerable and awful spot, and considering the episcopal dignity which by God's permission was mine, and because I was urged by the requests of almost all the pious Bishops of the East, in agreement with the departed Sophronius (I being the first in the jurisdiction of Jerusalem), I gave not, to speak graphically, sleep to mine eyes, nor slumber to mine eyelids, nor rest to my temples, for the sake of the fulfilment of this beloved command. Without delay I made this journey for this purpose alone; and since then thrice have I run to your apostolic feet, urging and beseeching the prayer of Sophronius and of all, that is, that you will assist the imperilled faith of Christians. . .

Such is the witness of Stephen to the belief of the patriarchate of Jerusalem. We shall hear more of him presently.

The synodal letter of Sophronius does not appear to have had any effect upon Sergius, but we have no further knowledge of his conduct. Of Honorius we have two fragments of a letter which were produced and read at the sixth Council. He writes to Sergius telling him that he has informed Cyrus of Alexandria that the new expressions "one or two operations" are to be dropped, the use of such expressions being most silly, πάνυ μάταιον. This was naturally condemned as heresy by the Council. But in this second fragment, Honorius implicitly teaches two operations, for he says rightly that the two natures work each what is proper to it, thus stultifying his own decision. The fragments read as if, after seeing the arguments of Sophronius, the Pope was trying to bolster up his wrong decision with orthodox arguments.

In one of the last four months of 638 the Emperor Heraclius issued the famous *Ecthesis*, composed for him by Sergius.* It enforces the decision of Honorius. All the Emperor's subjects are to confess one will of our Lord, but to avoid the expressions, one or two operations. We have seen that Sergius was in doubt when he wrote to the Pope. Now, having received the reply, he causes the teaching of the See of Rome to be proclaimed by the Emperor.† Before his death, in December of the same year, he further held a great synod at Constantinople. Its decision has been preserved, in which the *ecthesis* is acclaimed as "truly agreeing with the apostolic preaching." This is apparently a reference to its being based upon the letter of Honorius. "These are the doctrines of the Fathers, these are the supports of the Church," etc. The decisions were sent to absent Bishops, and Cyrus received them with great rejoicings. The See of Antioch was occupied by a Patriarch who had been uncanonically appointed by Sergius himself. St Sophronius was dead, and his chair was usurped by a supporter of the *ecthesis*. Pope Honorius had also died before its pub-

* Mansi, x, 991.

† Hefele says, "The agreement of the *ecthesis* with the two letters of Honorius is only apparent" (v, 64). It may indeed be said that the reasons given in the *ecthesis* are less clearly orthodox, but at least it was simply modelled on the first letter of Honorius. Catholic writers have not been willing to see this, for the sake of the Pope's honour, while Gallicans and Protestants have been equally blind, because they did not choose to admit that Sergius and the Emperor were in intention only giving effect to the Pope's decision and would never have thought of publishing such a proclamation without his authority.

lication. The new Pope, Severinus, who only reigned two months, is said to have had time to reject it.

On the arrival of the envoys from Rome to ask for the Emperor's confirmation of his election according to custom, the clergy of Constantinople (there was as yet no new Patriarch) presented them with the *ecthesis*, declaring that they would give them no assistance in the matter for which they had made so long a voyage, unless their envoys should promise to persuade the new Pope to subscribe the document without delay. St Maximus tells us that he was informed of the event by his friends at Constantinople. He writes:

> Having discovered the tenor of the document, since by refusing they would have caused the first and mother of Churches and the City [*ecclesiarum principem et matrem et urbem*] to remain so long a time in widowhood, they replied quietly: "We cannot act with authority in this matter, for we have received a commission to execute, not an order to make a profession of faith. But we assure you that we will relate all that you have put forward, and we will show the document itself to him who is to be consecrated, and if he should judge it to be correct, we will ask him to append his signature to it. But do not therefore place any obstacle in our way now and do violence to us by delaying us and keeping us here. For none has a right to use violence, especially when faith is in question. For herein even the weakest waxes mighty, and the meek becomes a warrior, and by comforting his soul with the divine word, is hardened against the greatest attacks. How much more in the the case of the clergy and Church of the Romans, *which from of old until now, as the elder of all the Churches which are under the sun, presides over all? Having surely received this canonically, as well from councils and the apostles, as from the princes of the latter, and being numbered in their company, she is subject to no writings or issues of synodical documents, on account of the eminence of her pontificate, even as in all these things all are equally subject to her according to sacerdotal law.*
>
> And so when, without fear but with all holy and becoming confidence, those ministers of *the truly firm and immovable rock, that is of the most great and Apostolic Church at Rome*, had so applied to the clergy of the royal city [Constantinople], it was seen that they had conciliated them and had acted prudently, that the others might be humble and modest, while they themselves made known the orthodoxy and purity of their own faith from the beginning. But those

of Constantinople, admiring their piety, thought that such a deed ought rightly to be recompensed; and ceasing from offering them the document, they promised to procure by their own care the issue of the Emperor's order with regard to the episcopal election. When this was accomplished, the *apocrisiarii* dear to God thankfully returned home.

Of this document, divinely honoured Father, a copy has been sent to me also. They have explained in it the cause for being silent about the natural operations in Christ our God, that is in His natures, of which and in which He is believed to be; and how in future neither one nor two are to be mentioned. It is only to be allowed to confess that the divine and human [works] proceeded from the same word of God incarnate and are to be referred to one and the same.—Mansi, x, 677-8.

This evidence with regard to the papacy is very remarkable as proceeding from the Saint's orthodox friends at Constantinople. The Roman envoys claim absolute immunity from all synodal decisions, and declare that their Church is above all others, *propter pontificatus provectionem*. These rights are from Councils, from apostles and from the princes of the apostles. Such claims we expect from Rome. But the clergy of Constantinople so amply admit them that they are even touched by the boldness of the envoys. St Maximus and his friends are exultant: the Church of Rome is truly the immovable rock. We see then that it is a doctrine of Constantinople, as well as of Jerusalem, that "in Rome are the foundations of the holy doctrines."

Severinus was not able to be consecrated until May, 640. He was succeeded in December by John IV. The new Pope, before the death of Heraclius (February, 641) held a synod against Monothelitism. He informed the new Patriarch of Constantinople, Pyrrhus, of his condemnation of the *ecthesis*, and the Emperor before his death excused himself, laying the blame on Sergius, and wrote to John IV a letter, in which he disowned his own *ecthesis*.* The Pope sent an epistle to the elder son of Heraclius, declaring that he was sure the *ecthesis* would now be withdrawn, and that the whole West rejected the new heresy. This document has become well known as the Apology for Honorius.

---

* Mansi, xi, 9, in Acts of Maximus.

The Pope says that he hears the new patriarch Pyrrhus has been confusing men's minds with his novel teachings, and supporting them by the name of Honorius. The defence which follows is a very lame one. It points out quite truly that both Sergius "of reverend memory" and Honorius only used the expression "one will" because they would not admit contrary wills.* But the whole argument of the letter of John IV shows that his predecessor was wrong in admitting the expression. What is most remarkable is that not a word is said about the prohibition by Honorius of both one and two operations, the very point for which St Maximus and Pope St Martin were to lay down their lives.

It is clear that Pyrrhus taught one will in the heretical sense. But, after the death of Constantine and the exile of his younger brother, Heracleonas, Pyrrhus was himself exiled to Africa, and a successor, Paul, was set up uncanonically in his stead.

John IV died on October 11, 642. Theodore I, his successor, wrote to Paul refusing to confirm his election as he had requested, until Pyrrhus had been properly deposed by a synod to be held in presence of two papal representatives. "Why has he allowed the *ecthesis* to remain on the wall, though it had been disowned by the late Emperor and condemned by the late Pope?" The heresy of Pyrrhus is made manifest by his praise of Heraclius, and by his signing, and causing others to sign, the *ecthesis*.†

---

* St Maximus uses the same arguments in his letter to Marinus, and he tells us that he had heard from the holy Roman abbot, Anastasius, that he had heard the Abbot John Symponus, the writer of Honorius' letter, affirm that he never made any mention in it of the abolition of the natural human will in our Lord, but only of the lower will of the flesh, adding that the letter had been corrupted by the Greek translators. This seems to be untrue of the version read at the sixth Council, as it was examined and approved by the papal representatives. St Maximus has perhaps slightly exaggerated the testimony of Abbot John in repeating it.

† Mansi, x, 702. We possess an interesting letter to this Pope from a Synod held in Cyprus, May 29, 643, in which the Bishops say (Mansi, x, 914):

"To the most holy and God-confirmed Father of Fathers, Archbishop

The Condemnation of

Pyrrhus was now in Africa, and, being no longer at court, had no temptation to remain in heresy, for the Africans were orthodox. In July, 645, probably at Carthage, a great disputation took place in presence of Gregory, the governor, and of many Bishops, between Pyrrhus and St Maximus Confessor, who had become, since the death of St Sophronius, the protagonist of orthodoxy in the East. This illustrious saint, born at Constantinople, had been the first secretary of Heraclius, but, leaving the world, had betaken himself to a monastery at Scutari, where he became abbot. The minutes of the disputation are interesting.* Pyrrhus was eventually convinced, his quotations from the Fathers being refuted by Maximus. It is assumed that the letter of Mennas to Vigilius is a forgery.

and œcumenical Patriarch Lord Theodore, Sergius, least of Bishops, greeting in the Lord:

"Christ, our God, has instituted your apostolic chair, O holy head, as a God-fixed and immovable foundation. For thou, as truly spake the divine Word, art Peter, and upon thy foundation the pillars of the Church have been fixed, and to thee He committed the keys of the heavens, He ordered thee to bind and to loose with authority on earth and in heaven. Thou art set as the destroyer of profane heresies, as Coryphæus and leader of the orthodox and unsullied faith. Despise not then, Father, the faith of our Fathers, tossed by waves and imperilled; disperse the rule of the foolish with the light of thy divine knowledge, O most holy. Destroy the blasphemies and insolence of the new heretics with their novel expressions. For nothing is wanting to your orthodox and apostolic definition and tradition for the augmentation of the faith amongst us. For we (O inspired one, you who hold converse with the holy Apostles and sit with them) believe and confess from of old since our very swaddling clothes, teaching according to the holy and God-bearing Pope Leo, and declaring that 'each nature works with the communion of the other,'" etc.

They are ready to be martyred rather than forsake the doctrine of St Leo.

"May God, the Creator of all, preserve for many years our all-holy Lord for the stability of His holy Churches and of the orthodox faith, the good Shepherd, who lay down your own life for your spiritual sheep, and who chase away the ravages of the wolf with your pastoral staff."

At this time Cyprus was a province ecclesiastically independent of the Patriarch of Antioch. The recognition of the Pope's primacy could hardly be stronger. But, when persecution arose, Sergius was on the side of the heretics, not of the martyrs.

* Mansi, x, 709.

Pyrrhus gives up Vigilius. But what of Honorius, who plainly taught one will (p. 740)? Maximus replies that his letter must be interpreted by the writer of it, who was the same as the writer of the apology of John IV, viz., John Symponus. Pyrrhus can only reply: "My predecessor accepted it too simply, considering the wording alone." Maximus answers that what he dislikes about Sergius is his changeableness: "You never know where to have him.": Pyrrhus then renounces the "one operation," and asks pardon for himself and his predecessors, as having failed by ignorance. "Is there no way of saving their memory while rejecting their doctrine?" "There is no other way," Maximus answers, "but to keep silence as to their persons, yet to anathematize the heresy." Pyrrhus laments that so the great synod he had held will be condemned. Maximus replies that it was no synod.*

Pyrrhus: If there is no other way than this, I am ready to place my own salvation before everything else; and to do this with completeness, I only beg that I may in consequence be deemed worthy of [approaching] the apostolic seats, or rather the princes of the apostles themselves, and of seeing the face of the most holy Pope, and of presenting him with a *libellus* with respect to the absurdities which have been committed.

Maximus and Gregory the Patrician said: Since your proposal is good and useful to the Church, so be it.

Thus end the Acts. A contemporary has added the note:

Therefore, when he was with us in this famous city of Rome, he fulfilled his promise, and condemned the dogmas of the impious *ecthesis*, and joined himself to the Catholic Church by a right profession, by the grace and co-operation of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ, to whom be glory for ever and ever, Amen.

---

* "I marvel that you call that a synod which was not held according to synodical laws and canons and ecclesiastical sanctions. For the encyclical epistle did not receive the consent of the Patriarchs, nor were the place and day of meeting fixed, and there was neither introducer nor accuser; those who assembled had no letters of commendation, neither the bishops from their metropolitans, nor the metropolitans from their patriarchs, nor were there letters or representatives sent by the other patriarchs." The synod was thus clearly intended as a kind of general council of the East, no doubt at the Emperor's wish, and bishops not subject to Constantinople were present. Hefele (p. 89) should not have called it Pyrrhus' own "patriarchal synod."

In the following year the Bishops of Africa and the adjoining islands held synods against the Monothelites by the counsel of St Maximus. According to rule they sent their decisions to Rome, and four of their letters are still extant in the Acts of the Lateran Council, at which they were read. The first of these is a joint letter from the primates of Numidia, Byzacene and Mauritania, in the name of three provincial Councils which they had respectively held.

They have heard that the heresy is spreading, and have read the *libellus* which Pyrrhus had presented to the Pope; and in consequence they have decided to send a remonstrance to Paul, the Bishop of Constantinople, beseeching him with tears to remove from his Church and himself the new heresy which Pyrrhus had already rejected, and to have the *ecthesis* taken down from the doors of the churches, where it scandalized the orthodox people of his city. Since the conference of Maximus with Pyrrhus, the patrician

*Their introduction is modelled on the well-known letters of Popes Innocent and Zosimus to the African councils of 417-8. "No one can doubt that there is in the Apostolic See a great and unfailing fountain pouring forth waters for all Christians, whence streams do richly proceed, bountifully irrigating the whole Christian world; to which See also, in honour of B. Peter, the rules of the Fathers have decreed all special reverence in searching out the things of God which ought by all means to be carefully examined, and above all and justly by the Apostolic Head of Bishops, whose care it is of old as well to condemn what is evil as to approve what is laudable. For it is sanctioned by the ancient rules that whatsoever is done, even in remote and distant provinces, shall neither be discussed nor accepted, unless it be first brought to the knowledge of your good See, so that a just sentence may be confirmed by its authority, and that the other Churches may thence receive the original preaching as from its native source, and that the mysteries of the faith of salvation may remain in incorrupt purity throughout the various regions of the world. Wherefore most humbly doing obeisance to your Apostolic Headship, with tears we inform you of that concerning which we cannot be silent without groaning of heart—that some time ago a hateful invention at Constantinople was brought to our notice. If we have been silent until now, it is because we believed that it had been destroyed by the most serene examination of the Apostolic See."

Gregory had revolted and made himself Emperor of Africa. In the next year he was vanquished by the Saracens, and for this reason the Africans were afraid to write directly to Constantinople. They therefore enclose their letters to the Pope.*

In accordance with the desire of these Councils Pope Theodore addressed a letter to Paul of Constantinople, which has not been preserved. The reply of Paul† commences with professions of the love of union, of charity, of humility, of silence. He relates that the papal envoys, after much discussion, at last begged him to write his explanation of the will of Christ, and to send it to the Pope. He therefore exposes his views, which are those of the *ecthesis*. He quotes in his own favour Gregory Nazianzen, Athanasius and Cyril, " with which testimonies Sergius and Honorius of pious memory are in agreement and accord, who adorned respectively the Sees of new and elder Rome." Paul seems to be more settled in his heresy than were Sergius and Pyrrhus. Upon receipt of this letter Pope Theodore pronounced a sentence of deposition against him.

Meanwhile Pyrrhus had returned, as St Martin says, like a dog to his vomit. It may have been in this year, 648,‡ that St Maximus wrote a letter to a high official in the East, called Peter, of which parts have been preserved. In it he denounces the *ecthesis* as worse than the old Monophysite doctrine. Yet he defends Honorius once more:

---

* The enclosures are a letter to the Emperor Constantine and one to the Patriarch Paul. In the latter are many quotations from Ambrose and Augustine. A fourth letter is from Victor of Carthage, who had become bishop after the other letters were written. He therefore adds this letter in his own name, replete with rather fulsome compliments to Pope Theodore.

† Mansi, x, 1020.

‡ We learn from the report handed in to St Martin at the Lateran Council by Bishop Stephen of Dora, that about this time he was appointed by Pope Theodore to be Vicar Apostolic of Palestine, in the absence of an orthodox Patriarch of Jerusalem. Sergius, Bishop of Joppa, had usurped that dignity, after the retirement of the Persians, who had invaded the country; and he had proceeded to consecrate bishops. These intruders agreed to the *ecthesis*, in order to get the support of Paul of Constantinople, who seems to have claimed even to give the necessary confirmation of their election. Stephen received back those of them who presented a petition (*libellus*) of repentance. We gather that the orthodox Bishops of Palestine were at one with Sophronius as to papal authority, and obeyed Stephen.

> In this regard the wretches have not conformed to the sense of the Apostolic See, and, what is laughable, or rather lamentable, as proving their ignorance, they have not hesitated to lie against the Apostolic See itself; but as though they were in its counsel, and as if they had received a decree from it, in the acts they have composed in defence of the impious *ecthesis*, they have claimed the great Honorius on their side.

He appeals to Sophronius, to Arcadius (the late Metropolitan of Cyprus and predecessor of Sergius) and to the Popes:

> What did the divine Honorius do, and after him the aged Severinus, and John who followed him? Yet further, what supplication has the blessed Pope, who now sits, not made? Have not the whole East and West brought their tears, laments, obsecrations, deprecations, both before God in prayer and before men in their letters? *If the Roman See recognizes Pyrrhus to be not only a reprobate but a heretic, it is certainly plain that every one who anathematizes those who have rejected Pyrrhus, anathematizes the See of Rome, that is, he anathematizes the Catholic Church. I need hardly add that he excommunicates himself also, if indeed he is in communion with the Roman See and the Catholic Church of God.* I beseech you, therefore, blessed Lord, to order that no one should speak of Pyrrhus as *sanctissimus* or *almificus*, for the holy canon does not allow him to be so styled. For he who has wilfully separated from the Catholic Church has fallen from all holiness. For it is not right that one who has already been condemned and cast out by the Apostolic See of the city of Rome for his wrong opinions should be named with any kind of honour, until he be received by her, having returned to her, nay, to our Lord, by a pious confession and orthodox faith, by which he can receive holiness and the name of holy. Therefore, if he wishes neither to be a heretic nor to be accounted one, let him not make satisfaction to this or that person, for this is superfluous and unreasonable. For just as all are scandalized at him when one is scandalized, so also, when satisfaction has been made to one, all without doubt are satisfied. Let him hasten before all things to satisfy the Roman See, *for if it is satisfied, all will agree in calling him pious and orthodox.* For he only speaks in vain who thinks he ought to persuade or entrap persons like myself, *and does not satisfy and implore the blessed Pope of*

the most holy Church of the Romans, that is, the Apostolic See, which from the incarnate Son of God Himself, and also by all holy synods, according to the holy canons and definitions, has received universal and supreme dominion, authority and power of binding and loosing over all the holy Churches of God which are in the whole world. For with it the Word who is above the celestial powers binds and looses in heaven also. For if he thinks he must satisfy others, and fails to implore the most blessed Roman Pope, he is acting like a man who, when accused of murder or some other crime, does not hasten to prove his innocence to the judge appointed by law, but only uselessly and without profit does his best to demonstrate his innocence to private individuals, who have no power to acquit him from the accusation. Wherefore, my blessed Lord, extend yet further the precept which it is known that you have made, well and according to God's will, by which Pyrrhus is not allowed to speak or mis-speak with regard to dogma. But discover clearly his intention by further inquiry, whether he will altogether agree to the truth. And if he is careful to do this, exhort him to make a becoming statement to the Roman Pope, so that by his command the matter concerning Pyrrhus may be canonically and suitably ordered for the glory of God and the praise of your sublimity.—Mansi, x, 692.

The doctrine of this passage is explicit enough. We have already seen that Maximus was not the only Constantinopolitan who held it. Indeed, he clearly assumes it to be well-known and admitted by all.

Consequently we can understand that the rejection by the Pope of Paul's confession of faith was felt by him as a serious blow. At first, indeed, the supplanter of Pyrrhus showed nothing but anger, and wreaked his wrath on the Roman *apocrisiarii* who had brought the papal sentence of deposition to the East. He revenged himself by destroying the altar in the chapel which belonged to the Holy See in the palace of Placidia at Constantinople, "in order that the envoys should be unable to offer the immaculate, adorable and spiritual sacrifice, and be partakers of the divine and life-giving sacraments." In reply to their admonition to him to renounce his heresy, "he persecuted them together with other orthodox men and venerable priests, casting some of them into prison, sending others into exile, and subjecting others to stripes." This information we have from the speech of St Martin at the Lateran Council a few months later.*

But Paul did not intend to break with the Holy See and with Catholicity altogether, as we learn from his next move, which was nothing less than the final withdrawal of the *ecthesis*, which his appeal to the name of Pope Honorius had not availed to defend. Up to this time the great objection to the *ecthesis* on the part of the orthodox—of St Sophronius, of St Maximus and especially of successive Popes—had been its assertion of the one will. It had been confidently asserted that the meaning of Honorius in acknowledging one will had been misunderstood and that his secretary was alive to establish his real intention. This point therefore Paul simply withdrew. But the main idea of the *ecthesis* was not so much its half-hearted defence of one will as its prohibition of both the expressions "one operation" and "two operations," and here at least it could not possibly be said to misrepresent the teaching of Honorius. It was indeed logically necessary to apply the same prohibition to "one will" and "two wills," for it was inconsistent to permit "one will" but to forbid "one operation."

Paul therefore persuaded the Emperor Constans to substitute for the *ecthesis* or exposition of faith an imperial decree, approving neither doctrine, but forbidding the naming of one or two wills equally with one or two operations.

> We declare [says the Emperor] to our orthodox subjects that from the present moment they no longer have permission in any way to contend or quarrel with one another over "one will" and "one operation," or "two operations" and "two wills." No one is to add anything to the usages or words of the holy Fathers, but the form of doctrine is to be preserved everywhere as it was before the rise of the said controversies, as though no disputes had arisen, and no blame is to attach to any one of all those who have up till now taught one will and one operation, or two wills and two operations.—Mansi, x, 1029.

For the sake of the union of all, Constans has ordered the *ecthesis* to be removed from the narthex of Sta Sophia, where it was still posted.

---

* Mansi, x, 879.

This document is known to history as the *typus* of Constans. Severe penalties were attached to its contravention:

> Whosoever ventures to transgress the command now given is subject before all to the judgement of God, but he will also be liable to the punishment of the despisers of the imperial commands. If he is a Bishop or cleric, he shall be deposed; if a monk, excommunicated and banished from his monastery; if he is a civil or military official, he shall lose his office and dignity; if he is a private person, he shall, if of the upper class, be mulcted in his property, if lowly, be chastised with corporal correction and permanent exile.

Thus heresy is to go without blame, while the truth is to be forbidden. It was clearly impossible for the Holy See to accept the *typus*. Theodore, John IV, and probably Severinus, had all asserted the two operations and had made the expression a term of communion. But the Patriarch's move was a subtle one. He did not oblige himself to unsay anything that he had said, yet he withdrew, so that he could appear to have some deference to the papal censure. He seemed in effect to say: "I am afraid there is a misunderstanding. These controversies are fruitless; let us be united as we were before they arose." If then the Pope should try to insist on the two operations and wills, the answer was ready: "Your predecessor pointed out that we had misunderstood the words of Pope Honorius about the one will. I am willing to admit this. Hence the Emperor has issued this disciplinary measure, absolutely according to the true mind of Pope Honorius. No man's conscience is bound by it; the Emperor merely follows the papal decision in imposing silence for the sake of peace."

It is certain that at Rome it was well understood that Paul had scored heavily. From this time forward not a word is ever again said in defence of Honorius. Until now even Sergius had not been condemned. Maximus had indeed accused him of shiftiness, but he had lived and died in communion with the Holy See. Honorius had approved his letter, and John IV had called him "Sergius of reverend memory." Now this was all necessarily to be changed. It was not imperative to condemn Honorius at once by name, but Sergius is no longer spared. The *typus* is condemned, and Sergius with it, and by implication Honorius also. The issue of the *typus* falls in the Constantinopolitan year between September, 648, and September, 649. Pope Theodore died May 5, either before he could see the *typus*, or at least before he could take action against it. He was succeeded on July 1 or July 5 by the illustrious saint and martyr, Martin I. The grave state of affairs demanded that Rome should at last give a solemn and final decision. The preceding Popes had indeed supported the orthodox in every part of the world; they had condemned the *ecthesis*, and had deposed its partisans. But no Pope had yet issued a definition to the world, or had given a formal exposition of the true answer to the questions that had arisen. The evil had ever grown, and the new decree of the Emperor, intolerantly enforcing mutual toleration, made a protest unavoidable. We are not surprised to find that St Martin determined to call a Council at Rome at the earliest opportunity. Just three months after his accession he opened in the Lateran Basilica a Council in importance the rival, in authority the equal, of œcumenical synods, and in interest the superior of many of them. A hundred and five bishops were present, chiefly from Italy and its dependencies.

The proceedings were inaugurated by the "chief notary of the Apostolic See," who in a set speech invited the Pope to declare his reasons for "summoning the holy Bishops here assembled and presiding, above whom you shine forth by your great and Apostolic Presidency over the Bishops who are in the whole world."*

St Martin then exposed the Catholic doctrine of two wills and two operations, relating how it had been denied in the "nine propositions" of Cyrus of Alexandria, how these had been approved by Sergius, who afterwards composed the *ecthesis*, fixed it at his church door and deceived Bishops into signing it; how Pyrrhus imitated him, but repented and offered a *libellus* with his signature to the Apostolic See, condemning his own acts and writings; how he went back to his vomit and was justly deposed; finally, how Paul for his letter to the Apostolic See was also deposed. "This last, to cover his error, imitating Sergius in this also, deceived and persuaded the Emperor to publish a *typus* which destroyed the Catholic dogma. For in this *typus* he casts out all expressions of the holy Fathers, together with those of the unspeakable heretics, since he decreed that neither one nor two wills were to be confessed." He had destroyed the altar of the Holy See at Constantinople, and had insulted the papal envoys. St Martin adds that many of the orthodox from various parts of the world had made complaints to the Pope in person or by writing, that by apostolic authority the sickness of the Catholic body might be purged.

---

* Mansi, x, 870.

> Our predecessors have not been wanting both with and without writing at divers times in sending to these aforesaid men with due prudence, both entreating them and canonically rebuking them, and by envoys admonishing them and adjuring them,etc.

And now he has thought it needful to call this Council together for common consultation and decision.

The speech is a fine one. It is remarkable for what it says and for what it leaves unsaid. The *ecthesis* is condemned, and so are Cyrus, Sergius, Pyrrhus, Paul and the *typus*. Sergius is condemned for his letter approving the nine propositions of Cyrus, but the letter to Honorius in which Sergius withdrew the worst part of the other—the letter which Honorius approved—is passed over. The *ecthesis* is represented rather unfairly as implying not merely one will, but even one operation, and as thus going beyond the words of Honorius. But of Honorius himself not a word is said. To defend him would necessitate the acceptance of the *typus*, since its only fault—rightly called heresy—was its prohibition of the orthodox together with the heretical formula, after the example of Honorius.

The Pope betrays his consciousness that he was implicitly condemning one of his predecessors, when he declares that these had repeatedly besought and rebuked the heretics, for he does not give the names of those who had done so: it would have been too striking to mention Severinus, John, Theodore, and omit Honorius. Throughout the Council the same conspiracy of silence on this awkward subject is maintained. None of the documents mention Honorius, none of the speakers breathe his name.

We are manifestly half way between the apology of John IV and the condemnation by Leo II.

The second session commenced with the reading of the memorial of Stephen of Dora. After the Pope had accepted the document with words of sympathy, a deputation of thirty-seven Greek abbots, priests, or monks residing in Rome was introduced. Apparently the irruption of the Saracens had driven them from their own countries. One abbot was from Jerusalem, another from a Greek Laura in Africa; one was an Armenian, another a Cilician. A memorial signed by them all was read, it demanded an anathema on Sergius, Pyrrhus, Paul and Cyrus, the condemnation of the *typus*, and the solemn assertion of two wills and two operations. The words as to the papacy alone concern us here. The petition is addressed to the holy synod "assembled according to the holy command and request of him who by divine choice is the president and exarch of you all, the Bishop of bishops and Father of fathers, our Lord Martin, the thrice blessed Pope." For the confession of the faith they have of necessity appealed, together with every province and city to the apostolic and head See against the heretics; they implore the fathers of the synod, that is, the apostolic and head See, not to despise the prayers of all Christians. They ask that the *typus* may be anathematized as the work of Paul, "who has already been deposed by your Holiness's predecessor, Theodore."

The letters of the African Councils above mentioned were also read.* In the third session, October 17, were read passages from a letter of Theodore of Pharan, the seventh proposition of Cyrus, the letter of Sergius to Cyrus (but not his milder letter to Honorius); all these were disapproved. Next came the *ecthesis*, some excerpts from synods held by Sergius and Pyrrhus, and the approval of the *ecthesis* by Cyrus, which was considered particularly damning. The Pope remarks that Sergius and Pyrrhus were disappointed, "for the *ecthesis* [exposition] of their impious and presumptuous novelty was not accepted or acknowledged by any means according to their vain expectation, but was rather anathematized and condemned by apostolic authority."

---

* On the letter of Victor of Carthage the Pope observed that the Bishop had shown his zeal and also his humility, "since he most properly does not consider Paul to be excommunicate, but calls him fellow-Bishop until he shall learn the judgement about this matter of our Apostolic authority, or, which is the same thing, of Peter the Prince of the Apostles, since he alone was deemed worthy to be entrusted and to receive from the King of kings, Christ our Lord, the keys of the kingdom of heaven, to open

The fourth session contains a long speech by St Martin, in which he shows the heretical nature of the documents already read. Some of his strong language against the *ecthesis* applies, as he surely was aware, just as well to the letter of Honorius (p. 1012). Afterwards the letter of Paul to Pope Theodore is read. The appeal by Paul in this letter to Sergius and Honorius, quoted above, is the only occasion on which that Pope's name was pronounced in the Council. The Bishop of Cagliari pointed out that Paul had been admonished by preceding Popes in writing and by messengers and asked for the *typus* to be read.

The synod on hearing it declared that its contents are not consonant with its good intention (this was to spare the emperor while condemning Paul); it is good to cut short altercations and discussions, but not to destroy the good with the bad; the heretics had begun by declaring one will and one operation (Cyrus), then they changed and said neither one nor two operations (Sergius), now they go further and say neither one nor two wills (Paul), and there is no knowing what they hold; against this the truth of two operations and two wills must be asserted. Again not a word of Honorius, though the whole story had depended on his declaration. The symbols of Nicæa and Constantinople and the decisions of the Third, Fourth and Fifth Councils were read. Then Maximus of Aquileia

---

it justly for those who believe orthodoxly in the Lord Himself, or to shut it to all heretics who remain in their heresy."—Mansi, x, 950.

sums up the condemnation of Cyrus, Sergius, Pyrrhus and Paul.

In the fifth session (October 31) a quantity of excerpts from the Fathers were read, teaching two wills and two operations, and after these a series of excerpts from older heretics, teaching one will and one operation. After the former series, the council points out the fallacy of the appeal of the Monothelite leaders to the Fathers; after the second series St Martin shows the parallel between the teaching of the modern heretics with that of the older heresiarchs. After several long speeches comes a resolution and a set of twenty canons. The eighteenth of these condemns Theodore of Pharan, Cyrus of Alexandria, Sergius of Constantinople and his successors Pyrrhus and Paul, also the *ecthesis* of Heraclius and the *typus* of Constans.

The signatures of the Pope and all the bishops follow. A letter to the Emperor was also signed by all.* The encyclical letter sent with the Acts throughout Christendom is addressed by St Martin and his council to "all our spiritual brethren, bishops, priests, deacons, abbots of monasteries, monks, ascetics, and to the entire sacred fullness of the Catholic Church." Thus at last was an infallible decision of Rome on the subject published to the world.†

---

* Mansi, x, 789.

† The Pope wished to get Frankish bishops deputed by synods to accompany the papal envoy to Constantinople. He wrote to St Amand of Tongres on the subject, with regard to the Austrasian kingdom. The Neustrian deputies were to have been St Eloi and St Ouen of Rouen, but they were prevented from coming.

(*To be concluded.*)

JOHN CHAPMAN, O.S.B.

DENOMINATIONALISM & the EDUCATION BILL

THERE is a deep prejudice in the public mind against denominationalism as a principle of national education; it is regarded as a principle inherently reactionary, as something for which a man has to be apologetic but for which no intelligent man would offer an *apologia*. The advocacy of this principle—belief in its national efficacy—is supposed to argue a lack of that liberality of outlook which is characteristic of the best educated minds.

This accusation is in some sort the revenge of the freethinker of the twentieth century. Denominationalism, even though the denomination in question was the Church Catholic and Universal, was in the Middle Ages exclusive—fiercely exclusive. And now the tables are turned: it is no longer the freethinker who is excluded from the pale of an intellectual civilization of which the Church is the mistress. The denominations, and above all the Church, are in a sense excluded from the pale of an intellectual civilization whose principle is Liberalism.

Twenty years ago there was a popular "extravaganza" played, first in Italy, and subsequently in Paris and London, called *Excelsior*. In various circumstances, and on various occasions in history, the "Spirit of Progress and Liberty" was represented as in deadly conflict with the "Spirit of Darkness," which personified the superstitions of medievalism. One may almost say that denominationalism is now regarded by the typical well-educated man as one of the aspects in which this so-called "Spirit of Darkness" still threatens to return to us. In attempting to say a few words on behalf of this much-maligned spirit, one can only hope to gain a hearing by first consigning to the flames prepared for denominationalism by the modern Liberal Inquisition two attendant sprites which pertinaciously bear it company —namely, provincialism and sectarianism. When denominationalism is freed from their influence, we think that spirit has a good deal to say for itself.

We would maintain then that the Liberal philosophy which spurns denominationalism is not practical or true to human nature; that, even apart from the claims of the Church, religious denominationalism is natural to man and inevitable; that its excesses indeed should be curbed, but that really to uproot it would be to kill religion, because it would destroy the normal conditions of its life as human nature now is. To a large degree this is true in fields other than that of religion. The sphere of human activity is so far wider than the sphere of absolutely proven knowledge, that men naturally have a number of habitual working hypotheses not so proven in social and political life, and even in economical and philosophical speculation. These working hypotheses are largely inherited or instilled in the course of education, and are further determined by each man's temperament and the circumstances of his life. Men of similar views or prepossessions form political parties, social propagandas or schools in philosophy. The party or school has its disciples and becomes hereditary; and the wave of corporate conviction strengthens and deepens the belief of individual members.

But the principle in question especially applies to religion. Such knowledge of the unseen world as is proven to the satisfaction of all is necessarily very limited. Yet the whole sphere of conduct depends for most of us very largely on our religious convictions. Consequently, one who lives a life of action, and does not artificially seclude himself, will naturally have a whole apparatus of convictions on religion—the more earnest in proportion as he is more religious—which are in the first instance inherited, or are due to his surroundings or to his education. In a Catholic country, indeed, the Church supplies these convictions and instils them early. But elsewhere men fall into groups from similarity of antecedents, or of external influences, or of mental and moral temperament.

Thus the full, living, breathing, acting man is almost inevitably a denominational animal. The intensity of a man's religious convictions and their influence on his action are in most cases inseparably bound up with the definite form of his creed. To destroy or weaken parts of it, which to others may seem superfluous, is often to imperil the life of the whole. And in religion still more than in politics or philosophy the tenets of the denomination to which he belongs act as a kind of social authority, supporting his own line of thought and action. His own personal belief is reinforced by the sympathy, the *esprit de corps*, of those who share it.

To live and act is indeed inevitably to take sides. We can no more in our religion identify ourselves with all denominations than in our political sympathies with all nations. A merely cosmopolitan education is rightly held to miss imparting just those qualities which give the highest culture in any one nationality, just as a man who writes ten languages will be a master of style in none. The perfection of taste and knowledge will only come with a more complete surrender to the culture of one nation than is compatible with an impartial cosmopolitanism. The width of experience which cosmopolitanism implies is in itself most valuable, but it is not to be desired at such a cost. Moreover, it is gained more naturally and more advantageously by one who has first acquired the tastes and culture proper to his own land. We remember Tennyson's line:

> That man's the best cosmopolite who loves his native country best.

That is to say, the fixed standpoint and fixed line of orientation, which belong to a thorough lover of his country, make him a man strong and deep in life and affections, capable of assimilating a width of culture and profiting by a wide experience which would be incoherent or overwhelming for one who had no such source of strength.

The same principle is still more true of what is analogous to cosmopolitanism in religion. If a boy's religion is to hold and influence him and make him eventually a strong man, it must be definite, perhaps must even have something in its exclusive dominion over him which in a man would be called bigotry. Tennyson used to say, "We must choose between bigotry and flabbiness." The practical alternative in early youth to a certain narrowness of view is a want of depth and strength. It is just this strength of religion and its depth as a principle of action which it is so important to instil early. Greater width of view and the comprehension of different standpoints may be gained later by those who are fitted to think on such subjects. Introduced earlier they may kill religion as a principle of action.

That the denominational principle, which is good, should in its early stages introduce something of the sectarian spirit, which is bad, is then, in some degree at least, an unfortunate necessity. A loyal boy or girl will weigh neither its parents nor its religion in an impartial balance. Children will often be unjust to the enemies of either. But the alternative is worse, for in practice it would mean being without trust in father or mother or God. If bigotry of one kind or another is the danger attending on denominationalism, flabbiness of religious conviction is the mean and unworthy sprite which attends on the gaudy-coloured and pretentious spirit of progressive latitudinarianism. Even a grown man, who does not on the whole, and in practice, take sides, who contemplates all views of religious truth and identifies himself with none, and embodies none in life and action, is inevitably, in the poet's unpoetical phrase, "flabby."

It would be idle, however, to ignore the dangers of provincialism and sectarianism; but we maintain that they are fatal to educational interests only if they survive in the later stages of mental training.

So far as we confine our interests to the concerns of our own denomination, or judge of the world at large without real understanding of the varieties of human nature, and from the limited standpoint of our own religious coterie, so far we are guilty of provincialism.

And sectarianism is a somewhat similar fault, though, as the word is popularly used, it conveys primarily the animosity and the unfairness characteristic of a sect. Sectarianism is the moral fault resulting from the intellectual perversities of provincialism. To be sectarian means to love combat with other denominations; to love to dwell on points of difference rather than on points of agreement; to be intent rather on victory over these rivals in struggles sometimes paltry than on the larger aims in which they are often our allies; to be unfair in controversy, fastening only on the weak points of our opponents and ignoring our own. Rancour and want of charity are its characteristics. It sees truth only in its own shibboleths; it attacks, and would if possible destroy, all that do not subscribe to them.

The real question is—what is the true remedy for the narrowness of provincialism and sectarianism? The remedy now popular is a neutral standpoint, which abruptly truncates human nature, and strips it of that religious inheritance which is part of its very life. We maintain, on the contrary, that such a remedy is negative and destructive; it burns the wheat with the tares. The true remedy lies in width of knowledge and variety of experience; and these are quite compatible with the fixed line of orientation which it is natural to all men to have, and which involves a general adherence to a religious party or denomination. Just as cosmopolitanism is the cure for provincialism, but not a substitute for patriotism, so wide knowledge and experience are the cure for sectarianism, but not a substitute for loyal adherence to a man's own creed.

In the choice between "bigotry and flabbiness," an element of narrowness, which may amount, when judged from a higher standpoint, to bigotry, must be admitted in early education, just as we teach children history by pictures and depict its characters for them in broad colours which will not satisfy the requirements of the best historical criticism. Greater breadth of view and accuracy must come later. And even in early youth religious narrowness is not best reduced to a minimum by the employment of teachers whose standpoint is neutral, but by the influence of really educated teachers, who profess the same religion as their pupils, and whose own culture has given them width of mind.

We go so far then as to maintain that the lessons of a teacher who unites real learning and width of view with the fixed standpoint attaching to religious conviction is the *best* cure for the defects of provincialism and sectarianism: that is to say, a good denominational education is the best cure for the very defects of which denominationalism is popularly regarded as the cause. A neutral treatment leaves alone more or less completely those convictions in the children which form the basis of the denomination. This will in some cases foster the elements of sheer prejudice which accompany their convictions; for it leaves them untouched, and therefore uncorrected. In other cases it will tend to make the convictions themselves die of inanition.

A mind too early formed by the general literature of a non-Christian civilization either keeps two water-tight compartments having no connection with each other, one well-educated but excluding religious interests, the other with its religious beliefs in a crude and childlike form, or else loses the religious equipment altogether. General culture, literary, historical or scientific, may broaden the mind in secular subjects; but if we are to extend the breadth of mind to religious thought itself, we need some synthesis between religion and the secular knowledge of the present day.

The battle raging round the Education Bill has brought out one interesting fact, namely, that the recognition of the importance of denominational education is far more widespread in the Established Church now than it was when the Board School system was introduced in 1870. The influential party among Anglicans, whose views have been so brilliantly set forth by Mr Wyndham in the House of Commons, have shown themselves to be uncompromising advocates of the denominational principle. The differences separating Anglicans from ourselves as well as from each other are so wide that it would not be logically or historically exact to speak as though we were, strictly speaking, allies in the struggle. None the less we hold it of great importance that Catholics should show their concern for the general interests of Christian education in the country. The Bill violates great principles and attacks the most earnest Christianity which exists in England. Such an assault we should be foremost in resisting, even when it wrongs others than ourselves. Two main principles attacked are: (1) that in a country where the inhabitants belong to different religious denominations the State should give every facility for a child to be brought up in the creed of its parents; (2) that the most earnest religion is necessarily, as we have maintained above, denominational.

The old way of talking of "our common Christianity," as if it could suffice for a religion, involved a profound fallacy. Our common Christianity doubtless has an existence on paper. Many members of different denominations believe in common in Christ, in the Incarnation and in the divine authority of the Bible. But such a common denominator of belief can as easily form a religion to be practically taught to all as the logician's ideal abstract man—man universal—can be really identical with a number of actual living and breathing men. The abstract man has eyes, ears and nose, but of no determinate colour or size or shape. In the concrete each of those features must be determinate; and they are, as a matter of fact, different.

The denominational principle is, moreover, in a large measure that for which Catholics have fought and suffered for 300 years. The Reformers inaugurated a criticism on the elaborate structure of the Catholic Church and dogmatic theology which had gradually been developed; they appealed to the simple forms of earlier days and to the simple Word of God as it is given in the Bible. The Catholics, on the other hand, maintained that the Church which had thus grown and developed was the providential means of preserving the identical Christian teaching—contained, for the most part, in the Bible, but not adequately preserved by it—which had existed from the first; that its *formulæ* and organization and its definition of the principle of authority were the outcome of its unflinching defence of the Christian revelation in the past; that to sacrifice them and to admit in their place private judgement, which draws from the Bible what creed it can, would be the first step in that process of rationalistic criticism of religion which would pull down the defences which had been erected, and would gradually emasculate and finally destroy Christianity. This Protestant principle is precisely that of "undenominationalism"; and thus we may well join hands with the advocates of denominationalism who oppose it with dogma and authority, even in cases where Catholics must count the authority and the dogmatic superstructure defective and erroneous.

The denominational system being then, as we have said, a partial application of the principle for which Catholics have fought for years, it was no less fitting than it was inspiring to see the representatives of Catholic Ireland in the House of Commons coming forward as a united phalanx in opposing the Second Reading of a Bill aimed at its destruction. While duty demanded this course, the performance of duty had here something of the heroic in it. If the Catholic schools are saved for England, it will be largely owing to the loyalty of the Irish, who did what was once more often done in the House of Commons than it is at present—placed principle and religion above mere party considerations.

II

DESCRIPTIVE criticism of the Education Bill, which passed in the House of Commons its First Reading on April 9 and its Second Reading on May 10, would be out of place in these pages, which are "sober," if only because the date on which they appear requires that they contain not first impressions but afterthoughts.

The principle of the Bill is precisely the opposite to that of denominationalism as described above. It requires men to discard, as certainly superfluous and probably superstitious, whatever is not held in common by all Christians. If it were established universally, it would deprive Catholic children of just those distinctive dogmas upon which—it is a fact in the common experience of parents as well as of priests—children base their lives from the age of reason. Catholics are no less ready than any one of the divisions of Protestants to recognize the importance of that minimum of religious truth which all Christians hold in common; but to ask them to adopt this minimum and not to go beyond it for purposes of popular education is to ask Catholics to become Protestants. Indeed the very basis of undenominationalism, private interpretation of the Bible, is the cardinal principle of Protestantism. It is not as though the points of difference between Catholics and Protestants were, as such, more important than points of agreement, but that Catholic dogma is an organic whole. Ever developing and yet for ever the same as the original *depositum fidei*, it is a whole from which nothing can be taken, even for a time or for a specific purpose, without depriving it both of its value as truth and of its efficacy as inspiration and motive.

An attempt has been made by some writers to show that the artificial religion which has been developed under the famous restrictions of the "Cowper-Temple" Clause in the Education Act of 1870* would be more accurately described as "co-denominational" than as "undenominational." Even if it were true, as this contention implies, that such religious instruction includes, or may include, a number of dogmas held equally by a number of sects, there would remain one sovereign exception to its co-denominational character. The religious teaching given under these restrictions is not recognizable by Catholics as something which can include Catholicism. There may be a common Christianity, but there is no such thing in the English-speaking world as a common Catholicism; undenominational religion may not be Protestantism in any one of its regular forms, but it is, as we have said, Protestant in principle and in effect. Whatever be the nature of this religion according to public syllabus, whether it be a compromise between conflicting views of truth or a residuum about which there ought to be no dispute, Catholics can have none of it.

It is perhaps to be regretted that English Catholics should so far have taken so little part in the protests which have been made against the injustice of endowing out of public funds a form of religious instruction acceptable only to one group of Protestants. As citizens it is surely their right and their duty to pronounce upon this central principle of the Bill, while, as Catholics, their immediate business may be only to denounce as inadequate the special arrangements made in their favour. The support which the Irish party gave in the House of Commons to the amendment to the first Clause, moved by Mr Chamberlain, set an example which might with advantage have been more generally followed during the agitation. The amendment, which was defeated by a large majority on May 28, was designed to deprive undenominational religion of the special privilege which it has enjoyed since 1870 and to prevent the extension of that privilege which is proposed in the Bill of 1906. The votes of the Irish Nationalists were given not on behalf of the Catholic claim, still less in order to embarrass a Government which it is obviously to their interest to support whenever possible, but in defence of a financial and social principle no less dear to Catholics than to other people. The "fundamental injustice" of the Act of 1870, against which Cardinal Manning made his annual protest, would have been removed if the amendment had been carried, though Catholics would have derived no direct advantage from its removal.

---

* "§ 14 (2) No religious catechism or religious formulary which is distinctive of any particular denomination shall be taught in the school."

But there is another reason why Catholics, as such, should concern themselves with the special privilege the Bill proposes to confer on the undenominational instruction which it is now the fashion to describe as "simple Bible teaching." If the Bill passes in its present form, there will be some two hundred and forty-three Catholic schools in which such instruction may be given at the option of the local authority on three days in the week at the public expense, while Catholic teaching will be confined to two days in the week, will have to be undertaken by the priest or by any volunteer, not a regular member of the school staff, to whom the priest may entrust the task, and must be paid for out of Catholic funds. There is surely sufficient reason to protest against a form of religious teaching which, under the Bill as it now stands, would be imposed upon at least twenty-three per cent of the Catholic shools, and would deprive them of their Catholic character. For it is obvious that three undenominational lessons in each week, lessons which no Catholic teacher would willingly undertake, must very soon exhaust the atmosphere of those elements which make it Catholic. Looking at the statistics published by the Board of Education* from the point of view of the Catholic parent and the Catholic child, it appears that under the present provisions of the Bill (Clause 4) there would be schools containing no less than 23,400 children deprived of Catholic atmosphere. Children in these schools would be forced to rely for their knowledge of Catholic truth upon the efforts of volunteers allowed to instruct them for one hour per week and that at the charges of priest and people. The faith of one child is rightly held to be a matter of importance by those who are accustomed and required to consider the education of the people *sub specie æternitatis.* The danger threatening the faith of some 23,000 children (for the statistics are based on average attendance during the year before last) affords sufficient ground for Catholics to join with other denominations, whose plight will be even worse than their own, in a protest which would be all the more effective if it were unanimous.

---

* See the "Statement showing the number of Voluntary Schools on January 1, 1906, in urban areas with a population of 5,000 and over, and

The Bill, apart from the religious principle of undenominationalism which it continues and extends, is an attempt to translate into the language of legislation two catchwords which the Liberal Government has interpreted as a mandate from the country. One of these catchwords is that popular control must follow public money. The application made of this principle in the Bill seems to Catholics much too sweeping, though to popular control over secular instruc-

---

their average attendance for the statistical year ended July 31, 1904, with approximate percentages to the total number and average attendance of all the Voluntary Schools in England and Wales for the same period," issued by the Board of Education, and sold for one halfpenny (Cd. 2947). The figures relating to Catholic schools in England and Wales together are as follows:

Total No. of Schools	Average Attendance	Urban Areas with 5,000 population and over			
		No. of Schools	Average Attendance	Percentage of Total No. of Schools	Percentage of Total Average Attendance
1,062	280,695	819	257,295	77·1	91·7

The percentages of schools in urban areas of 5,000 population given for other denominations are as follows: Jewish, 100; Wesleyan, 52; Church of England, 25·6; "Others," 39.

tion they have no sort of objection. It is obvious that in a measure which throws upon the denomination the cost of the religious instruction which it prefers, there would be good ground for exempting from popular control this part of the curriculum. The principle that public control should follow public money cannot fairly apply under the provisions of the Bill to the "extended facilities for religious instruction of some special character."

The principle that all schools should be under public control is expressed in Clause 1 of the Bill, which provides that "on and after January 1, 1908, a school shall not be recognized as a Public Elementary School unless it is a school provided by the local authority." There is, it will be observed, no apparent reference in this clause to the religious difficulty. But when it is read in connexion with the subsequent clauses, it becomes obvious that public control is to be entirely without restrictions and is to extend even to religious instruction. It is doubtful whether a clause which of itself abolishes the dual system of schools to which Catholics are naturally attached, and, when read in connexion with the Bill as a whole, extends popular control to the domain of religion in school life, be not so objectionable as to require Catholics to oppose the Third Reading, whatever concessions may be made in their favour in other parts of the Bill. Such concessions might, it is true, make the system to be established by the Bill tolerable to Catholics, but while Clause 1 stands nothing could, in our opinion, make it actually acceptable to them.

The difficulty could not be solved by merely exempting in set terms the teaching of religion from the control of the local authority; for religious teaching depends upon the religious teacher. And here English Catholics necessarily find themselves in opposition to the second of the two catchwords. The abolition of religious tests for teachers strikes at the root of religious education. The word "test" is thought by some people who are afraid of words to be misleading. They argue that in the interests of the denominational schools there is required, not a "test," but "an effective guarantee of the teacher's personal conviction of the truth of what he teaches." But this means that somehow or other the teacher's religious belief must be tested; and if that be not a test, what is? Eschewing all such ingenious and disingenuous attempts to accept the principle that there should be no religious tests for teachers, while claiming under another name what only tests can secure, should we not boldly say that to the abolition of tests for teachers Catholics are and must be opposed?

For it is important that those who undertake the defence of denominationalism in popular education should think clearly and speak plainly about this matter. The want of clear thought on the point has been illustrated by Mr Chamberlain's unfortunate statement in the House of Commons that "there is no more reason for extracting a profession of faith from a teacher than from any other civil servant." There is no other class of civil servant required in the course of his duties to teach religion.

The special provisions designed to meet the Catholic claim seek to do so by the illogical process of walking round the difficulty. An arbitrary separation is made between the secular and the religious aspects of the teacher's work. He is to be paid for the secular part of his work, in which of course his religious influence will be operative almost to the same degree, by the local authority which appoints and employs him; for the specially religious part of his work he is to be paid out of Catholic funds and presumably by the trustees of the Catholic school, who are to receive rent for it from the local authority.

Lest it should appear that the State after abolishing tests required the local authority to appoint only teachers capable of making the extended facilities a reality, the Bill merely permits local authorities to permit the regular teachers to give the religious instruction for which the Clause elaborately provides, but which *must* be given by the regular teachers if it is to be of advantage to anyone. Thus the State shifts from itself to the local authority the criminal responsibility of ascertaining, so far as may be possible under the seventh Clause of the Bill, whether a teacher is or is not a Catholic before he is appointed to teach in a Catholic school.*

It must be acknowledged frankly that we cannot accept anything short of an absolute guarantee that the teachers in Catholic schools shall be themselves Catholics. Religious instruction must be given by the regular teachers or not at all. Will this "permissive" arrangement be satisfactory? Can we trust local authorities to appoint only Catholics and "practising Catholics" to those schools which establish their right to the extended facilities? It is true that there would be very few non-Catholic teachers who would seek employment in these schools, and that, unless the supply of trained Catholic teachers falls off considerably (as indeed, in view of the Bill, it well may), there will be enough good teachers available for any appointments that may become vacant in our schools. On the other hand, there is always a danger with the small local authority lest the patronage be used for private ends. The disappointed friend of a member of the Committee, having failed of promotion elsewhere, may set his heart upon being head teacher of the Catholic school, or the promising relative of the Road Surveyor may desire quick preferment. The salary would of course be according to the scale which obtains in the area of the authority. Indeed, there will be no disadvantages about the position except to those who are sensitive and dislike feeling like a square post forced into a round hole.

When such considerations are put before men who support the Bill through thick and thin, they are accustomed to reply that these dangers are imaginary. Experience has a different tale to tell; and "experience teaches even"—Catholics. In particular, so long as the appointment of teachers remains solely in the discretion of local authorities, there will be a danger lest the best teachers be excluded simply because they have taken vows and wear a religious habit. This is a "religious test" of the most antiquated and intolerant variety; yet it is not unknown in England even now. Discrimination between lay teachers and religious has been exercised hitherto only by refusal to pay religious on the same scale as others;* under the Bill there may be substituted for such unfair discrimination a direct refusal to appoint religious at all. It is noticeable that the section which protects teachers from tests would not protect nuns from disabilities based on religious antipathy. An amendment to Clause 7 (2) providing that religious vows and the habit shall be no bar to appointment should be pressed upon the Government. This is not a matter which can be left with safety to the collective wisdom of local authorities. Competent judges have often declared that primary education is raised, as it were, to a higher power wherever nuns are employed; for they alone among teachers have the power of refining as well as training children.

---

* Where extended facilities are so afforded, the local education authority may also, if they think fit, permit the teachers employed in the school to give the instruction desired, but not at the expense of the authority. See Clause 4 (1).

Another danger is dimissed as imaginary by the supporters of the Bill. They cannot conceive a local authority which would deliberately select a troublesome or disloyal Catholic, which would allow itself to be deceived by an impostor, or would refuse to discriminate between a lapsed and a practising Catholic. Yet if a teacher is not to be "required as a condition of his appointment to subscribe to any religious creed, or to attend or abstain from attending any place of religious worship" [7 (2)], it will be quite impossible for a local authority, even with the best intentions, to satisfy itself that a candidate is not one of those strange Catholics who are always quarrelling with their parish priest, or an impostor posing for the moment as a Catholic, or a Catholic lapsed from practice of the faith.

Into such difficulties does the abolition of religious tests for teachers lead us. There is one obvious way out of them, to make it obligatory, notwithstanding the clause which practically forbids inquiry as to the teacher's religious belief, to appoint Catholic teachers to schools which have acquired "extended facilities" for Catholic teaching. Though this would be in absolute contradiction to one of the principles of the Bill, an amendment to this effect might be accepted by the Government under pressure. But, failing such amendment, there are other less satisfactory methods of obtaining something like security for Catholic teachers.

---

* In the West Riding and elsewhere.

Mr Dillon has handed in an amendment to Clause 4, which would substitute the following words for the paragraph we have quoted (words now in the Clause are printed in italics):

> In any school *where extended facilities are so afforded* the parents of the children attending the school may elect, pursuant to regulations to be made under this Act, four persons who shall be known as the parents' committee, and no teacher shall be appointed to such school without the concurrence of the parents' committee; and *the local authority may also*, *if they think fit*, *permit the teachers employed in the school to give the instruction desired*, *but not at the expense of the authority.*

It is difficult to understand why the local authorities should be left thus with a veto which would enable them to render the "extended facilities" nugatory by refusing permission to the teachers to give religious instruction. Even as the Clause now stands, it is sufficiently absurd that the local authority should have power after granting "extended facilities," the value of which depends absolutely on the regular teachers giving Catholic instruction every day, to forbid the teachers to put their services at the disposal of the trustees. But there is for this some shadow of a reason under the arrangement by which the appointment of teachers is left entirely in the hands of the local authority. Mr Dillon's amendment would take from the authority the absolute power to appoint, but leave it with absolute power to refuse this permission.

Nor does "concurrence" seem quite an adequate word; it may mean almost anything. The proposal for a "parents' committee" is admirable, for practical as well as for theoretical reasons. Catholic parents take a deep interest in the schools, and are capable of undertaking responsibility for them; and such committees would be a recognition of the "parental right" which it had occurred to no one to deny until on December 20, 1905, the "National Council of Evangelical Free Churches" issued an encyclical (with anathemas) against it. The concurrence of parents in the appointment of teachers, if it is to be of any use, must be either (1) a veto to be exercised only on religious grounds against teachers proposed for their acceptance by the authority, or (2) a power of nomination.

Under the first arrangement (the religious veto) the authority would have to go on proposing teachers until they happened on one who was a good Catholic. In spite of all the abolition of tests they would have no difficulty in finding one, though in theory they would have asked no one any questions about the candidate's faith. In most cases the first teacher proposed by the authority would be quite acceptable to the parents' committee, for there is a pretty general desire to save trouble, and to propose a Protestant or a lapsed Catholic would mean delays.

But a further amendment to the Bill would be most desirable in order that local authorities well disposed towards denominational schools might be able to give practical effect to their good intentions in the "four-fifths" schools. Clause 36, one of the "miscellaneous amendments," carries out the threat made in April in a memorandum on the Registration of Teachers and the Abolition of the Register issued by the Board of Education. The Clause provides that

> Any obligation to frame, form or keep a register of teachers under paragraph (*a*) of section four of the Board of Education Act, 1899, shall cease.

The section thus repealed required the Board to frame and keep a register of teachers which should contain the names of the registered teachers arranged alphabetically and, opposite each name, a brief record of the teacher's training, qualifications and service to date.

Into the reasons, or rather the motives, which have led the Government to abolish the existing Register we need not enter. It is well known that the Register was divided into two columns, one for elementary and the other for secondary teachers; that at first some secondary teachers objected to being herded with the humbler brethren of the craft, who, if they had more technical skill, had not in general the advantage of training and a degree in one of the older universities; that an exceedingly bitter feeling against the Register has gradually been aroused among the elementary teachers, who have denounced, with eventual success, the sanction given by a public document to a distinction which they regard as merely social in origin and as unfair in its operation to themselves. These are sufficient grounds for the reform, but not we think for the abolition of the Register. The number of secondary teachers who disapprove of the separation of two branches of a great profession struggling towards unity increases steadily. As we write, there goes from the Conference of Catholic Colleges a petition to the Minister of Education stating definitely that Catholic secondary teachers have no sort of objection to being included in the same Register with elementary teachers.

The importance of the Register, so far as elementary teachers are concerned, is heightened by the provisions in the Bill as to extended facilities. At present there is no guidance for local authorities in their choice of teachers. A Register containing, in strict accordance with the Act of 1899, a brief record of training and experience against the names of all teachers registered, would furnish guidance not only as to their merits as teachers but also as to their denominational connexions. The Catholic teacher would be recognized by the names of the College in which he was trained and of the schools in which he had served. Mr Birrell has argued that there can be no purpose served by transferring to the Register from the lists kept at the Board of Education the 85,000 names of elementary teachers. But it is of the essence of a Register that it should be accessible to the public, and that a body of governors or a local authority should be able not only to verify from it the qualifications of candidates for appointment who answer their advertisements, but also to search in it for a teacher with the qualifications and with the denominational connexions which would fit him for appointment to a given school. At present the only use of the lists kept at Whitehall is that they enable the Board to answer any inquiries as to particular teachers which may be addressed to them. In a Register framed in accordance with the Act of 1899 local authorities would be able to find the kind of teacher they want. And if it be said that this would be only to reintroduce a religious test in another form, we would answer that the value of "extended facilities" is literally *nil* without a guarantee as to the teacher's faith; and that *naturam expellas furca, tamen usque recurret*—which may be translated, "You may expel nature with a pitchfork, but you cannot with that clumsy weapon prevent its recurrence."

The other method, that of nomination to the authority, has been recommended at length in the House of Commons and has one very great advantage. It would mean that nuns would be nearly always nominated by the parents' committee for appointment in those schools which they now manage. And if the amendment to Clause 7 (2), providing that religious vows and the habit should be no bar to appointment, were passed, the calamity of their removal from schools which they have taught and in many cases founded would be averted.

The objection which will have to be met by the advocates of this method of nomination to the local authority is that a parents' committee of this kind would be no judge of the educational qualifications of candidates. The preliminary business of advertizing and then verifying the certificate, training and previous service of candidates for the appointment must be left to the local authority, which is accustomed to dealing with such technical points.

But no amendment will be satisfactory which does not delete the objectionable words which leave it open to the authority to make the "extended facilities" utterly useless. There should be substituted for them the words: "The local authority shall require such teachers to give the instruction desired, but not at the expense of the authority."

It will be a better policy to secure the appointment of Catholic teachers in 819 of our schools than to secure "extended facilities" in all the existing 1,062 schools with nothing more than a probability that Catholic teachers will as a rule be appointed to them by those local authorities upon which "men of good-will" have a majority. But this guarantee as to teachers once secured, we should press for an extension of the provisions of Clause 4 to any school, wherever it may be situated. It is notorious that the object of restricting those provisions to schools in urban areas with a population of 5,000 was simply to exclude from them all the Anglican schools in what are called single school areas. There must be some principle in a provision of this kind, unless it is to go down to posterity as a piece of merely vindictive legislation.

And, after all, the principle that schools must be homogeneous in religious belief in order to qualify for a denominational character is a sound principle. There is no sense in restricting its operation to urban areas, as though religious faith were something less genuine in the country, or to towns of 5,000 inhabitants, as though faith had rights only in a crowd.

A good example of the absurdity involved by the present restrictions in Clause 4 is furnished by Arundel in Sussex, where the population, some 3,000, is pretty evenly divided between Catholics and Anglicans. Each half of the town has its own school, and each would come under the rule that four-fifths of the parents of children in attendance must be agreed in desiring "religious instruction of some special character." Yet the extended facilities would have to be withheld in each case, because the town falls short in population of the arbitrary standard of 5,000.

There should be no restrictions imposed by this Clause except that four-fifths (or some such lower percentage as 70 per cent.)* of the parents should demand Catholic, Anglican, Wesleyan or Jewish instruction, as the case may be. The special case of "single area schools" is already met in the Clause itself by the requirement that there must be accommodation in other schools for the minority of children whose parents do not like the denominational plan.

But it will be remembered that Clause 4 opens with the words, "a local education authority *may* afford extended facilities for religious instruction of some special character." None of the amendments which have been discussed above will satisfy the denominational claim unless the clause is made mandatory, unless the word "shall" is substituted for the word "may." It is worth noting, as an indication of the feeling of the House of Commons, that no less than eighteen members* have handed in amendments to this effect, and, as an indication of the attitude of the National Union of Teachers, that Dr Macnamara is of their number. The Minister of Education, in his speech on the First Reading, assured the denominational minorities that they might safely trust "the generosity, equitableness and fair-mindedness" of local authorities. But an assurance of this kind is valueless, for bitter experience has taught us that anti-Catholic bigotry is not unlikely to find representation on these constantly changing bodies. There is at present no obligation upon local authorities to grant extended facilities. Catholics and other believers in denominational education can be satisfied with nothing less than a statutory obligation upon local authorities to give effect to the good intentions embodied in the Clause. The Government must acquire the courage of its convictions.

---

* As suggested in the amendment to Clause 4 standing in the name of Mr Hart-Davies.

Then there is the fifth Clause, which deals with schools which may be built after the Act comes into force and with the few existing voluntary schools which get no Government grant. The Clause runs:

> If the local authority at any time take over an elementary school not being a public elementary school and conduct it as a public elementary school, the foregoing provisions with respect to facilities, including extended facilities, shall apply to that school in the same manner as they apply to a transferred voluntary school.

This Clause obviously needs amendment. Of the four proposals so far made for its amendment, two would leave out the Clause altogether and one would omit the reference to "extended facilities." But though no amendment to this effect has yet been handed in, an excellent proposal to meet the case of new schools has been made outside the House of Commons. It is suggested that new schools should qualify for public assistance by a certain length of service to public education. In other words, any school which could show to the satisfaction of the local authority that it had efficiently educated a given number of children, say 500, would thereby become entitled to claim transference to the authority on the terms set forth in Clause 4. It is not enough to provide that new schools shall be fairly treated "if the local authority at any time" take them over; we must secure that the local authority shall be bound by statute to take them over if they have served the public in an efficient manner for some time by giving a good education without charge to the public to a specified number of children, say 100. Even so, it would take many years before a school could qualify for recognition and assistance as a public elementary school. It would take a school for 100 children about seven years before it could claim to have educated as many as 500 children. But some such provision there must be, for owing to the increasingly migratory habits of labour there may be large aggregations of Catholics in a district where there is now no Catholic school, and our duty towards their children must not be neglected.

---

* Messrs Evelyn Cecil, Cave, Cavendish, G. D. Faber, Samuel Roberts and Thornton; Lord Balcarres; Messrs John Redmond and Pike Pease; Sir Francis Powell and Dr Macnamara; Messrs J. W. Wilson, Middlemore, John Rutherford, Long, Verney, Ashley and Butcher.

Clause 6 banishes the religious lesson beyond the limits of compulsory school hours in these words:

> The parent of a child attending a public elementary school shall not be under any obligation to cause the child to attend at the schoolhouse, excepted during the times allotted in the time table exclusively to secular instruction.

Some Catholics, and notably Father Sydney Smith, S.J.,* contend that this Clause gives us a welcome security that Protestant teaching shall not be forced upon Catholic children. They argue that, if this general exemption from attendance at the religious lesson had been applied to the existing dual system, it would have been most objectionable; but that, as it stands in a Bill establishing undenominationalism, it should be welcomed as a protection for Catholic children in the Council schools and in the ordinary transferred schools (Clause 3). Again, it has been pointed out by others, and notably by Mr Birrell himself, that of late there has been no legal obligation upon parents to send their children to school in time for the religious lesson. These supporters of Clause 6 argue that the decision made upon this point by the Board of Education during the lifetime of the last Government fully justifies the present Government in enforcing by Statute an exemption already sanctioned by administrative action.

---

* In the May number of *The Month*. The article has been republished in pamphlet form by Messrs Burns and Oates, price one penny.

The obvious answer to the argument that Clause 6 gives a protection to Catholic children is, first, that it is our aim that none of them should attend other than Catholic schools, and, secondly, that in the few instances where they must attend a Council school or an ordinary transferred school the conscience clause provides sufficient protection already. To the defence of the Clause put forward by Mr Birrell and others the answer is that very few parents have been aware hitherto that their children were not strictly required to attend the religious lesson unless they had taken advantage of the conscience clause; and that it makes all the difference that the exemption should now be made explicit and statutory. Clause 6 will certainly reduce very considerably the attendance at religious instruction. And it should therefore be opposed by all who care about the maintenance of religious education, whether denominational or not.

But apart from the general principle involved, there are obvious reasons why Catholics should urge upon the Government an amendment which would exempt the "four-fifths" schools from the operation of this Clause. We may not be able to secure that it shall be dropped altogether, though we ought to join with other denominations in protesting against it. But at least we ought to fight hard to secure that the Clause shall not adversely affect religious education in our own schools. For those who have most experience of Catholic schools are unable to take the optimistic view that the average Catholic parent can be fully relied upon to send his child to school in time to hear the religious lesson, though he be exempted from any obligation to do so. And, after all, there would be good reason for making religious instruction obligatory in the "four-fifths" schools (subject, of course, to a conscience clause protecting the minority of children) since it is of the essence of those schools, even as the Bill now stands, that religious education should play in them the same important part which it now plays in real voluntary schools. We should, therefore, if we fail to get Clause 6 deleted altogether, press for the addition to it of some such words as these:

> Provided that in schools where extended facilities are secured under Clause 4 those parents concerning whom the local authority has satisfied itself that they desire those facilities, shall be required to cause their children to attend at the schoolhouse for the whole time during which the school is open for instruction, whether religious or secular.

Concerning other Clauses of the Bill very little need be said here. Under Clauses 8 and 9 there will be set up a Commission of Three, whose procedure may be public or not as the Commissioners prefer, and whose decisions with reference to any particular school will have the force of an Act of Parliament without "lying for a month on the table of the House of Commons." We cannot do better here than borrow from the explanation of the Bill which was issued as part of the programme for the great Catholic meeting in the Royal Albert Hall on May 5:

> If a Catholic school is not handed over, the local authority may apply to the Commission of Three for a decision as to what shall be done with the school. This Commission cannot decide that the school may be carried on by the trustees themselves at their own expense, or at the expense of the parents, unless a guarantee is given that the school will be kept going for at least five years efficiently and so as to satisfy the Government inspectors.
>
> If the Commission are of opinion that the wishes of those who built and endowed the school will best be carried out by handing it over to the local authority, they may compel the trustees to do so, and may fix the payment or other consideration in the transaction. . . It will be noticed that the only circumstances they are definitely recommended to take into account are those which might be

held to reduce the payment, or other consideration, due to the trustees.

These powers are sufficiently arbitrary. But Clause 10* provides for even more drastic treatment of denominational schools which do not at once come to terms with the local authority. To quote once more from the programme of the demonstration of London Catholics:

> As the majority of Catholic schools are held under *charitable* trusts, this means that the local authority, even though it had not come to terms with the trustees of a Catholic school, might take possession of it and maintain it during 1908 without paying anything to the trustees, if there were not room in other schools for all the children in the district. During the year 1908 Catholic instruction would be given by the teachers every day as before. The only Catholic schools which can escape the clutches of this Clause are those, if there are any, which are privately owned.

Many things remain to be said about Part II of the Bill, which gives the Board of Education powers to manipulate educational endowments in order to make them "more serviceable for the educational purposes of the time"—powers which are even more drastic than those which the Commission of Three is to exercise over schools held under charitable trusts. And it would be easy to criticize Part IV, which gives to Wales, whose record in elementary education seems to show that she requires special supervision by the central authority in the interests of peace and progress, an anomalous and unnecessary autonomy in educational administration. But there are, as we write, persistent rumours that these two parts of the Bill will be dropped by the Government. In the happy expectation of the demise of these Clauses, unhonoured and unwept, let Catholics refrain from comment upon them: *favete linguis.*

---

* "Where the schoolhouse of an existing voluntary school is held under charitable trusts, the local authority, if they require the use of the schoolhouse for the purpose of avoiding for the time being any deficiency of public school accommodation in their area, and have not obtained that use, shall be entitled to have, without payment, such use of the schoolhouse as is needed for the purpose of carrying on a public elementary school from January 1, 1908, to January 1, 1909. While a schoolhouse is used under the powers [hereby] given, the same conditions and provisions shall apply as where an arrangement is made for the use of a schoolhouse; except that the local authority shall permit the religious instruction given in the school to be of the same character as that previously given, and shall also permit the teachers in the school to give that instruction as part of their duties."

It is now time to sum up. If these arbitrary powers proposed for a Commission of Three, which has yet to be appointed, are not modified; if it is not made a statutory obligation for the local authority to grant the extended facilities to all schools, whether in town or country, which can establish their claim to them and prove that there is accommodation elsewhere for the minority of children whose parents prefer religious teaching of other kinds; if there is given us no guarantee that only Catholic teachers approved by a committee of the parents, or by some other competent judge of their religious qualifications, shall be appointed to our schools; and if it is not made possible for schools built after the passing of the Act to qualify for public recognition and assistance by a specified length and quantity and quality of service to the public—if these amendments are not secured, there will be no alternative before English Catholics but to resist the new system actively and passively year in and year out, while straining at the same time every nerve and every resource in order to pursue their work of denominational education as a *gens lucifuga*, without recognition or recompense from the nation.

June 11, 1906.

SOME RECENT BOOKS

¶ *Under this heading will be noticed a limited number of books to which the Editor desires, for one reason or another, to call attention.*

WE have been deluged of late years with histories of dogma, some of them indeed first-rate of their kind; but a really good summary of early Church history—the history of the people and the events, as well as of the progress of thought—was greatly needed. We are indeed grateful that Mgr Duchesne has yielded to the wishes of his friends, and has published the instalment before us. (*Histoire Ancienne de l'Église.* Tome I. Paris: A. Fontemoing. 1906. 8 fr.) It deals in 570 pages with the history of the Church up to the end of the third century, thus excluding the persecution of Diocletian. Mgr Duchesne has aimed at being concise, interesting, moderate; and it must be said that he has succeeded extraordinarily well in the difficult task of popularizing the results of the detailed criticism which has in recent years been applied to this period. He says in his Preface:

> . . . Le cerveau humain est toujours fécond en inventions bizarres. Mais il y a une opinion moyenne, représentée par les jugements des gens graves et sains d'esprit, qui s'impose au public de gens rassis. Je n'ai pas besoin de dire que je crois être de celle-là. Peut-être me flatté-je. Mais je me sens une égale horreur pour la niaiserie de certains systèmes et pour celle de certaines légendes. Je crois même que, s'il fallait choisir, les légendes, où il y a au moins un peu de poésie et d'âme populaire, auraient encore ma préférence.

This characteristic passage, in Mgr Duchesne's well-known half-bantering vein, is not alone. All through the history we have his customary irony and fine sarcasm, without a touch of enthusiasm. But his style is always charming, and his matter solid, learned, orthodox and prudent. He often treads with surprising lightness on dangerous ground. He explains difficult questions with wonderful clearness. He throws new light on obscure points by some happy phrase. No one who has worked at the same subjects will invariably agree with his statements or with his way of looking at facts, for many questions are uncertain and must remain so, especially in the earlier period.

But the general good sense and moderation of the author's judgement will probably be admitted by all. Occasionally one finds an assertion on some doubtful point without anything on the other side. For instance, that the Alogi were Anti-Montanists is not a fact, but a conjecture based upon a conjectural emendation of St Irenæus. The "era of the Marcionites," 144, is not an admitted date but a very improbable inference made by Harnack. The list might be easily lengthened. But all such points are mere matters of detail. On the whole we have to be very thankful for so excellent a piece of work, which will be invaluable as a manual for students. One wishes it could be translated into English; but the subtlety of Mgr Duchesne's language would be almost impossible to render adequately. One is afraid the result might be not only heavy but misleading. C.

TO the large number of Catholics who have owed very much to *Nova et Vetera* and *The Faith of the Millions*, a new book by Father Tyrrell is an event of real importance. We name especially these two of his works, because their very form exhibits Father Tyrrell at his best. Aphorisms or short essays analysing with the insight of genius various departments of the religious or psychological life of man, or trenchant criticisms of current exaggerations and inaccurate popular statements on matters theological—these are departments in which Father Tyrrell is perhaps unrivalled. He is less reliable as a constructive thinker, partly because the extreme suppleness of his mind leads him to regard some of the problems with which he deals from very different points of view at different times. And the different aspects are often presented by him with so much force and brilliancy that his readers may identify what is only one aspect of a large question, or even the expression of a passing mood, with his mature and complete verdict. Nothing would be easier than to find passages in his more constructive writing which, taken by themselves, do not fairly represent his real mind. He has that quality, moreover, of the critic or zealous reformer, that he is more ready to dwell on defects in the existing state of things than to realize adequately the true principles underlying what is unsatisfactory —principles which may have been pressed out of due proportion or imperfectly realized.

The theme of his present work, *Lex Credendi* (Longmans), which is a continuation of *Lex Orandi*, is the fundamental connexion between creed and prayer; and he takes the *Pater Noster* as "the most succinct expression of the spirit and life of Christ, of that life whose representation in ourselves is the criterion of our religious beliefs and institutions." The Lord's Prayer is at once "the *Lex Orandi* and the *Lex Credendi.* The *Credo* is but the 'explicitation' of what is latent in the *Pater Noster.*" This connexion between dogma and devotion was a favourite theme with the late Dr W. G. Ward in his lectures at St Edmund's fifty years ago. His critics used, however, to argue that he tried to make the connexion between them more direct and more ascertainable *hic et nunc* than it is in reality. We are inclined to think that Father Tyrrell is, in some passages both in this work and in *Lex Orandi*, open to the same criticism. The true view appears to us to be the historical one. The simple expressions of belief in sub-apostolic days were inseparably and ascertainably bound up with the devotional life of Christians. As time went on and theological controversy arose, the conservative spirit of the orthodox made them endeavour so to formulate the Christian theology as faithfully to preserve the primitive beliefs. But the growing theological structure, which took its phraseology and some of its philosophical ideas from the speculations of each succeeding generation, gradually grew so complicated that theology became a science apart. That the spirit of the Saints is essential for a satisfactory attitude towards theology remains true. And that it is where orthodoxy has been present that that spirit really thrives may be equally true. But the immediate spheres of devotion and theology have become so far separate that devotional values cannot be always regarded as a direct test of orthodox theology.

At the end of the present work Father Tyrrell distinctly dissociates himself from any such position, and it is important therefore to remember that, even if it might be deduced from passages both in *Lex Orandi* and *Lex Credendi*, it is not the final conclusion of their author. Nothing could be better put than the following:

> It would be a complete misapprehension of the scope of *Lex Orandi* were one to sit down and sift every point of Catholic belief, with a view to rejecting those that did not manifestly stand the "Pragmatic" test, or even were one to endeavour to deduce a creed *a priori* from the known exigencies of the spirit-life. Its purpose was not to supply a new theological weapon, or a criterion for violent and artificial criticism, but to furnish a reason for trusting to the natural criticism effected by time and experience; for suffering good and evil to grow together till the harvest; for quietly abiding the sure uprooting of every plant not planted by the Father's hand; for living the truth rather than analysing it.

We should like to find a disclaimer also of the position that the prayer-value of theology and the Creed consists merely in their being the explication of "spiritual experience," and not rather, in a large measure, in their character as the expression of facts believed in. This we account important for the validity of Father Tyrrell's own theory as to the connexion between dogma and devotion. He writes indeed that "the prayer-value of certain historical beliefs cannot demonstrably be shown to depend on the historicity of the facts." He therefore leaves this aspect to other tests. But if this be taken to mean that their prayer-value does not depend on the conviction in him who prays that they are historically true, such a statement appears to us in important cases to be inaccurate. It was the passionate belief in the fact of our Lord's Resurrection which lay at the very root of the hopeful prayer of St Paul and his contemporaries. If the historicity of the facts is disbelieved in or doubted, the prayer-value of the dogma is gone. Setting aside all controversies as to the exact nature of the spiritual body which rose, it was belief in a fact, and not a mere "spiritual experience," which was the very life of the prayer of St Paul and his contemporaries. And this instance does not stand alone. We think then that this side of the analysis of dogma should have been more unmistakably insisted on by Father Tyrrell with a view to the completeness of his own theory. It is here that we find the parting of the ways between the theories of M. Sabatier and a more accurate historical analysis than his of the genesis of dogmatic *formulæ*.

The book teems with illuminating passages. If the writer is not always ready to see amid inaccurate overgrowths the true essence and genius of Christianity lying at the root of the older theological traditions, he has a special gift for finding what is good and helpful for Christian thought in the work of thinkers who are far removed from Christianity in their own conclusions. We shall content ourselves with quoting one passage on Nietzsche's *Superman* which appears to us especially valuable, as much in what it suggests as in what it says:

> It is plain [Father Tyrrell writes] that this More-than-man is somewhat of the "Gothic" and military type; that he is a spiritual descendant of the hordes of Northern barbarians who swept down on the effete Roman empire, and to whose fresh vigour, innocent alike of Greek ethics and of Christian saintliness, our European civilization largely owes its birth and progress. Needless to say that this superman might be more properly called the superbrute; that he competes on just the same plane of merely psychic selfish existence as other animals, although through the development of his reason he has left all competitors behind.
>
> This ideal has been easily and freely criticized. It is easy to show that the self-giving as well as the self-seeking instincts are essential to the survival of species; that brutal unmitigated egotism is a principle of decadence and deterioration; that competition obtains only in regard to material goods of limited divisible quantity, and to the conditions of merely animal life; that violence is not strength; that society is the condition of individuality; that the social instinct is the complement of the individual instinct, and so forth.
>
> But it is far more important to recognize the confused gropings after a better conception of perfect manhood: the revolt against an exaggerated pessimism which excludes all possibility of God's will being done on earth as it is in heaven; the revolt against a trans-

cendental mysticism that finds the theatre of man's highest life only in the clouds; against a sentimental, enervating pity that views pain and sorrow as the sovereign unmitigated evils, and fosters a blind self-defeating "indiscriminate charity"; against the confusion of gentleness with softness, of meekness with weakness; against an overstraining of the "organic" idea of Society and against kindred theories of government and authority, socialistic or absolutist, which are fatal to the growth of personality and to the truly Christian principle of individual dignity. We should sympathize with the scorn of contented mediocrity, of the average and paltry, with the feeling that in some sense a man should "be himself" and not the creature of servile imitation and conformity, with the aspiration after the "strong man," the hero, the more-than-man, whose production is the goal of all moral endeavour. For all his monstrosity the superman is largely built up of, and lives by, certain too neglected elements of the Christian ideal of perfect manhood. He represents a revolt, although an excessive and indiscriminate revolt, against false mysticism and false sentiment. He moves at once away from and nearer to Christ in the same circle or orbit. The ideal is not all of iron or earth, and whatever admixture of heavenly gold it may possess we have a right to seek the same, pure and unalloyed, in the ideal manhood of Christ.

We would add, in conclusion, that Father Tyrrell has not convinced us by the essays referred to in his prefatory note that the physiological analogy underlying Newman's analysis of development—an analogy which he rejects somewhat hastily—has been even adequately mastered by him in its implications and its avowed limitations. We must be slaves to no analogy—so far we agree with him; but this special analogy is one of singular value, and is indeed something more than an analogy. For this very reason it is at the root of much that is most valuable in modern sociological speculation. The Church is a society of living beings with a history, and in this respect comes under the laws which govern a living and growing organism. Theology, as representing living ideas in a living society, must so far come under the same laws. The analogy does not, as Father Tyrrell says, either "degrade the present to exalt the past," or "degrade the past to exalt the present," though we fancy we recall both views of it suggested at different times in earlier works of Father Tyrrell. On the contrary, the conception of the Church as a living and growing organism and of its dogmatic theology as developing, presupposes that divine truth, which it does unreservedly exalt, is never *adequately* represented by human language either in the present or in the past. If it so far exalts the Apostolic *depositum* as to find in it the unchangeable essence of Christianity, it also exalts the work of later teachers in excluding error. If, on the other hand, it finds early theological forms wanting in intellectual completeness, it still attaches authority to later and more complete definitions only because they express what was implicitly contained in the original *depositum*.

W.W.

THE *Origin of Life*, by John Butler Burke (Chapman & Hall. 1906), is a highly interesting, though, one must add, unconvincing work, marred by some curious errors and rendered exceedingly difficult of comprehension in divers places by the singularly involved style in which it is written. Still, in spite of these faults, it will undoubtedly find a wide circle of readers, not merely on account of the intrinsic interest of the subject with which it deals, but also because of the excitement which has been awakened in the minds of the general public by the sensational announcements of his discoveries or observations of which Mr Burke has been the victim.

It is quite clear that before entering upon a discussion as to how life originated we must be certain as to the meaning we attach to the term "life" itself. Hence the writer begins by attempting to define what is meant by life or what he conceives life to be in its simplest form. The attempt has often been made with more or less success (or lack of failure) by various writers, but we find it difficult to imagine that any one of them, possessed of a competent working knowledge of biology, would be prepared to accept the statement of the case put forward in this book.

> Life might be described as a specialized mode of motion, the specialized mode of motion being that of a complex system of molecules in a dynamically unstable state, so that there is a continuous

or continual change, or flux of its substance, between the individual aggregates of molecules and their surroundings.—p. 49.

The writer admits that the sense in which he uses "life" is, "if not necessarily a new one, at least an extension, and perhaps a considerable extension, of that in which it is already employed" (p. 48). This is undoubtedly true, and we more than doubt whether Mr Burke would find any biologist willing to adopt his definition as anything like an adequate or satisfactory summary of the facts. Probably he would admit this himself; but then he would argue, so far as we have been able to grasp his argument, that life as we now know it is not necessarily life as it has always been. It is a more perfect condition of things, a condition of things made more perfect by evolution and selection. In fact, life as we know it is not life as it originally was, or life in its simplest terms, but a more complex and an improved article. No doubt, as the writer admits, the matter is largely one of definition (p. 74), but in all seriousness one must ask, would Mr Burke's definition, or this statement of life's history, be accepted by any biologist as adequate? If it is not, then the whole argument of the book breaks down.

It is hard at the present day for any man to possess a serious and detailed knowledge of both experimental and biological sciences, and the present writer admits that his studies have been in the latter direction. Hence we feel a diffidence in discussing the physical questions which Mr Burke has—to us, as it seems, quite unwarrantably—mixed up with biological considerations. We do not presume to criticize the accuracy of Mr Burke's observations on such matters as the nature of flame or the phenomena of phosphorescence or fluorescence. No doubt his observations with regard to these matters have been of interest and value. But we protest against the doctrine that the changes which take place in connexion with the processes above alluded to are "not merely analogous to, but essentially of the same kind as, even if incomparably simpler than, organic metabolism" (p. 179). We do not believe that there is the slightest justification for any such statement. We should hesitate to accept it from one who was a master both of biology and of physics, and we certainly refuse to do so from one who betrays such a fundamental ignorance of the elements of biology as is displayed by Mr Burke. This is a strong statement, but we think we can justify it. We will pass over the extraordinary error, thrice repeated on p. 135, where chlorophyll is mentioned when chromatin, a totally different substance, is clearly intended. This may have been a mere *lapsus calami*, though it is a little difficult to account for its triple occurrence on that hypothesis.

But we presume that if Mr Burke had been cognizant of the facts he would, as he most certainly should, have told his readers when dealing, as he does at length and in more than one place, with Haeckel's *Monera*, that the form in question probably does not exist and never did exist. What is the good of discussing an object of this kind, if it is a purely hypothetical thing? This at least may be said that the latest and best authorities deny that any such thing as a non-nucleated living cell has been shown to exist.*

It is by no manner of means true that Sach's view of the crystalline nature of protoplasm is "now generally accepted" (p. 111). Of Mr Burke's views as to the nature of fertilization all we can say is that, if after reading the passages on pages 127, 128 three or four times, we have grasped his meaning, then he has acquired an entirely wrong conception of the nature of that process. But we find still more fatal and more fundamental errors in another passage. If there are chapters in biology in which the exponent of a theory of life must be deeply read, they are those which deal with the morphology and physiology of the cell and, perhaps above all, with the phenomena attending cell-division. Now here are Mr Burke's views.

> The phenomenon of karyokinesis, or mode of subdivision of the inner portions of the nucleus or nucleosus [nucleolus], the centrosome, as it is more commonly called, can be imitated in the artificial radio-active cells.—p. 136.

The nucleolus is *not* the same thing as the centrosome, the centrosome is *not* contained within the nucleus but lies outside it, save in a few rare cases; and it is a mere abuse of language of the worst kind to talk of its undergoing karyokinesis. Again, on the next page, mytosis (which ought to be spelt mitosis) is *not* the multiplication of the chromosomes, as Mr Burke states it to be. These are errors which one ought not to be confronted with in a book which professes to deal with the fundamental laws of life and living things.

---

* Cf. O. Hertwig, *Allgemeine Biologie*, aufl. 2, 1906, p. 44.

To turn to the radiobes themselves, the really original and valuable portion of the book, these objects have been obtained by the action of radium chloride or bromide on sterilized bouillon. The bodies in question pass after their formation through certain stages which stimulate those undergone by the living cell. At all times of their existence they appear to be soluble in warm water, and they end up as crystals. It is hard to see how objects of this kind can be held to throw any light upon the origin of life. Mr Burke says that the process which is gone through "is a development which no crystal has yet been known to make, and forces upon the mind the idea that these bodies must be organisms" (p. 109). To this it may be replied that there are a number of well-known observations in connexion with the formation of pseudo-cells in inorganic fluids; that there are no known instances of animal or vegetable cells which are soluble in merely warm water, nor are there any cases where the termination of the cycle of existence, if we may use such a term of the radiobes, is the formation of a group of small crystals; and that the whole process looks to us, though we admit that we have not studied the radiobes themselves, more like some aberrant process of crystallization than the behaviour of a living organization.

But then Mr Burke will say, and with truth, that he does not claim that his radiobes are living things.

> The forms we have obtained are analogous to living types and may, as we say, be called artificial forms of life, but they are not the same as life as we know it to-day. . . If these artificial things are alive, it is not life as we know it in nature. It is not life which can claim descent from the remote past, and it is not life which will hand on its own type to the distant future.—p. 187.

Some persons who have only a superficial acquaintance with the question at issue, or who have only read the rather highly coloured statements in the popular press, seem to imagine that Mr Burke has claimed to have produced life or living things. He himself is quite clear on this point, as the above quotation will show. What then is his claim? It is that these objects may help to fill in the gap between living or dead matter—or what is commonly called dead matter, for in Mr Burke's view all matter is alive.

It is difficult to see how an object which is not alive in any commonly received sense of the term can fill in any gap between living and dead matter. That a huge gap does exist between those two kinds of matter almost everybody would admit, and would further admit that a thing must be either alive or dead and that there is no half-way house between the two states.

Supposing, however, for the sake of argument, that these objects were shown to possess life, the observation would be intensely interesting, instructive and suggestive, but even then it would not help us to a conclusion as to how life originated in the beginning. The substance in which the radiobes is formed is an organic substance, a proteid, a substance which was once alive or at least part of a living organization. Granted that at any period when life arose there were plenty of radio-active substances in existence and favourable conditions under which they might come into operation, it is quite clear that there were no proteids for them to act upon. In order that the experiment should really teach us something as to the origin of life, it would be necessary to produce living objects under conditions of strict sterilization from some such substance as inorganic mud or the like which might easily have been brought into contact with radio-active substances. We do not say that such a feat will never be performed, though it certainly never has been, but we are anxious to show how far off we are at this moment from an approximation to a scientific solution of the question which so many have tried to solve.

For the purpose of explaining the processes of nature

Mr Burke postulates the existence of substances or entities—we hardly know how to describe them—which he calls biogens. Now of these substances it must at once be said that they are as hypothetical as the biophors of Weismann, or as any of the other things with learned names which have been put forward by theorists—as hypothetical and as impossible of proof or of disproof. Hence they do not belong to the province of science at all; for science is based upon ascertained facts and cannot exist without them.

Mr Burke believes that spontaneous generation must have taken place at some time. So do many others. He thinks that it was at a very early period of the world's history. So did Huxley. He thinks that the first living forms must have been so small as not to be capable of detection by the microscope as we now have it. So does Weismann. But all these ideas are pure surmises and rest upon no kind of solid foundation of fact. Huxley knew that perfectly well and proclaimed it. Mr Burke knows it too and admits it. All, therefore, that can be said about these and scores of other surmises as to the operations of nature is that "it mout ha' been, and, then again, it moutn't." It is probable that human ingenuity will discover in the future scores of other ways in which the phenomena of nature *might* be explained; it will be many a day before the secret is really guessed, even supposing that day ever dawns.

We do not propose to say anything about the rather top-heavy edifice of general philosophy which Mr Burke erects upon the basis of his radiobes and the biogens which he has postulated. It is not a materialistic philosophy. But to us it rests upon so insecure a scientific basis that it can hardly claim serious consideration.

Mr Burke has expended great labour upon his book, and it will, we are certain, be widely read; but we are obliged regretfully to confess that he has done little or nothing to help us to a solution of the problem to which so many have devoted their attention and hitherto in vain.

B.C.A.W.

The Metaphysic of Cause

AT length we have a book on philosophy which will, it may be hoped, go far to satisfy the most exacting critics of philosophical textbooks. Although *La Métaphysique des Causes d'après Saint Thomas et Albert le Grand*, by Théodore de Régnon, S.J. (second edition, with preface by M. Gaston Sortais. Paris: Victor Retaux), notwithstanding its 663 octavo pages, was written for the benefit of "*ceux qui débutent*" in the sublime science of philosophy, men of the highest rank in thought have declared their personal indebtedness to its brilliant pages.

During a lifetime consecrated to the service of physics in preparation of candidates for the École Polytechnique, the keen intelligence of Père Régnon had been meditating higher flights than the regions of physical science afforded him. The decrees of 1880, which deprived him of his post as professor, proved to be a blessing in disguise, for from his humble retirement, near the Collège de Vaugirard, he published, during the thirteen years of life that remained to him, a remarkable succession of monographs, the best known of which is perhaps *La Métaphysique des Causes*. This modest title will convey to the unfortunate student who has hurried through his Ontology but a feeble and unattractive conception of its import. The gist of the volume, a reprint of the first edition of 1886, is that in the universe of existences which is permeated by a vast, complicated and endless system of causes, effects and interactions, one, and one only, Perfect Cause stands plainly revealed in its magnificence. The book is no excerpt from a wider philosophy, it is a self-contained and self-supporting edifice. And though it may occasionally refer to developments which must be sought elsewhere, it borrows nothing. Its only theology is that of "the First Cause" as such, the pre-eminent principle which is cause alone and in no sense whatever effect or potentiality.

After an introduction in epistemology, both fresh and satisfying, Being is analysed, and the root principle of the universe, "Being comes before non-being," is vindicated against the school of Hegel. The references to Hegel, as well as to the positivist, the materialist or the thorough-going evolutionist, are always forcible, but rarely more than incidental. It is not so much the beginner in philosophy, as the initiated and the man of reflection, who will welcome this volume as an exposition, which, in our judgement, stands alone. The merit of the book is to be sought in the apt choice of materials, the penetrating insight into the bearings of every phase of causation, and in the limpid abundance of the author's developments. One breathes freely amid the spaciousness of his outlook. At every turn almost there is revealed some hitherto unnoticed feature. Not to mention his remarkable synthesis of causation, his exposition of the eminence of the exemplar or ideal cause, his triumphant analysis of the final cause, it may simply be said here that his extensive treatment of "univocal" causes will furnish many new lights to the majority of readers.

Whoever desires to see the scholastic philosophy presented in a form which will command his respect and inflame his intelligence, let him read patiently *La Métaphysique des Causes* from cover to cover. H. P.

THERE are two ways of approaching a subject indirectly, or even directly, bearing upon the Christian Faith. The one is to examine the subject intrinsically, holding in reserve the authoritative definitions of the Church upon the subject, and hearing first what the exponents of the matter may have to say upon it; the other is to formulate first the Church's pronouncements, and to bring these to bear immediately upon the subject that is to be examined. It is certainly high time that a careful discussion of modern spiritism, and a brief sketch of the Church's views upon the subject, should be put into the hands of English-speaking Catholics. (*The Unseen World;* an Exposition of Catholic Theology in its relation to Modern Spiritism. By Rev. Father Alexius M. Lépicier, O.S.M., S.Th.M. Kegan Paul. 6s.) Spiritists in England, and especially in the North, are no longer content with experiment; they are rapidly formulating their supposed discoveries in a kind of creed, they are organizing a sort of religion, and even go so far as to open "churches" and Sunday schools for its propagation. Very abominable stories are told from time to time, and apparently on the best authority, as to the results of all this upon children who are subjected to the system, and there is no doubt that the spread of spiritism in such counties as Yorkshire is having a sad effect upon Christian belief.

Father Lépicier approaches the subject frankly from the dogmatic and scholastic standpoint. He discusses at length the constitution of the spiritual world, the nature, functions and faculties of angels and discarnate spirits, and concludes that the manifestations at *séances*, when they are not complete impostures on the part of the medium, arise from the fraudulent action of evil angels. With this conclusion no instructed Catholic will quarrel; and his argument is clear and well arranged. But it is doubtful whether the book will be of service except to those who already accept the authority and mind of the Church; indeed, the author explicitly addresses only these. Those whose views on Revelation are at all nebulous, and even those who recognize any system of theology other than that of the scholastics, will not find what they want in this book. It is true that Father Lépicier refers more than once to the bad effect of spiritism, both morally and dogmatically, upon its devotees, and that he shows again and again the intrinsic weaknesses of the system; but he does not base his denunciation upon these facts. He approaches the subject simply as a teacher of Catholic theology, not in any way as a disguised inquirer.

The book, then, while undoubtedly valuable to those who understand and follow the scholastic method, would have little effect upon others; indeed, it might make them a little impatient of hearing what the Church has to say upon the whole question. A book on these lines is not what we should wish to circulate among non-Catholics in order to show them the dangers of dabbling in this branch of study. It is interesting to notice that Father Lépicier, in discussing such cognate subjects as hypnotism and astrology, is careful to point out that the Church has committed herself only against the abuse of those powers, so far as they may be realities. B.

Some Recent Books

THE *Dangers of Spiritualism*, by J. Godfrey Raupert (Kegan Paul. Second edition, 1906. 2s. 6d.), is a very remarkable book. It is likely to do far more towards dissuading the amateur spiritualist from his researches than Father Lépicier's *The Unseen World*. While the latter approaches the subject from the severely scholastic position, Mr Raupert writes as a practical experimentalist, and with no less energetic condemnation. His first-hand stories are horrible and convincing, and his conclusions for the most part overwhelming. Briefly, his evidence goes far to show that the "subliminal self" theory is quite inadequate to observed phenomena, and that these can only be accounted for by the action of discarnate beings upon persons still living on earth, an action which sooner or later culminates in disastrous injury to the inquirer. Of special interest is his discussion of "spirit photography," in which he is a convinced believer; three or four plates illustrate this department. But the reader could have wished for even longer discussion on this point, as its solution would be more nearly final in favour of the objective theory than almost any other conceivable evidence. If this photography could but be absolutely established, and all possible peril of fraud removed, the conclusion would be simply irresistible that the brain is not the only percipient of apparitions, but that these convey actual rays—generally invisible by the eye—to unintelligent chemicals. It is true that he advances one very impressive piece of evidence, but it is no more than very impressive; and he scarcely does more than outline his theory on the subject. But on other points he is extremely convincing; and it is difficult to imagine a better book of its size to put into the hands of any one who is beginning to dabble in this fascinating aspect of the spiritual world and to incur its dangers. He is as convinced of the reality of these things as the most confirmed occultist, and, at the same time, utterly condemnatory of the physical, moral, mental and spiritual effects produced by their investigation, as well as of the intrinsic untrustworthiness of communications received in this manner. The writer too, although a Catholic, does not propose authorities unacceptable to the average Protestant. B.

IN his short prose poem, *Richard Raynal: Solitary*, Father Benson has given us a spiritual idyll with an exquisite setting, not only of "nature's unambitious underwood and flowers that blossom in the shade," but also of the rich tapestry of a medieval court. Peace and brutality, the spiritual and the grotesque are mingled in the representation. The solitary, who comes to the King with a ghostly message revealed in prayer, enters among the scullions in the crowd and dies in the King's state-bed almost worshipped as a saint. It is also a very delicate and subtle study of the medieval mind with its curious revulsions from the moods of a brutal child to the musings of a mystic.

The spiritual effect is produced in a wonderfully small compass, and the work gains greatly from its brevity. It should be read, if possible at one sitting, in some quiet chamber of an old house invaded by the lights and scents of early spring. Like a piece of music it should come and go without interruption. And for this reason we are inclined to be patient with the construction—annoying as it is, that not only does Sir John interfere somewhat with the personality of Richard Raynal, but that the author will not leave us alone with Sir John. The whole setting is too elaborate, but perhaps the central figure would not have passed so simply and swiftly across the stage without this machinery.

Where we are inclined to complain of Sir John and the author is in their comments on mysticism. It is not so much in what is said, as in what is left out. We wish that the writer had insisted that neither the King nor Richard Raynal himself had come to the full measure of the great mystics. They lack the robust sanity, the clearness of judgement, the trumpet-note of triumph, the calm mastery over others that distinguished St Catherine of Siena or St Teresa. They are exquisite figures, spiritual and intensely pathetic, but it would not have detracted from their pathos to have borne in mind that there are greater types than these of humanity made strong to deal with the visible by its intercourse with the unseen. S.

Some Recent Books

IN *Fenwick's Career* (Smith, Elder and Co.), Mrs Humphry Ward completes her trilogy of novels based on real lives in the past, reset in a framework of our modern existence. To this method in itself there can be no moral or artistic objection; but we believe there is a strong objection on the score of art to permitting the modern characters to discuss and be influenced by their prototypes. That Fenwick's wife should read the life of Romney and be bitterly conscious of the resemblance between herself and Romney's wife is surely against the true rules of art. Why not leave us in the presence of this plain, fine human tragedy of ambition hardening the heart, and jealousy of love destroying love, without teasing us with comparisons of likeness or unlikeness to the prototypes of Fenwick and Phoebe? We must be incapable of being deeply stirred or touched by the central figures if we do not resent the ghostly presence of the originals.

Fenwick himself is a real human being—intensely real—and Phoebe is no lay figure when she is allowed to act untrammelled. There are scenes—notably the artist's first return from his London life to the wife and child in the cottage in Langdale—in which there is true and deep human feeling, and we recognize with our judgement that our emotions in reading them are fully justified. But in the greater part of the book Mrs Humphry Ward shows too low an opinion of her public. She will not let us look at her pictures with our unaided intelligence. We must have a guide with us pointing out a comparison here and dilating on a type there, instead of letting us use our own eyes and our own hearts. The class differences are constantly insisted upon, the influences of schools, descents, environments are given their value and more than their value, and the characters are seldom left to act for themselves. And yet there is so much of beauty and power and truth in Mrs Ward's work that perhaps we have no right to complain of this fine thing simply because it is not another thing, and to ask for life instead of reflections upon life, for human beings instead of striking essays upon character. Eugénie, Welby, Lord Finden, the other artists, seem to us rather subtle studies in character than living human beings. But these studies interest us deeply—with the exception of the sketch of Elsie Welby. Surely the presence of a second jealous wife as a pendant to Phoebe is unnecessarily painful.

There are throughout the book only about six passages dealing with religion, but they are worth noting by anyone interested in the religious thought of the present day. Early in the story we are told that Fenwick, who had "now few or no orthodox beliefs," prays passionately for the success of his picture "to some 'magnified, non-natural man' afar off to come and help him." Years afterwards, when suffering and repentance had brought him to hopes of new life and higher aims, "he threw himself on the grass, face downwards, praying as he had been wont to do in his youth, but in a far more mystical, more inward way; not to a far-off God, invited to come down, and change or tamper with external circumstance; but to something within himself, *identified with himself*, the power of beauty in him, the resurgent forces of hope and love."

But Eugénie, the ideal of goodness and refinement, the friend of Renan and Taine, whose agnosticism is sufficiently evident, goes daily to a little Ritualistic church at eight o'clock in the morning, and thus speaks of the celebration: "It seems to me so simple. It's an *action*, not words, and an action means anything you like to put into it, one thing to me, another to you. Some day we shall be tired, shan't we? of creeds, and sermons, but never of 'This *do*, in remembrance of Me!'"

Later on, "when her only comfort is religion," Eugénie, while wintering in the south of France, goes to daily Mass and "makes the spiritual communion which sustains her." "The act was to her the symbol and instrument of an inflowing power; the details of those historical beliefs with which it was connected, mattered little."

Here is a mysticism, an eclectic mysticism, which it would have been very difficult to explain to a St Teresa or a St John of the Cross. What is this "something within himself identified with himself" which is yet to save Fenwick from the wreck he has made of himself? It cannot be the same "something" which is for Eugénie an "inflowing power," plainly not identified with herself. For Eugénie there is still, as for Matthew Arnold, "a stream of tendency, not ourselves, that makes for righteousness." But she is sustained by spiritual communion with our Lord, of whom we must not venture to question whether He be God; for such a detail to the true modern mystic is of no consequence. The noblest man in the story, Watson, the unsuccessful artist, when dying passes with a gentle smile to and fro between Omar Khayyám's pessimism and the Psalms. But if any of us find it hard to be so loftily indifferent about any dogma as to a future life, let us rest if we can (and we have need of consolation after following the tragedy of *Fenwick's Career*) on the assertion with which the book closes: "The mystic carries within a little flame of joy, very hard to quench. The wind of death itself does but stir and strengthen it." G. B.

A STORY well worth telling and told with emotional heat and restraining art leaves the reader in a mood of reflection on mysteries half-revealed and half-concealed by what he has read, and thus incapable of summing up its purport. Such is the effect of Mrs Wilfrid Ward's latest and best novel, *Out of Due Time* (Longmans. 6s.), a study of the intellectual discipline of the Catholic Church and of its action upon the temperaments of some typical English Catholics. It would be a shallow summary of its theme to say merely that it deals with the fortunes of a Catholic Review, conducted at first on loyal if bold principles; with the fatal caprice of a specialist, whose zeal had a root of bitterness, spoiling this attempt slowly to pour new wine into the old bottles; with a condemnation reluctantly forced by the subject of it from the Holy Office; and with the eventual submission of this genius born out of due time. A sentence from Newman's *Apologia*, quoted at the end of the book, gives us Mrs Ward's view of the movement and its condemnation. Paul d'Etranges is one of those who "will not listen to the voice of authority," and so "he spoils a good work in his own century, in order that another man, as yet unborn, may not have the opportunity of bringing it happily to perfection in the next."

But the foundation of the Review and its condemnation provide only the skeleton of the book, which will be valued rather for the flesh and blood of reality with which the novelist has clothed it, reality as seen by a lover of souls and portrayed by a lover of form. The following sentences, by showing that intellectual discipline acting upon character is the true theme, will take us nearer to the heart of the book than any compendium:

> Misunderstanding, condemnation, rash judgements [are] things always hard to bear, but surely doubly hard when they relate to things most sacred; when it is exactly the noblest work, the highest aims of your life that are misunderstood. I think it must be—it is surely right—that the subtle sensitiveness of the Catholic mind should be easily made anxious as to what is new, or, human nature being what it is, it might fall in love with every novelty. But to those whose whole duty it is to go forward, and especially to the women who must be with them—for there are women involved in all the actions of men—what subtle tortures may be applied!—p. 166.

The misunderstanding and the rash judgements proceeded from both parties, and were suffered by both parties to the controversy, by means of which in the last half of her book Mrs Ward develops the four deeply interesting characters she has taught her readers to love and laugh with and laugh at in the first half. The controversy is never intruded; nor was there any need for these high matters to be fully discussed. Enough that we realize by a hundred delicate touches how important these questions are made, how the fate of many souls becomes involved in their decision, when the spirit in which they are raised is hasty or disloyal or both. It is the spiritual drama of three souls which the writer is concerned to unfold. Your gaze is concentrated upon the development, through controversy, of what is least generous and least human in Paul d'Etranges, of what is most sound and most reverent in the temper of George Sutcliffe and of what is most devout and tender in Marcelle, Paul's sister, first his satellite and after her death his guiding star. The drama is the record of an action both serious and complete within itself; it is unfolded in action, not in long paragraphs of psychological analysis, an error against which the device of narrating in the first person perhaps secured the author. And certainly, by the fear and the pity of it, the drama purifies in the reader by raising to a higher emotional level the sentimental sympathy he may have felt with intellectual excesses and the fears which may have shadowed the footsteps of his faith. Thus, as a tragedy, it fulfils all the more famous conditions of Aristotle's definition.*

Mrs Ward has perhaps made too little of the episode of Father Colnes. Her purpose was to justify the "claim to control the pace at which truth is developed," the slowness and caution of authority, by a picture of the peril which a weak intellect, taking its ideas at second hand, may incur by hasty and bold developments of doctrine made by a specialist. The nervous priest, who "knew what people felt towards him almost as acutely as if he had been a dog," is sketched too slightly, and the process of his lapse and speedy recovery needed fuller description. A more positive blemish is the device by which the explanation of Paul's final submission is relegated to an epilogue printed in italics. Fine in feeling and expression as this epilogue is, one feels that Paul would never have written it; it is too personal. And it seems a pity that the substance of it could not have been embodied in the report of the first sermon preached by him as a Dominican friar; for the sermon with its history and panegyric of Marcelle and the "statement" as to the effect her death had upon the wanderer would have made one subject.

The use of foreign tongues in the middle of English dialogue should be governed by some definite rule. Marcelle uses expressions which are neither difficult to translate nor idiomatic, nor always French even. "I won't" is better English than "je ne veux pas" is French; "autrement" is not a safe equivalent for "otherwise," if an equivalent be needed; and such expressions as "mais, oui, certainement," and "non, certainement, non," give no colour to the dialogue and distract the reader. This fault is the more to be regretted since Marcelle is so often made with success to clothe French thought in English language. How charming is her expression about the dog for whom she dug a beautiful grave and "prayed heaps of prayers for what soul there was of him!"

---

* *μίμησις πράξεως σπουδαίας κὰι τελείας μέγεθος ἐχούσης . . . δρώντων καὶ οὐ δι' ἀπαγγελίας, δι' ἐλέου καὶ φόβου περαίνουσα τὴν τῶν τοιούτων παθημάτων κάθαρσιν.*—Aristotle, *Poetica*, 6.

But the secret of Mrs Ward's style is that she translates into language without thinking of the words what her own insight reveals to her.

> I have had a river for a friend which spoke to me when men were dumb, which dried tears on the eyes that looked into it, which did not reason with an unsatisfied heart, and made no reproach to want of courage. Its voice has been to me the handmaiden of religion, soothing what was strained in nature, and the gentle companion of sorrow, when the human voice would have been intolerable.

This is beautiful, just because the writer thought more about the stream than about the words of her tribute to it. She has also the rare power of sketching a character in a few words—Father Deely, for instance. There is much humour too. Paul's crude theory of action is

> to teach the young priests philosophy up-to-date. Shake the Vatican like a bottle of medicine till you get the right things at the top, and you will have a Catholic Church made in Germany, and fit . . . to guide and to embody the thought of the human race.

Again, Sutcliffe's Catholicism is in

> the true English style. For if he would have died with More for the papal prerogatives, he would have died as willingly in the defence of his country against the Spanish Armada. Very humble and very independent, he owed both characteristics to the absolute clearness his faith.

There are towards the close of the book half a dozen passages about Rome and St Peter's and the catacombs for which every one who has been to see Christian Rome—and their number is small in proportion to those who visit Rome ancient and modern—will be grateful.

> I was as ever conscious, as I knelt at that tomb, rather of the whole world-wide Church than of Rome, for that is part of the

subtle mystery of St Peter's. . . When you are there, you are free of any one space and you wander in the whole . . . as you find comfort, the self that needed it has been lost; as you humble your mind, it has vanished in a song of triumph; as you submit to the human rule . . . you have become yourself part of the triumph, not as a captive but as a conqueror. You sought to subdue the lifting of a mind that seemed to see further than the minds of those about you, and you and they together are lost in the light of a new and vaster knowledge. . . But what of afterwards? What of the testimony of your life, if you were taken behind the cloud, and heard that which no man could utter? Ah me, true it is, it was good for us to be there, but we had to come away, and there was confusion at the foot of the mount. But do you think that Peter did not believe in the vision of Thabor when he warmed his hands at the fire and denied his Master? The unutterable weakness of man whispers its *mea culpa* amid all the glories of Peter's tomb. You can hear it amid the silent thunders of the dome, or when the silver trumpets sing there of heaven's secrets. For, after all, the tomb is that of an apostate, and the highest state of man is to be forgiven.

Little has been said here of the serious purpose of the book. In case the novelist should attempt a further work on the same lines, we would say to her by way of warning and encouragement what Paul in this book says to Lisa: "What could not help would be to debase art even for the noblest uses; let yourself, your nearest and dearest thoughts, go into your art, and they will reach us." And it is to be hoped that Mrs Ward will treat the same or similar themes in future novels. For, to adapt some words from a sermon recently delivered, she has acquired in this book some of that "spiritual diplomacy" which comes from knowledge of man and his thought as well as of God and His Church, which, in the crisis, utters no rash or bitter words, but seeks refreshment in the inner vision. And thus the work which lies before her is the work of a peacemaker. R. B.

THOSE who appreciate the spirit and method of the works of the Abbé Fouard will be prepared to give a warm welcome to the work of Mgr Le Camus (*L'Œuvre des Apôtres*, par Mgr Le Camus, Evêque de La Rochelle. Tome I, Période d'Affranchissement. Tomes II, III, Période de Conquête. Paris: Oudin). It is evidently the result of patient and scholarly research and has already won the approval and recommendation of the Pope.* In a letter written to the Bishop the Holy Father blames those who rest contented with the old exegesis, and congratulates Mgr Le Camus on having taken his stand between the two extremes as a wise but resolute progressive.

The full text of the Acts and of the Epistles of St Paul is interwoven with a commentary which misses nothing and illumines all. To secure this result the author has neglected nothing of the critical apparatus that has been brought to such perfection. The Greek text is ever kept before the reader in judicious footnotes; Josephus, Tacitus, Philo, the early Fathers are called in to bear their testimony. Add to this that Mgr Le Camus speaks of what he has handled and seen; he has measured the dimensions of the theatre at Cæsarea, tasted of the "new wine," seen the sick in the streets, followed in the footsteps of St Paul to Damascus, to Antioch and across Asia Minor to Philippi and Athens and Corinth. He knows the history of every town and seems to know his way about the ancient streets. Hence he has been able to give a reconstruction of the historical events which seizes and holds the imagination while it satisfies the reason. Maps, plans of the latest excavations and photographs aid the imagination of the student.

But the author has evidently a more serious purpose than that of writing even the best of commentaries. He has given us a study of the origin and development of Christianity in the days of the Apostles. In the first volume, *Période d'Affranchissement*, he describes the bursting of the Gospel seed through the soil of Judaism and places in their true light the events that took place at Antioch, where the disciples were first called Christians. The second volume carries us on to Athens and Corinth; the third shows how the tribulations of St Paul led to the conquest of Rome. Everywhere Peter is shown to have followed in the steps, and to have confirmed the work, of Paul; the absurd theory that pits Paul against Peter is disposed of, and with it many other "fantastic devices" of the Tübingen school. The development of doctrine and practice is studied by means of excursions which inform without wearying the reader. The faith of the early Christians is shown to have been not less enlightened nor less robust than our own. The sacramental and disciplinary systems are seen to have existed from the beginning.

---

* *The Tablet*, Feb. 10, p. 214.

The history of the conversion of the Gentiles is the history of the first practical apologetics; and on this subject the author has much to say which is of interest. Especially in the introduction to the second volume is the thesis developed that "the Catholicity of the Church is the great miracle, the divine realization of a human impossibility." If we mistake not, this work will do much towards replacing minor devotions by a more robust and evangelical piety. To this point Mgr Le Camus returns again and again. "Why have we complicated with so many new devotions that which was, in the beginning, given to the world so profound and complete in its simplicity?" F. R.

MGR BARNES'S contribution to the Westminster Lecture Series, *The Witness of the Gospels*, is one for which we have to express nothing but praise. Confining his observations to the Gospel of St Luke, and using without prejudice every source available for the purpose, he has, we think, succeeded in setting forth the original documents which the Evangelist used in writing his Gospel. He shows that St Luke, when he brought the final revision of his work to an end, about the year 80, had used pre-existing documents, as he intimated in his preface his intention of doing. These documents are: the original draft of St Mark's Gospel; the Sayings of Christ; the "great insertion" between the ninth and eighteenth chapters, where the guidance of St Mark's Gospel is left, and another authority taken, probably the Gospel of St Philip; the Passion document, formerly considered to be Pilate's report; and the birth narrative, taken directly or indirectly from our Lady. As the author says, this plan was more likely to produce a reliable account than to write a completely new work from whatever source was then and there at hand. **D. I.**

St Francis as Social Reformer

MGR MOYES tells us in the preface to his lecture on *The Existence of God* that he is going to follow the traditional lines of scholasticism. He cites the apt description of this method as "the main line of European thought," and remarks that the soundness of its metaphysical research is untouched by the fact that many of its physical inductions have long since been evacuated. We have six arguments from Motion, Causality, Necessity, Perfection, Design, and Law or Conscience set forth with great ability and with all the clearness that the limits of a lecture allowed. The author's seventh argument is the ontological one.

We are extremely grateful to Monsignor Moyes for this admirable lecture, which greatly impressed his hearers on the occasion of its delivery, and which will be of so much assistance to those who endeavour to formulate the philosophic basis of the great fundamental dogma of religion.

W. W.

IN the introduction to *St Francis of Assisi, Social Reformer* (Benziger Bros., 4s. net), Father Dubois, S.M., writes: "The bibliography of St Francis reveals to us two facts equally striking: the wonderful abundance of the literature on the Saint and his work, and at the same time the absence of any study professedly treating St Francis as a social reformer." We might well ask whether it is possible to treat of St Francis exclusively from the standpoint of social reform, for St Francis, as Father Dubois himself admits, was primarily a religious reformer, and the social reform which came from the Franciscan movement was a consequence of the religious reform, and so intimately connected with it that the one cannot be treated apart from the other. Father Dubois' own book is a proof of this. But it is surely incorrect to imply that the social side of the Franciscan reform has not received the attention of students of St Francis' life. In fact, having read carefully the author's book, we have failed to note any original contribution to the special subject of which it treats.

Having said this, we hasten to assure the student of Franciscan history that here is a book he will do well to read. For the author, if he gives us no new conclusions, at least has brought to his work a freshness of thought which is inspiriting. He sees in St Francis a great social reformer, basing his reform, not upon economic theory, but upon religious truths. St Francis' reform is "the natural outcome of his love of God and for everything which God has created"; "there was no philosophy, no method, no spirit of organization in Francis"; "he was the soul of a popular movement"; and "when the preservation of Francis' work required thought, order, direction, he himself applied to the Church." Though the reform was aimed at conversion and salvation, "it was nevertheless all-comprehensive, including the natural as well as the supernatural, the material as well as the spiritual in man." All this is very well stated. The author does well to insist upon the part the Church took in the organization of the reform; but this is just the question that needs further elucidation in the analysis of St Francis' work. Father Dubois does not throw any new light on this important question; but his book shows a wide acquaintance with Franciscan literature, and his conclusions are generally sound. Fr. C.

IT will surprise not a few readers of Father Thurston's book, *The Stations of the Cross* (Burns and Oates), to learn that "the arrangement of our actual stations, though professedly made in imitation of a pilgrimage along the Via Dolorosa, owes less to Jerusalem and the Franciscan custodians of the Holy Places than to the pious imagination of a Carmelite friar who lived all his life in Belgium." Yet to Father Thurston the evidence for this conclusion "appears quite irresistible." Bishop von Keppler had already pointed out that our fourteen stations are derived directly from the *Theatrum Terræ Sanctæ* of Adrichomius published in 1584; but this writer, according to Father Thurston, undoubtedly borrowed from the Carmelite, Jan Pascha, whose book *La Pérégrination Spirituelle* was published at Louvain in 1563. Before this date there were various methods in vogue amongst the faithful of treading in spirit the way of the Cross, the most famous being that of the "Seven Falls" of Jesus under His Cross, from which we seem to derive the three falls in our present Stations. Curiously enough Pascha's Stations, which with some modifications have now become the recognized arrangement, differed very widely from the Stations at Jerusalem, which they were eventually to supplant even in the Holy City. How the Franciscans at Jerusalem came to accept the scheme of Adrichomius "in spite of the flat contradiction offered to it upon so many points of fact by a long succession of writers of the Order" is one of the remarkable incidents in the development of the devotion. In all probability the change was forced upon the Friars at Jerusalem by the great popularity of the fourteen Stations in Catholic Europe. And though the present arrangement of the Stations cannot be said to have originated with the Franciscans, the devotion to the Way of the Cross was chiefly fostered by them, and was a distinctive feature in their missionary labours.

Of all this Father Thurston treats with his usual thoroughness. It is not an altogether thankful labour that he has undertaken in setting forth the history of our popular devotions. The scoffer will quote his books to heap scorn on the simple piety of the faithful; and the devout will blame him as giving occasion to the scoffer. But in the long run such work as Father Thurston's will undoubtedly put our popular devotions upon a more stable footing. It is true that the value of a devotion depends not upon historical accuracy of detail but upon the loving piety it evokes. Yet in a correct knowledge of the history of a devotion lies many an incentive to piety. Few, we think, will read Father Thurston's book on the Stations without deriving edification as well as instruction from the reading. A devotion which has grown out of the souls of the faithful and their love of their Lord, as Father Thurston shows the Stations to have grown, is surely one of the spiritual treasures of the Church.

Fr C.

GENIUS is said to display itself in one of two ways—in complexity or in simplicity. The observer asks either "How could a mortal man have done so much?" or "Why could I not have done that myself?" It is certainly in the former of these two ways that the genius of M. Olier, founder of the Seminary of St Sulpice and *curé* of the parish, displayed itself. (*Le Ministère Pastoral de Jean-Jacques Olier*. Nouvelle édition, publiée par G. Letourneau. Paris: Librairie Victor Lecoffre. 1905.) He found a ruinous church, broken altars, an inadequate staff, a debauched and irreligious population; he lived through some of the most troublous years imaginable; he witnessed civil war in Paris, and the rise of Jansenism; both he and his church were the objects of personal violence; he suffered from continual overstrain, ending in paralysis and death; and yet he left behind him a work so vast that it is impossible to do more than name a few of its more important branches. Firstly, then, he founded the seminary which certainly in France, if not in the world, has done more than any other institution for the training of the secular clergy. Secondly, he established a system of schools which has become the undisputed model for all religious training of Catholic children. Thirdly, he organized parish work on a scale so huge that it may almost be called diocesan. Fourthly, he was an eloquent preacher. Fifthly, he was an unequalled director of souls. Sixthly, he did more than any other priest of his time (if not more than any either since or before his time) towards the conversion and sanctification of that class most difficult of all to affect—the court and society. (Surely, however, there is no good authority for saying, as this book does, that his effect upon Charles II was that that king "*fit en* 1665 *une abjuration secrète*"?) When, then, we consider all this, we are not surprised to learn further that his work among the poor was crowned with brilliant success, that he was particularly eminent in rescue work, charity organization and conversion of Protestants; and that his zeal, not in the least content with activities that should have killed a dozen men, extended itself in desperate eagerness towards the evangelization of Canada and the recovery of England to the Catholic Church.

Of course, the secret of this amazing and complex energy consisted in one very simple thing, as it always does—he loved the Lord his God with all his heart and his neighbour as himself. He was Curé de Saint-Sulpice for only ten years, and he died at the age of forty-nine.

The book is admirably put together, although presented of course in the annoying paper covers which come from France; but the style is easy and attractive, neither verbose nor contracted. One thing only we miss, and that is, unfortunately, a necessity of the case; for the outward activities of this astounding priest occupy all the available room: but it would have been instructive to know a little more of the lines on which his inner life moved. We are told that he was severe with himself; that he made an annual retreat of ten days; that his particular devotion was towards the Sacrament of the Altar and the Mother of God; and that patience, energy and courage were among the most notable of his virtues. But if it had been possible we should have liked to know more of particular features of his character. His face, if we may judge from the engraved frontispiece, was one of those which tell no secrets. B.

THE Library of Historical Theology, now in course of publication under the direction of the professors of theology at the Institut Catholique of Paris, is making substantial, if rather slow, progress. The latest addition is the second volume of M. l'Abbé Turmel's *Histoire de la Théologie Positive* (Paris: Beauchesne. 6 frs), which, covering the period between the Councils of Trent and the Vatican, deserves at least as hearty a welcome as was accorded to Vol. I of the same work. Owing to the enormous mass of material to be dealt with, the author, instead of ranging over the whole field of dogma, has found himself obliged in this volume to confine his attention to the two important questions of the Church and the Roman Pontiff. The result is a most interesting panorama, in which the course taken by the theological conflicts provoked, first by Protestantism and then by Gallicanism, is unfolded with great skill, clearness and even charm.

The picture drawn by M. Turmel is a vivid and inspiring one. We see the determined and vigorous attacks upon the doctrines and rights of the Church met by equally determined and successful defence; on either side champion follows champion, carrying on the fight with energy and skill. Occasionally we hear the shouts of triumph as some outwork seems to fall, when the defenders are obliged to forego a piece of apparently conclusive evidence from antiquity, proved by advancing criticism to be a forgery; and cries of disappointment, when the assailants discover that, after all, they have made no real progress in the work of destruction, and are as far from their goal as ever.

Above all the confusion of battle one figure, that of Cardinal Bellarmine, stands out pre-eminent. The debt that Catholic truth and Catholic controversialists owe to his immense labours in the field of positive theology has not always been fully acknowledged. No one, after reading M. Turmel's valuable work, can fail to recognize the enormous influence exercised by the great Cardinal upon the whole course of the long fight against the Protestant and Gallican opponents of the Church and the Papacy.

BETWEEN explanations of the Catechism and the Creed, however useful, and the numerous Latin manuals of theology, there has always been a wide gap, waiting for the man who, combining, in the necessary proportions, sound doctrine, knowledge of modern requirements, familiarity with the sure conclusions of the latest Biblical and physical research, and the necessary literary skill, should essay, with some hope of success, to fill it.

Father J. Souben undertook the task by publishing his *Nouvelle Théologie Dogmatique*. The recent appearance of Vol. III, *Les Sacrements* (suite). and Vol. IX, *Les Fins Dernières* (Paris: Beauchesne. 2 f. 50 c. each) has crowned his enterprise with success as complete as we dare hope for. He has, throughout, shown himself to possess in a high degree all the qualifications above set forth, and his cheap and handy volumes should find a warm welcome as well from the educated laity as from the overworked clergy.

The doctrine is sound, traditional, clearly expounded, solidly established, free from encumbering subtleties, and well adapted to the requirements of the modern mind in the freshness of its treatment.

B. M.

A Modern Pilgrim

A GLANCE at the sober pages of *A Modern Pilgrim's Progress* (Burns & Oates) dispels any expectations, which may have been raised by the title, of a modern Mr Great-heart depicted amid modern giants of dissent, disunion and higher criticism. The book is a record of independent study and thought, laying "no claim to originality." The individual experience is that of a woman who left England with her family at the age of fifteen, and led in a distant colony a healthy vigorous life, which promoted an eager search for truth in the intellectual thought of her time.

A chapter called "Science and God" pathetically describes the dark 'seventies, "days when it seemed that scientists ignored God and, dazed by the new-found wisdom displayed by creation, lost sight not only of the existence of God but of the dignity of man." This closes the colonial part of the narrative. The scene shifts to London. Herbert Spencer's philosophy was now searched as the outcome of a new knowledge for an answer to the new problems. "In the Labyrinth" describes a plunge into the religions and theosophies of London.

Father Sebastian Bowden has pointed out in his suggestive introduction to the book that "freedom from all mental servility" was the writer's safeguard in this search. But her mental outfit for truth-hunting in London omits the poets of her day. The large Theism of the Brownings forms a better basis for deep dogmatic belief than conflicting negations. Anyhow the writer was saved from the vague resignation to merely æsthetic ideals characteristic of unfaith in our day.

Coming to the study of Catholic claims and credentials, she gives us a view of Pusey:

> From Dr Pusey I received kindness but no help. I do not quite know how to express what I mean, but I felt that, kind as he was, he did not understand me in the very least. I felt that he thought me very wicked for having questioned the Divinity of Christ. Heavy on my heart lay the burden of doubt, and I felt that no such weight had ever crushed his. He seemed merely to view my doubts as unrepented sins, and not at all as difficulties; nor did he help me to overcome them. He recommended the study of documents. Per-

haps the fact that I had for years lived in a new country where everything is modern predisposed me to regard modern facts as more convincing than historical proofs derived from ancient documents.

Pusey's views on the Blessed Sacrament may be quoted:

> You cannot study diligently our Communion Service without seeing that it teaches the Real Presence. I have dwelt on this in a book, *The Real Presence the Doctrine of the English Church*, with a vindication of the reception by the wicked and of the adoration of our Lord Jesus Christ truly present. I should hope that you mistook both parties; that one did not say that it was "mere bread and wine," or that the other told you to worship the outward veils of His Presence. Christ is truly present, but there is no illusion of the senses; the senses are not deceived in what is the object of the senses, although they cannot report to us our Blessed Lord's Presence.

The Modern Pilgrim found her way into the Church through the preaching and final instruction of a French Dominican priest in London; it is regrettable that misprints make him unintelligible to most readers. The book is very remarkable for clearness of thought, depth of feeling and an unconscious power of self-expression.

A *Soul's Wayfaring*, by "Z" (Bristol: Arrowsmith. 1s.) contains the confidences of a married rector of the Anglican Church poured into the ears of "Z," a person interested in his conversion—so far a good plan of a story. But Romanus the rector poses for modernity; he courts publicity and is full of paradox. We suspect the influence of Huysmans' *À Rebours* in his mysterious experience of Satan's power to-day mixed up with mystic superstition. This is to be regretted, for the Somersetshire descriptions are fresh, and the narrative presents one more pathetic story of sacrifice for conscience' sake amongst the married clergy of the Church of England. B.W.C.

THERE is a curious dignity in the four *Portraits de Croyants* given us by M. Léon Lefébure (Paris: Librairie Plon-Nourrit). The sense of proportion is admirably kept; enough of detail is introduced to prevent the attention from flagging; but the representation is constructed on the larger lines of character, and the background is suggestive at once of human fate, of the constant conflict of the ideal with the actual, and of the supernatural revealed in glimpses of light from above. We are reminded of a great picture by Vandyke, in the foreground of which was the man portrayed as he was at his best, while the suggestion of helplessness in the face of fate was given in the darkness of the middle distance, and the heavy clouds above, and then, far off but predominant, the light on the horizon. But, like Vandyke again, M. Lefébure is almost too disdainful of the undignified and homely, and, though he is not a mere panegyrist, his natural vision sees much the same dignity of pose and gesture in all his heroes as did the great artist in his sitters.

But it must be allowed that there were salient points of resemblance in the men who vibrated to all the influences of the Catholic revival in France. They were born idealists, and it was in vain to ask them "to see only that which is, and to wish only for that which may be." Of the four amongst them described in this volume—the Comte de Montalembert, the politician; Augustin Cochin, the philanthropist; Rio, the great art critic; Guthlin, the thinker—each on his own lines was to be disappointed—constantly disappointed but never disillusioned.

The Comte de Montalembert was set aside comparatively early after a political novitiate of astonishing brilliancy; Cochin was obliged to fly from the populace of Paris, for whom his whole life had been spent; Rio could not get a hearing until many of his ideas had become public property; and the Abbé Guthlin was closely associated with the struggles and sufferings of his beloved Alsace.

It is because they were tried and not crushed, because with their eyes ever fixed on the vision of all ages, they yet believed in the good in the men of their own day and in the future, that we should seek their company, and strive to learn their great language of faith, and to put into practice their great principles of action.

"He was an enthusiast," writes M. Lefébure of the Abbé Guthlin in the last of his portraits; and the words are equally applicable to all four. "But it is from this over-flow of enthusiasm that the mass of minds oppressed by the *terre-à-terre* of life, or overtaken by disenchantment, are to find their nourishment." S.

THE "Robert Elsmere" of these days will not be able to take refuge in an ethical Christianity; not, that is, if he reads *The Religion of All Good Men*, by H. W. Garrod (Constable and Co.). The volume consists of five essays. In "Christ the Forerunner" Mr Garrod, Fellow and Tutor of Merton College, Oxford, shows that Christianity, even without dogma, will not and should not satisfy this generation. To this conclusion he is led, not merely by the intrinsic immorality of such principles as "the fostering of the feeble," but by deductions that result from an "open-minded" criticism of the New Testament. He is careful to warn us that he approaches the record of the life of Christ "from a frankly rationalistic standpoint." The following propositions indicate the nature of his conclusions.

1. Christ was the disciple of St John the Baptist, "a fact which the Gospels rather wilfully obscure."

2. Christ was himself but the "forerunner" of the Son of Man.

3. The imminence of the Parousia of this Son of Man was the principle and motive of Christ's ethical teaching.

4. "Can any moralist firmly persuaded of the imminent dissolution of the world and all things in it, frame an ethical code adequate for all time?"

The "religion of all good men" would seem to be no more than the love of father and mother, children, friends and home.

THE idea of the "Bibliothèque de l'Enseignement de l'Histoire Ecclésiastique" was conceived by Pope Leo XIII. Mgr Batiffol, Rector of the Institute of Toulouse, the general editor, and Lecoffre the publisher, are bringing students into touch with the critical labours of experts in the various departments of ecclesiastical history. Each volume is in 12mo and costs 3f. 50. *L'Église Byzantine de 527 à 847* by Père Pargoire is the ninth volume that has appeared. It treats of the history of the Church of the Eastern Empire from the accession of Justinian, in whose reign Byzantinism, a tendency which we should in these days call Gallicanism, became its dominant characteristic. The volume closes with the eve of the Great Schism. During this period orthodoxy was engaged in several severe contests: from 527 to 628 it had to struggle against Persia and Monophysitism; from 628 to 725 against Islam and Monothelitism; from 725 to 847 against Islam and Iconoclasm. The record of these conflicts forms the historical background of the three parts of the volume. Prominence is given to the growth of the pretensions of the Œcumenical Patriarch and hostility to the Papacy. The title "Œcumenical Patriarch" assumed by John the Faster is allowed to have been neither new nor in itself objectionable; but, as an indication of the spirit of opposition to the Papacy, Père Pargoire conceives that the assumption of the title gave real ground for the alarm of Pope St Gregory. In each of the three parts of the volume the author portrays with considerable detail the interior life of the Byzantine Church.

The whole constitutes a volume of sound historical work, everywhere based on documentary evidence and displaying literary skill and method. Considering that for the ordinary student the only source of information on the subject has hitherto been the hardly sympathetic work of Gibbon, it may be readily conceived that the labours of Père Pargoire have satisfied an urgent demand in the province of the universal history of the Church. Such is the excuse, if one were needed, which we would offer to those who consider a history of Byzantinism premature. F. R.

IN his book, *The Early Scottish Church: Its Doctrine and Discipline* (Sands. 6s.), Dom Columba Edmonds, O.S.B., gives a popular exposition of the doctrine and discipline of the ancient Celtic Church, with the object of showing the identity of that Church with the Catholic Church of to-day, and of refuting the claims of the various sects that pose as descended from it. It may be said that he has attained his object fairly well, when we remember that the limits he has set himself preclude the many details mentioned being treated at any great length. The book is in four parts. In the first, "Papal Claims," the ordinary proofs for the supremacy of Rome are concisely and clearly given. The second part sketches the apostolates of SS. Ninian, Palladius, Patrick, Kentigern and Columba. The third, "Doctrine and Discipline," deals with the Paschal controversy. This is the important part of the work, since it brings into clear prominence the fact that the keen dispute on this point was confessedly one of discipline only and that there was no matter of faith in question. It would, however, have been well to explain the difference between the Eastern Paschal controversy and that agitated in Britain, so as to show how groundless is the argument, relied on by some, to prove that Britain received her faith from the East and not from Rome. The fourth part, "Liturgy and Ritual Observances," speaks of the language of the Liturgy, the Cultus of our Lady, Prayers for the Dead, the Sacraments, etc. The references are full but sometimes secondhand. D. I.

THOSE who with Malcolm, son of Duncan, "delight no less in truth than life," will find both in *Simple Annals* (Longmans), in which M. E. Francis has given us studies of the lives of working women. There is the pathos of the little French dressmaker and the *bon gros* her husband; there is the exquisite old village Gamp, Mrs Angel, with cinder tea for new-born infants; there is Martha Lupton, who is "wonderful house-proud" even in the almshouse; there is the worldliness of Mr Brown melting before the tender heart of Tilly; there are the rival couples at "Cworting Corner," and a dozen other pictures, all charming, all living, all giving evidence of that great attainment, the art which has learnt to return to nature. S.

A SERIES of lectures given by Mr W. R. Inge in St Margaret's, Westminster, is now published (John Murray, 6s. net) in a volume entitled *Studies of the English Mystics.* Mr Inge writes on the difficult subject of mystics and mysticism in a sympathetic spirit, and with a sound judgement in criticism which gives one confidence in his ultimate verdict. That he uses mysticism in a very broad sense is manifest from his including Wordsworth and Browning amongst his English mystics. In Wordsworth's mysticism we are all ready to believe, but Mr Inge's claim is perhaps less easily accepted for Browning as a mystic

> in virtue of his profound belief in a perfect spiritual world in which all fragments are made whole, all riddles solved . . . . a tenacious grip of the concrete finite example, with a determination to make it illustrate and be illustrated by its ideal and spiritual principle. This is the method of the true mystic, and in all that includes human character this is the method of Browning.

We are more familiar with the spirit of such religious mystics of the fourteenth century as the Lady Julian of Norwich (as Mr Inge prefers to call Dame Juliana) and Walter Hylton. Mr Inge devotes a lecture to each of these and draws a charming fragrance from their writings. William Law is a less attractive figure than these two saints of the middle ages, but his claim to be a mystic is undeniable. The lectures are delightfully written, and one carries away from the reading of them many new ideas and a soothed sense of having conversed with saints. C. E. B.

IN *The Door of Humility* the Poet Laureate returns to the theme of his *Madonna's Child*, which is known to have been a favourite with Cardinal Newman. But while it is again the story of a lost faith involving the loss of a loved human being, this work is more ambitious and more intellectual in its aims than the early poem. It goes without saying that the sympathies and views of the author are in many matters such as we can in no sense approve. But the psychological interest of the poem is great. It is an exhibition of the mind of later life analysing "the aspirations and the difficulties of youth."

Monica, on learning that faith has gone from him, sends away her poet lover without a farewell interview, for she cannot trust herself to see his face and hear his voice; but he is given a tryst on the old spot by the little doorway to the village church where they are to meet again when the cloud of doubt has passed away.

> But, when you find yourself once more,
> Come back, come back and look for *me*,
> Beside the little lowly door,
> The Doorway of Humility.

The hero after this stern dismissal goes away, and for a time seeks help among the eternal snows in the Swiss mountains. This is not the most successful part of the poem, and we are reminded of William Watson's dictum as to Matthew Arnold:

The deep authentic mountain thrill
Ne'er shook his page.

But in Italy the poet of *Madonna's Child* is at his best. In the thirty-first group of verses there are some exquisite lines describing a festa where peasants

. . . hail to-day with blithe accord
Her feast who to the Angel said,
Behold the Handmaid of the Lord !

And one stanza must be quoted entire :

Too trustful love, by lust betrayed,
And by cold worldlings unforgiven,
Unto Her having wept and prayed,
Faces its fate, consoled and shriven.

Several pages, in which there is much charm of description, are devoted to Florence. There is a delightful artistic touch in the following verses, a most happy mingling of suggestion with realism in detail :

When mount I terraced slopes arrayed
In bridal bloom of peach and pear,
While under olive's phantom shade
Lupine and beanflower scent the air,

The wild-bees hum round golden bay,
The green frog sings on fig-tree bole,
And, see ! down daisy-whitened way
Come the slow steers and swaying pole.

The fresh-pruned vine-stems, curving, bend
Over the peaceful wheaten spears,
And with the glittering sunshine blend
Their transitory April tears.

O'er wall and trellis trailed and wound,
Hang roses blushing, roses pale;
And, hark ! what was that silvery sound ?
The first note of the nightingale.

We leave Florence with regret, and our anticipations are fulfilled. Our guide lacks the fixity of standpoint, and, in consequence, the steady and large sweep of thought that is needed for the treatment of the Eternal City. He is fairly confused by the multiplicity of his artistic perceptions, and in spite of some fine lines we almost echo the words of his hero:

In this Imperial wilderness
   Why rashly babble and explore?
O, let me know a little less,
   So I may feel a little more!

We have no space to journey on to Constantinople, Athens, and lastly to Delphi, whence a letter from the dying Monica recalls her poet—only to find her lying with lilies at her head and lilies at her feet, and a farewell letter to her lover upon her breast. There is much that is true and beautiful in Monica's farewell, and we do not wonder that the poet after reading it passed at once through the little door, "The Door of Humility," into the church to pray.

Mutely I knelt, with bended brow
   And shaded eyes, but heart intent,
To learn, should any teach me now,
   What Life, and Love, and Sorrow meant.

And there remained until the shroud
   Of dusk foretold the coming night;
And then I rose, and prayed aloud,
   "Let there be light! Let there be light!"

It is curious and symptomatic of the hastiness of the journalistic criticism of the day that the Poet Laureate has been supposed to have imitated *In Memoriam* in *The Door of Humility*. How a love story, a flight to distant lands, minutely and often exquisitely described, and the return "too late" to the death-bed of the heroine; how so wholly different a theme, written in a different metre, can be supposed to be imitative of the elegiac work of his great predecessor we wholly fail to understand. S.

IT will be curious to see how that small English public which prides itself on cosmopolitan sympathies will receive the work of Maurice Barrès. To readers who have been nursed in the lap of tradition and honour the very shadow of Greece, his *Voyage de Sparte* (Paris: Juven.

3.50 frs.) should be a shock and a revelation. They will learn, with a certain horror, that M. Maurice Barrès, de l'Académie Française, the young author of several works of extraordinary talent, and a master of language, exclaimed on first viewing the Acropolis from the Gulf of Athens, "Cette petite chose, c'est l'Acropole?"; and found that, when he came to define his first vision of Athens, it absolutely disconcerted him by its aspect of toy-like and oriental fantasy. Even when M. Barrès finally avows that the classic ideal has conquered him, he praises it in the tone of an enemy or, at least, of an alien. But such praise, if reluctant, has the advantage of bringing into sight hitherto unconsidered merits in the thing admired.

M. Barrès never tires of reminding us that by race, period and sympathy he is wholly un-Greek, and belongs rather to the Romantics. He enjoys himself most in describing medieval Greece, as in the chapters on the palace of the Dukes of Athens, his departure from Mycenæ in the suite of Iphigenia (but it is Goethe's Iphigenia!) and the golden burghs, among which is the château of Geoffroi de Villehardouin, where the Helena scenes in the second part of Faust certainly took place. He reconstructs the story of Antigone, giving a larger share in the action to Tiresias, in the part of subtle and meddlesome priest; and examines the conduct of Castor and Pollux, deciding, with some show of reason, that they were "a pair of terrorists." Yet finally the glory of Greece triumphs over the individuality of Maurice Barrès, and the chapter on Phidias and the "classiques matinées de Sparte" atones for many pages of perverse and wilful egotism.

Byron, Chateaubriand, Renan, Leconte de Lisle, have all shown us visions of ancient Greece, seen through the windows of their personality, so to speak; but in the *Voyage de Sparte* we have a fine view of Maurice Barrès against a classic background, by the light of classic tradition. Here is local colour indeed, but it is subjective, not objective: the colour of the man who gives the description, not of the thing described. Barrès is a "regional" writer, and he cannot detach his thoughts and memories from his native

Lorraine. His too is the resentful criticism of one who has been too much told to reverence and admire. Standing on the Acropolis, he remembers the words of Pericles upon those who fell at Salamis and Marathon, but he also remembers the mothers wailing for their dead.

> What did I find upon these famous rocks, in the midst of this sublime landscape? . . . A sense of hard and rather cruel perfectness, with an undertone of lamentation.
>
> To me Pallas does not represent universal reason, but municipal wisdom. You may hear her voice, clear-cut and resonant with chill common sense, in the dialogue of the Athenians with the men of Melos. "The strong must exercise their strength in oppression, the feeble their weakness in submission." Such would be the formula of the first beast of prey that learnt to speak.

In a word, M. Barrès would have us realise the often-ignored fact that the man in the streets of Athens, in the Golden Age, was neither Socrates, Anaxagoras, nor Pericles, but one who misunderstood and persecuted all three; and that, taken in the mass, the people of Greece were slave-holders, militarists and potential tyrants. To which a confirmed classicist might reply that it was perfectly true, but what did it matter? What concerns us and all humanity (he would say) is not Athens as she truly was, but the ideal we have made of her. For two thousand years and more we have woven a glamour about the olive-crowned city; we have dowered her with all our hard-won achievements of beauty and art, but in a measure of unattainable perfection; we have built in our hearts the invisible Athens which shall endure.

And it is to this Athens that M. Barrès bows the knee at last; he is touched with this spirit when he dreams of the beauty of Helen of Troy, when he exemplifies the splendour of Phidias by the maxims of Anaxagoras, and casts the light of Greek philosophy on classic perfection. R.C.T.

TO offer any recommendation of such a classical work as Möhler's *Symbolism* should be quite unnecessary. Yet the translation of that work (by James Burton Robertson. London: Gibbings and Co. Fifth edition. 6s. net) is only too likely to escape the attention of many readers. The work continues, and must continue, to be of very high value to those interested in theology. For the class of readers who find in the Latin of our manuals an obstacle to acquaintance with the scientific exposition of Catholic doctrine, it is invaluable; and even those who are familar with Latin treatises cannot afford to neglect the opportunity, afforded by Möhler, of contrasting the consistency of the Catholic system with the almost hopeless incoherence of systems that were built up merely to safeguard some pet theological, but heretical, opinion. "Consistency is not indeed truth itself, and doth not even supply its place; but a system of doctrine is ever false which includes parts inconsistent with the whole." Moreover, it is to be observed that since Möhler's death, John Henry Newman's *Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine* has directed attention to the relative and historical aspect of dogma; this fact gives to *Symbolism* a value which the author perhaps hardly anticipated. In his time he complained that "the most splendid talents spend their leisure, nay, give up their lives, to inquiries into the primitive religions and mythologies remote from us both as to space and time." It is well that we, too, should be reminded that the contexts of the sixteenth and later centuries have played an important part in the development of doctrine.

In Book II we find an account of English sects. A whole chapter is devoted to Quakerism, in which system the author notes "a consistency extremely pleasing and cheering." A few pages are given to Wesleyan Methodism. Of other English or Scotch sects there is hardly a mention, except so far as they reflect the opinions of the Lutheran or reformed communities. F. R.

IN his book on *Greek Theories of Elementary Cognition from Alcmæon to Aristotle* (Oxford: Clarendon Press. 12s. 6d.), Mr John I. Beare has attempted an exact and minute account of the opinions of leading thinkers concerning sensuous cognition from Alcmæon of Crotona, the Pythagorean (*c.* 500 B.C.) to Aristotle (*d.* 322 B.C.) Such an undertaking was rendered unusually difficult by the scarcity of materials concerning the earlier representatives of Greek philosophic thought, and by difficulties of interpretation with regard to all. The writer has accomplished his task with conspicuous success, showing throughout a calm and patient spirit. He would be the last to say that the inquiry is now closed; still his careful and lucid exposition cannot henceforth be neglected either by the historian, or by the professed exponent, of philosophy. The method is uniform throughout. Each of the typical exponents of ancient views, Alcmæon, Empedocles, Democritus, Anaxagoras, Diogenes of Apollonia, Plato and Aristotle, is allowed to speak for himself, the author acting as guide and interpreter. The book will prove of no small service for the comprehension of Aristotle, and also for a better appreciation of the scholastic position. H.P.

MISS Sichel in her *Life and Letters of Alfred Ainger* (Constable, 12s. 6d. net) has not fallen below the standard she set herself in *Women and Men of the French Renaissance*, or in *Catharine de Medicis*. As a biographer she has but one fault, and that a fault so much on the right side that it will seem to many a merit. She might have laid more stress upon the impression which his acquaintance and the general public formed of Canon Ainger, and less upon the charms he had for his many intimate friends. She was herself one of their number towards the end of Ainger's life, and, in consequence, her book is almost too intimate.

Miss Sichel quotes with approval Canon Beeching's statement in a preface to one of Ainger's books that "what interested him most in religion was the character of Christ—its power of satisfying every need of man." He himself came to regard sermons as his chief work in life. In earlier years he was a close disciple of Frederick Denison Maurice; as an undergraduate he wrote from Cambridge, "The more I see of the world, the more am I convinced that the great secret of the faithlessness of this age is in the separation of classes." Though what may be called the socialistic aspect of Maurice's teaching meant less to him as time went on, he remained to the end of his life a "Broad Churchman." Yet, for all his "breadth," his attitude to modern criticism was one of shrinking distaste. He expresses this feeling in some lines "On Reading a Volume of Modern Sermons":

With eager knife that oft has sliced
At Gentile gloss or Jewish fable,
Before the crowd you lay the Christ
Upon the Lecture Table.

From bondage to the old beliefs
You say our rescue must begin;
But I—want rescue from my griefs
And saving from my sin.

Another influence was strong in his youth and, as Miss Sichel notes, formed to some extent his career.

> Charles Dickens and Frederick Maurice sound incongruous names to couple, yet both played an equal part in his existence. . . This is no chance effect of his fortunate contact with the two men: it springs from a deeper cause. For they represent, as it were, his dual nature, the two distinct sides of his character which he always kept strictly apart: on the one hand the sober and spiritual, on the other the humorous and dramatic. In most complex persons the varied elements are . . . fused; . . . in his case there was no fusion; there was, instead, a clear-cut contrast, and his differing tendencies ran alongside of each other on parallel roads to the end.

With what is here called the "sober and spiritual" side of his character others in closer sympathy with his attitude towards Christian doctrine may be left to deal with elsewhere; with his humorous and dramatic side every complete human being must feel a delighted sympathy. His humour, we are told, was "of the school of Charles Dickens—broad, warm, high-spirited." How he himself conceived of humour and what was the quality of his own, may best be told in his own words:

> Wit, according to the definition commonly accepted, lies in the discovery of relations between words and ideas before unsuspected and unimagined. Its pleasure lies in surprises. . . Thomas Hood was a great wit, . . but his best wit merges into humour, transfused by his great gift of human kindness. Thackeray was feeling his way to a truer account of the matter when he said, "Shall we not call humour the union of love and wit?"

Ainger's own wit and humour, as we understand it from Miss

Sichel's book, came well within the definitions which he sketched in this passage; love at least was always an element in them. If in later years his graver qualities were uppermost and his brilliant sallies became less frequent, this was a deliberate abstinence, because, in the severe words he borrowed from Sydney Smith, he was convinced that the tendency of wit is "to corrupt the understanding and to harden the heart." But his humour never failed, nor his belief in the spiritual service which that gift can render. "Humour," he said, "is in the region of our intellectual nature what charity is in our moral; . . it is the power of understanding and appreciating the tastes, the prejudices, the likes and dislikes, the *humours* of others, and throwing over them that atmosphere of charity which makes men feel for one another . . . and understand how sacred and solemn a thing it is to share the common nature."

Some of his broadest and kindliest humour will be found in his Christmas letters to the Smith family—the Smiths of *Rejected Addresses*. Miss Sichel has noted that "very High Churchmen and very Low Churchmen were both distasteful to him, though ritualism came in for the larger share of his impatience." Something of this feeling appears in the story which he evidently invented as an "awful warning" for Jim Smith, who had just taken his first curacy:

> A clergyman, fond of artistic church furniture, lately gave out the following among the notices for the week: "I hereby give notice that on Sunday next the offertory will be collected in a new *Pair of Bags*, expressly worked for me by a lady of the congregation."

But that he had a standard of humour, more severe than most men maintain, to which he himself conformed may be gathered from his censure of the *Ingoldsby Legends* as "a specimen of a particular sort of bastard humour, the influence of which has been wholly bad, and this, apart from the fact that it is *au fond* vulgar and irreverent."

His devotion to his nieces and nephews whom he adopted, his delightful friendship with George du Maurier, to whom some of his best letters were written, his collective intimacy with the Smith family—all these elements in his life are made by the tact of a true biographer to contribute to a picture as near the original as may be. For in some admirable sentences at the end of the book Miss Sichel explains that he belonged to no main road either of time or of literature; that his gift was not for greatness, but distinction; that in the winding bypaths where he was wont to wander he will still be found by those who seek him, and will still speak to those who love him for what he is; and that, in a word, Alfred Ainger is the story of a personality more than usually elusive. C.R.B.

CATHOLIC REVIEWS
Home and Foreign

MORE than forty years ago Dean Stanley lamented the multiplication of periodicals. But the number in existence at that date must have been insignificant in comparison with the vast multitude now in circulation. And those who are disposed to disparage this class of literature will find greater reason for regret. Nor can it surprise us to hear complaints that there are far too many journals, that they are too much read, and that the time they occupy would be better bestowed on books. It may be admitted that much modern reading is sheer waste of time. But the invidious distinction is largely due to an illusion. The value of literature cannot be measured by the mass. A little book, or a paper in a periodical, may often be of far greater moment than many a big volume. And apart from this possibility of lighting on articles of rare merit and importance, the study of periodical literature has a further advantage. A book, as a rule, speaks the mind of but one man, who may meet with little response from his readers. A review, on the other hand, brings before us the thoughts of many minds, both of those who write it or conduct it, and of those who support it.

Were it only for this reason, a special interest attaches to the study of Catholic periodical literature. Here and there we may meet with some paper of importance, announcing some new discovery in the field of science or throwing some fresh light on obscure problems of history or theology. But in any case a survey of Catholic periodicals shows us the present tendencies of thought in the various nations in the circle of Catholic unity. It is not our present purpose to give any complete account of the Catholic reviews; these remarks must be confined to some twenty or thirty journals that happen to lie ready to hand. But these may well suffice to give some notion of the whole; for they come from all quarters, and speak in many tongues, and their character and contents are no less various. Some of them, like the *Civiltà Cattolica*, have already attained to a venerable age; while others, such as *The New York Review* and *The Irish Theological Quarterly* have but lately sprung into existence. The first may claim the respect that belongs to long experience and good service in the past: the growing number of young and vigorous journals is the surest token of hope for the future. Some of them are already known far and wide, and their names must be familiar to most readers. Yet we fancy that there are comparatively few who have a just conception of the wide range and the varied excellence of Catholic periodical literature.

In the first place we have a goodly array of theological reviews, specially devoted to questions of doctrine, to the philosophy of religion and to the problems of apologetics. Among these may be mentioned the philosophical annual of the Görres Society, *Philosophisches Jahrbuch der Görres-Gesellschaft*, which has been in existence for eighteen years and has already done good service to the Catholic cause; and the younger Italian organ of theological and historical studies, *Rivista Storico-Critica delle Scienze Teologiche*. In our own tongue we already have several excellent journals of this class, such as *The American Ecclesiastical Review*, *The Irish Ecclesiastical Record*, *The Irish Theological Quarterly* and *The New York Review*; while other organs of a more general character, such as *The Month*, *The Catholic World* and *The American Catholic Quarterly Review*, devote many of their pages to the problems of theology and apologetics.

Naturally enough it will sometimes be found that the same topic is treated from somewhat different standpoints in contemporaneous issues of the various reviews. As an instance of this, it may be of interest to take the great question which lies at the root of so many modern problems in philosophy, in science and in theology—the theory of development or evolution. This subject was ably treated by Dr Ryan, of Rochester, New York, in a paper on "The Church 'Semper Eadem,' and the Theory of Development," which appeared in the December number of *The American Ecclesiastical Review*. The title, by the way, is reminiscent of an enigmatic article which was printed in *The Month* some little time ago. But the American writer adopts a more direct method, and brings together some suggestive passages which show that the principle was present in the Church from a very early age. Dr Ryan naturally touches on the controversy of the seventeenth century, and pays a passing tribute to Petavius. "The theological world to-day has formed its opinion on the great Jesuit and his assailants. In the eye of history he looms larger than any theologian of the seventeenth century except the Oratorian, Richard Simon, the father of Biblical criticism."

While this important theory is thus made the subject of an historical study in the *Ecclesiastical Review*, we find it treated in a different connection in the pages of the *Revue Bénédictine*, where Dom Placide de Meester gives an interesting account of a Russian controversy on the question of doctrinal development, and shows us that even the ancient and unchanging East is being affected by the spirit of this age of evolution. "L'on comprendra aisément qu' à notre époque, tout éprise de progrès et d'idées évolutionnistes, ce probleme soit vivant, même dans les rangs des érudits orthodoxes." The paper from which this passage is taken is the first of a series of studies on the theology of the Oriental Orthodox Church. It is scarcely necessary to insist on the importance of this attempt to break through the barriers and make the Eastern theology intelligible to Western readers. And it is satisfactory to find that this is no isolated instance. For, as Dom Placide de Meester points out in introduring the subject, many journals in France and Germany and elsewhere, pay some attention to the theological works of Orthodox writers. One of the foremost in this matter is the aforesaid *Rivista Storico-Critica delle Scienze Teologiche*, which regularly gives its readers an account of Russian theology.

It will be seen by this that while each of the Catholic reviews has its national character, they do not fail to take an intelligent interest in the work done in other lands. The most remarkable instance of this cosmopolitan interest is an Italian Catholic review devoted to the study of social science and kindred subjects (*Rivista Internazionale di Scienze Sociali e Discipline Ausiliarie*). Besides its leading articles and notices it gives an account of the contents of all the chief foreign organs.

Among the most important contents of current Catholic periodicals may be noted the Greek life of St Athanasius of Mount Athos, which is printed, from a MS. of that Monastery, in the January *Analecta Bollandiana*. It is edited by Père Louis Petit of the Assumptionist Order. In the *Revue des Questions Historiques* Père Ayrolles writes on Joan of Arc, a subject on which he is an acknowledged authority. The same may be said of M. Paul Allard, who has a paper on the expansion of Christianity in the period of the persecutions.

The April number of this excellent historical review opens with a paper which should have a special interest for English readers.

Home and Foreign

Much has been written of late on the subject of the sixteenth century revolution in religion. But we do not remember that any one has hitherto taken the standpoint of M. Trésal, who treats of *Les Responsabilités de la France dans le Schisme Anglican.* Possibly some readers may be at a loss to imagine the nature of these alleged responsibilities; but M. Trésal is able to give ground for holding that his own country was not wholly free from blame in the matter. For in England, as elsewhere, political interests were an important factor in the change of religion; and although it is difficult to speak with certainty on a question of possible contingencies, it may be said that Henry would hardly have taken the bold line he took in the matter of the divorce and risked a rupture with Rome, if this course had been fraught with grave political dangers. It seems clear that, but for the part played by France, the perils involved in this policy were more than enough to restrain a bolder man than Henry. The Emperor, Charles V, the natural champion of the claims of Catherine of Aragon, was then at the height of his power, and if England had stood alone, Henry could not have afforded to affront him. As M. Trésal reminds us, the King knew better than anyone else that he had neither fleet nor army to match with those of Spain, and that the population of his kingdom barely reached four millions, while the Emperor held sway over sixty million subjects. It was only by playing off France against Spain that Henry was enabled to pursue his bold policy with impunity; and it is clear that he was helped and encouraged in his course by the support of the French alliance. It was one of the first results of this alliance that Henry was enabled to marry Anne Boleyn without exposing his kingdom to the anger of the Emperor. In his opening words M. Trésal connects this grave responsibility of France with the Association of Prayers for the Conversion of England, appropriately founded nine years ago in Paris.

Like its Italian counterpart, the *Civiltà Cattolica*, the *Etudes* generally represents the more conservative school of contemporary Catholic thought. Though much of it is devoted to uncontentious topics of literary and historical interest, it can scarcely surprise us to find that its pages are occasionally stirred by the blasts of theological controversies. On most of these questions the journal itself appears to pursue a decided and consistent policy; but by the courtesy of its conductors, if not by the legal right of rejoinder, readers are often enabled to see the other side. Thus, in three recent numbers we find authors replying to the strictures passed on their writings. Some few months ago Abbé Dimnet wrote an article in rejoinder to a review of his recent volume on Catholic Thought in England.

Catholic Reviews

In one of the March numbers we find Père Lagrange taking exception to some remarks of Père Brucker, in particular to a suggestion that the learned Dominican, while allowing that the results of scientific research must be controlled by the teaching of the Church, did not seem in practice to take sufficient account of her decisions. On this Père Lagrange observes:

> Et j'attends la preuve que dans dans la pratique je ne tiens pas suffisamment compte des décisions de l'Église, à moins qu'on n'appelle décision de l'Église l'opinion toute factice que les PP. Billot, Schiffini, Murillo, Fonck, Delattre, Fontaine, Dorsch, Coubé, s'efforcent de faire prévaloir.

Here, as in the case of the Abbé Dimnet, the answer is followed by a rejoinder on the part of the Jesuit critic. In the number of April 5, Father George Tyrrell writes a vigorous yet withal dignified letter of protest against the article on March 5 on his *Lex Orandi.*

Another French fortnightly review, *La Quinzaine*, is in many ways one of the brightest and most attractive of the foreign Catholic periodicals. Its articles deal with a wide range of subjects, religious, literary, social, historical. A special interest attaches to that which opens the number of May 16, "Les Romans de M. Robert Hugh Benson." This is a critical appreciation of the two historical romances, *By What Authority?* and *The King's Achievement.* It is a piece of delicate and discriminating criticism, such as might be expected from a French pen. But the critic, M. Ducrocq, is not content to consider the merit of the books as works of literary art, or to compare them with the novels of French or English masters of historical romance; beyond the books he sees the personality of the author and the religious condition of England. This leads him to give his readers a sketch of Father Benson's career, together with some account of the work done by other members of his family. English readers may notice some slight mistakes in details, as for instance when Archbishop Benson is said to have been "le premier des Cowley Fathers." But they cannot fail to be struck by the French critic's power of appreciating English literature, and the Catholic's sympathetic treatment of Anglican religious activity. The paper may be taken as a pleasing proof of *l'entente cordiale.* We note with satisfaction the announcement that the books are about to be rendered into French, Spanish and German. M. Ducrocq's account of the author and his work should secure them a warm welcome from French readers.

FOR TRUTH OR FOR LIFE

The Via Media. By Cardinal Newman. New edition. Longmans. 1901.
The Way, the Truth and the Life. By F. J. A. Hort, D.D. Macmillan. 1897.
The Oracles of God. By W. Sanday, D.D., LL.D. Longmans. 1902.
Apologia pro Vita sua. By Cardinal Newman. New edition. Longmans.
The Arians of the Fourth Century. By Cardinal Newman. Longmans.

CARDINAL Newman has truly said that the positive sciences as bearing on the interpretation and explication of theology and Scripture are a comparative novelty in the Church. Theology was long a purely deductive science for which verification was regarded as almost impossible. Now it is, at least in many instances, otherwise. Historical and critical science has begun, in many cases, to test its conclusions. If, with some of the earlier scholastics, we prove from the nature of the case and by deductive argument that the ceremony of the "porrection of the instruments" in ordination is essential to the validity of Holy Orders,* the historian may correct the deductive theologian by shewing that, as a fact, it was absent in early ordinations; and this correction is now generally accepted. If theology makes us interpret the indefectibility of the *Ecclesia docens* in such a way as is inconsistent with the possibility of the mass of Bishops failing at any time to be active guardians of orthodoxy, history corrects the interpretation—as Newman does in the fifth appendix to his *History of the Arians*—by an exhibition of the facts of the Church of the fourth century, when, for nearly sixty years, the Bishops were wavering and divided, and important Synods received Arius into communion and condemned St Athanasius. Such corrections, rare in earlier days, are now being rapidly multiplied with the advance of historical criticism. So, too, with archæology and Biblical criticism: beliefs which were universal when we had no instrument of discovery beyond tradition and the deductions drawn by fallible man from the broad outlines of the Christian revelation and from the *consensus* of the Fathers, are necessarily modified as the methods for apprehending documentary evidence attain an effectiveness quite unthought of in pre-scientific days. In his later years the Cardinal used to say that the situation would best be met by the creation of a commission of experts in these departments, to report on those conclusions in the positive sciences of which theologians should take account. And it is the recognition of this necessity in the functions of the Biblical Commission now sitting in Rome that makes its existence especially interesting.

---

* Even as late as 1613 the Carmelite Thomas a Jesu maintains as the truer opinion that Oriental orders are invalid, because given without tradition of instruments.

The work of which we speak is in point of fact the continuation under modern conditions and with modern knowledge of such labours among Catholics as the researches of Mabillon and the Maurists, and of Mabillon's biographer Ruinart, the author of the *Acta Sincera Martyrum.* In later days the Bollandists also have devoted themselves to critical studies. It was, as we have often been reminded, within the Church that Biblical criticism was inaugurated by Richard Simon, and the critical study of Christian origins and of archæology has had in our own time representatives of the first rank in Rome itself in such men as Duchesne and de Rossi. If the conservative theological tradition has had, especially in the Eternal City, the strength of a long undisputed sway and of extreme definiteness, the vigour of those forces which must eventually modify some of its conclusions must not be overlooked.

The three names we have mentioned remind us that there are three departments especially in which the science of criticism is at work correcting or modifying traditions long received without question among us. Besides Biblical criticism, there are archæology and the study of early Christian history. Such questions as Father Thurston dealt with in the January number of this Review—the authenticity of the traditional holy places—have grouped themselves into a science apart. And the critical study of early Christian history continues that correction of long-accepted traditions as to the constitution of the Early Church which New Testament criticism begins. In all these departments it is universally admitted that the tradition handed down does need correction here and there, if it is to correspond with the probabilities brought to light by the experts, and even with facts ascertained by them beyond doubt. The degree of revision is still a matter of dispute, and in this, as in all such matters, there will always be the more conservative and the more progressive school of thought. With such differences we are not for the moment concerned. We propose to speak of the principle represented in the correction of tradition apart from the details of its application.

It cannot be disguised that the prospect of revising cherished traditions which have been bound up with our own devotional life and with that of our fathers is in the eyes of many a very unwelcome and dangerous one. The revision is sometimes made on the strength of a still very incomplete science. Its students have the rest and staying power of settled convictions disturbed by brilliant hypotheses, many of which prove, one after another, after all untenable. It is urged that to open questions largely insoluble, yet so far capable of scientific investigation that doubt is thrown on beliefs which were long the basis of Christian devotion, is a mischievous task. Even where conclusions are reached with some approach to certainty, the objection largely holds. The change is unsettling, and the new belief is probably less inspiring than the old. The man who has gone on a yearly pilgrimage to the Holy Shroud at Turin feels himself to have derived no benefit from the news that the experts have given up its authenticity. He has lost a source of devotion to gain a barren truth. So too one who has had a devotion to the sixth Station loses much and gains nothing by learning that the story of Veronica is not critically tenable. The Roman pilgrim loses much and gains nothing by being unable any longer to ascend the Scala Santa with the belief that it is identical with the steps of the Pretorium. Such investigations are a pursuit of truth, no doubt, but they damage inspiring sources of devotional life. Nay, if the process is carried on extensively in all three departments, the very springs of religious life may be in danger. And if that life has an inseparable connexion with real though unanalysed truth, it may be that in making explicit some new departmental truth, a larger or more fundamental latent truth, the hidden basis of religious life, is really obscured in the living mind. Burke said in effect, Keep your prejudices, for if you root them out, certain truths also, which in our imperfect minds can only be effectively grasped with the alloy of prejudice, will go too. Thus the reckless champion of unalloyed truth is, it is urged, the foe of those truths which can only be preserved *with* alloy. The mass of Christian tradition, it is argued, is such a compound. Thorough-going criticism, which the scientific critic who has no belief in Christianity rightly hails as gain for truth, may therefore for the Christian mean loss in spite of the truths it incidentally brings.

Be it observed this is no obscurantist position. It does not deny that criticism leads to partially true results. But it says that the constitution of the *human mind* is such, and the nature of our hold on supernatural truth such, that the mutilation of the traditional form in which our Christian faith has been assimilated, may destroy for some their hold on Christianity and lead to its abandonment. To use a homely simile, the process is like trying to teach a golfer of fifty years old a new and better style. With keen interest he masters the defects of his old style, and perhaps succeeds in getting rid of them. But at the end of his efforts he finds that he can't learn the new, and in place of driving a fairly long ball with a half-swing and a faulty stance he can't drive at all.

Let us say at once that our own conclusion is on the whole in the opposite direction from that which is indicated in this objection. Yet we think it a very important objection, and one which should have a practical effect on our dealings with modern criticism in all its departments.

One reason alone is sufficient to make the objection untenable in its extreme form. Whatever is true for the generation that is passing away, whose habits of thought are formed, it is certain that for the rising generation a thorough study of lines of criticism which are occupying the attention of the thinking world is necessary on the very ground taken up by the objectors themselves. The suspicion that Christian thinkers cannot face the problems of the day will be as fatal to the faith of the younger as the most disturbing speculations can be to that of the older. Moreover, their mental attitude is yet to form, and it must be formed by all the truth that is available. Let the golfer of fifty keep his half-swing and his other defects, but if we want good golf in England we must teach the young to play with a full swing. If that which tells for truth does not tell for religious life where it involves dislocation of vital belief without reconstruction, it does tell for life when reconstruction is possible and when the alternative is a suspicion that theology and religious faith can only live by a want of candour.

In our present paper we propose first to illustrate the contrast between the beliefs that tell for truth and those which tell for life, not in religion only, but in other spheres, and then to make some suggestions as to the bearing of the contrast on the problem sketched above, which we hope later on to develop.

J. S. Mill, in his autobiography, tells us of the paralysis that came for a time over his energies from suddenly realizing how little would after all be achieved, if he carried through all his projected reforms successfully. The anecdote is really most significant of a fact in the lives of us all. It is an element of idealization, which is in its measure illusion, that gives zest to all our work, and makes life active and useful. The bare truth is rarely inspiring. Youth is the time of illusions—and of fullest life. Love is full of illusions; yet it is the source of the most utter devotion, and is said by the poets to be stronger than death. The tree of knowledge has been from the first distinct from the tree of life. A student idealizes the science to which he has devoted all his energies. Let him live among those who value his researches and confirm his sense of their importance, and great results may ensue. Let him live, on the other hand, among those to whom its importance appears infinitesimal among the varied activities of life, and little by little, if he is impressionable, he grows slack. Is so much labour in so limited a sphere really worth while? he asks himself. Yet the realization of the comparatively small place his science holds in the estimation of the men of the world is a real gain in his knowledge. It tells for truth, but it tells against life. Few departments have seen more enthusiastic illusion among its devotees than the Higher Criticism itself. It is their great exaggeration of its possibilities, and their sanguine pursuit of hypotheses which time, the parent of truth, eventually reduces to comparatively modest limits, which has been the life of critical science, both in its masters and in their disciples. Again, the cast of mind of a Hamlet is a far-reaching illustration of the same distinction. "Sicklied o'er with a pale cast of thought," a man's energies are paralysed by too much analysis of the truth.

Yet in some of these cases it is perhaps not so much that truth is antagonistic to life, but that the particular truth is so—that it needs supplementing by higher and wider truth. "A little knowledge is a dangerous thing." Perhaps if Mill had looked at the matter in another way, if he had realized what thousands working persistently for such aims as his in every generation would do in ameliorating the conditions of mankind, by example as well as by achievement, he would have once more found his inspiration. Again, to know that this or that *coterie* of men of the world takes a science cheaply is a truth; but it is equally true that others whose opinions carry greater weight in such a subject do not. The worth of a science is appraised by a higher mind than is represented by average public opinion. Again, the illusions of the Higher Critics are the motive force which urges them on through many failures to success. Truth emerges in the end, and it would not have been reached but for a sanguineness beyond the sanction of true judgement in each instance, yet justified in the long run in the interests of truth itself. Thus the argument amounts to little more than this—consider the organic structure of the living human mind to which truth is to be administered; select as far as may be both your audience and your truths; have regard to the misleading effect of some knowledge on the imagination; consider the interests of life as well as those of truth. When Silas Marner found that the lots did not convey the judgement of a God of truth, he ceased to believe in God. Religious life was gone when once the accompanying illusion was discovered. Yet we could hardly wish him to keep the flagrant superstition attaching to his earlier belief. The shock of disillusion was like a physical shock, and belief was wrecked as a whole. It was probably the manner more than the matter that was fatal. There is no reason to think that a wise teacher could not gradually have cured his superstition without destroying faith, though the tension of the moment and the absoluteness and unity of his whole belief made the actual result fatal.

The line of thought here suggested does then go so far as this—that the greatest care should be taken in dealing with all men as to how the pursuit of truth should be made a real gain for them. In other words, the educational standpoint should never be lost sight of. The interests of life must be considered even for the sake of the increase of truth itself, in this or that man. Studies should be distributed and taken in order. An omnivorous reading of all speculations and researches no more tends to wisdom or real knowledge than an unrestricted diet tells for health.

But when the contrast between the interests of truth and of life is invoked in favour of simply avoiding the critical studies which are so much *en evidence* on the ground that they disorganize our existing convictions, it is only a sound argument for individual cases. The unintellectual mind is simply unable to grow and thrive on such diet. And narrowness or long-formed habits may be a similar bar. For the Church at large, however, those questions must obviously be considered which press on the intellectual, and which will come home to ever-increasing numbers as years go on; and for the great majority the interests of truth and of life are both essential according to the measure of each man's capacity. And, be it observed, the argument of the timid may most easily be reversed. The sense of the unreality and untrustworthiness of a belief which has long shirked all adaptation to the science of the time may come with a sudden force which will kill life. Illusion, it is said, was with Silas Marner necessary to faith. But it may be put in the opposite way. The discovery that faith had been bound up with falsehood involved both in the same ruin. In the long run honesty is the best policy. A serious operation frightens some by the immediate risk to life; and it may for a time lessen vitality through a long convalescence. But the doctor may know that it is the only road, and a fairly secure road, to the restoration of real health. The life that is preserved by its avoidance is a doomed life.

While, then, a consideration of the interests of truth and of life points to the necessity of Christian experts in Biblical studies, it also leads to the conclusion that the Christian or Catholic critic is not in the same position as the non-Christian, and especially the naturalistic critics, and this for two reasons:—Firstly, as the latter begin with no presumption that the Christian faith represents a belief in truth at all, they have not the same reason for considering that great care in the pursuit of critical research is a duty in the interests of truth itself. They do not believe, as we do, that truth is for Christians in possession, though bound up with incidental illusion and inaccurate knowledge, and that consequently the critic's business is, if possible, to avoid dislocating the existing mental equipment of the Christian, while correcting it. Secondly, naturalistic axioms almost inevitably colour their presumptions. We need as allies and guides those to whom the interests of the Christianity in possession are dear as the interests of the research in prospect.

On the other hand, the great Anglican critics to whom both interests are equally precious are in this matter our close allies.

Three names stand out among these critics—men whose work largely coincided with the time when the Higher Criticism first took form in its more aggressive shape under Baur and Volkmar—we speak of Lightfoot, Westcott and Hort.

Dr Hort is perhaps less famous as a critic pure and simple than the other two, but as a comprehensive thinker on the whole situation he is the greatest of the three. His attitude was a remarkable instance of boldness and prudence. We may differ from him here and there; some of us may think the degree of correction which the positive sciences will make in older traditions less far-reaching than he does. But there is deep wisdom in the general lines of his treatment of the question from which all Christians may learn. He dealt with the general situation created by the new criticism in the lectures—delivered some thirty-five years ago—on "The Way, the Truth and the Life." He saw from the first that Christians must of necessity take their share in the new critical movement, and that it must inevitably change beliefs hitherto generally received among them. On the other hand, he was equally clear in regarding this as no revolutionary movement, but as the natural—even inevitable—development of the older theology and tradition; the truer analysis, the intellectual correction, of a tradition in different degrees sacred in its various parts. He urges, in the lectures to which we have referred, that the preparation of mind given by the older and less critical theology, far from being a bondage or a subjection to mere superstition, was in itself a valuable training for the faculties, in the absence of which looseness or over-great suppleness would have ensued. The alternative to an over-definite belief would have been not a higher wisdom, but a ready subjection to the false rationalistic maxims, which are just as truly unproved traditions as are the most rigid forms of inherited orthodoxy.

Independent judgement is braced by an honoured sacred tradition which we consciously desire in a spirit of reverence to correct; it is destroyed by the unconscious identification of the false maxims of the hour with the decision of unbiased reason itself. A fatal want of candour ensues from this latter attitude. We canonize as the sacred truths of the new era naturalistic axioms which derive their influence and currency in reality, as Cardinal Newman said in his essay on the "Development of Religious Error," from the "mutual cheers and *imprimaturs*" of the brilliant opponents of supernatural truth. Dr Hort writes as follows on this subject:

> The subjection to early teaching was or should have been no bondage at all, but the one indispensable condition of a strong and timely growth. Without the regimen of a fixed and prescribed form of truth the faculties run riot in premature licence, and gain nothing but disablement for effective operation hereafter. Nor is the influence of a tempered authority in matters of truth less salutary after the first or second probation is over. The air is thick with bastard traditions which carry us captive unawares while we seem to ourselves to be exercising our freedom and our instinct for truth. The traditions of the hour or the age are as indubitably external to us, and as little founded of necessity on freshly perceived truth, as any traditions of the past. The danger of them lies in their disguise. The single negative fact that they make war on some confessed tradition prevents us from discovering that they too draw their force no less from an authority, until it is too late and we have lost or damaged that power of independent vision which is but braced and harmonized by a known and honoured tradition.

But more than this. We may regard a historical community marked by a definite spirit as having in some sense a continuous life of its own. And so regarded the Christian Church may have needed all that early preparation of vivid though uncritical belief, fruitful in good works, to give to the community the steadfast habit of faith that is needed for intellectual work which must without such steadfast faith be unsettling. We have the example of all the roll of Christian heroes in the past to strengthen our sense of the reality of their creed and to nerve us in facing fully all the adverse theories which the subtlest disbelievers in its reality have drawn from historical documents. What, again, our predecessors owed to the support of tradition and authority we can see; nor do the corrections which are now coming in the details of their beliefs enable human nature to dispense with those great safeguards against a weak and vacillating individualism.

For Truth or for Life

> If now, by a voice which cannot be disobeyed, [writes Dr Hort] the Church is summoned to know as truth what it has hitherto chiefly held as sacred tradition, the prospect may seem as alarming as when the disciples learned that the Teacher's voice would soon be no longer heard among them. We might well be alarmed if we could believe that either the former supremacy of authoritative tradition or its impending decline were without a purpose in the counsels of God. Perhaps we are none of us yet in a position to estimate rightly how much we have owed to that long-continued externality in the form of truth which there is a strong temptation to condemn as inherently vicious. But this much at least we can see, that it has enabled the Church to be nourished by its inherited store from age to age, while it was engaged in other tasks not less necessary for its active work in the world; and that it has deferred this more difficult task of ascertaining the full value of the inheritance till the maturity procured by that long and varied education.
>
> Nor must it be supposed that tradition and authority can ever become useless in matters of truth. In any state of things which we can at present conceive, a large proportion of the members of the Church must still for the fundamentals of their belief be in a state of partial tutelage. Nay, perhaps those who are themselves best exercised in unwearied and courageous search will be the readiest to profess how much they have been helped throughout towards clear and dispassionate vision by the gracious pressure of some legitimate tradition or other authority, into the limits of whose jurisdiction they had seldom occasion to inquire.

Thoughts like these may lead us to make the following generalization as to the safeguards which should ensure the study of modern criticism being really helpful in the cause of truth. Such study needs a preparation of mind which should make it a growth and not a revolution in our mental constitution. And that preparation is largely given by a full realization of the philosophical depth of the principles embodied in the historical Catholic Church, and by understanding the normal place of the new knowledge in her polity.

After the destructive thought of the eighteenth century the greater thinkers of the Romantic school in Germany and France did an invaluable work by showing the deep philosophy which really underlay the old conservatism. In our own country it was Coleridge notably who analysed the profound, though long partly subconscious, thought implied in the dogmatic principle and Christian tradition. He showed that a revision of the details of the tradition need not mean the abandonment of those deep principles. John Henry Newman, in his Oxford University Sermons, was urging similar thoughts, and it was from others that he first learned that much of what he said had been already said by Coleridge. It was these profound truths perceived by many concurrently as telling for traditional orthodoxy in its various degrees which won so many great thinkers for the Catholic Revival. It found a place for Biblical criticism—as we know in the case of Coleridge himself—without abandoning the great philosophy underlying the New Testament teaching and the whole of Christian theology. It won the respect of John Mill himself—the protagonist of the anti-traditional liberalism. To that liberalism indeed it gave the deathblow in the domain of philosophy.

It is the full realization then of the philosophy of traditional Christianity which we would urge as one indispensable preparation for a study of criticism which should not be destructive or paralysing in its effects on the mind. And for this reason we have already dealt with it in one form or another in this Review. Power of adaptation without loss of essential identity has marked Catholic Christianity from the first. To represent Catholic theology as irrevocably committed to forms of expression shaped by acute minds before the considerations brought forward by modern criticism were known, is, we hold, disrespectful to those minds themselves, many of which were unquestionably deep and wide. Had they known what research has since brought to light they would have written differently where such research is relevant. Once the mind realizes the depth of the philosophy underlying Catholic dogma, and the place naturally held in the scheme by critical science, the revision of old positions ceases to have a revolutionary or destructive tendency. The existence of the Biblical Commission bears witness to this place. To revise our conclusions with the assistance of well-balanced criticism which takes account of modern research is merely, as we have often urged, to treat the knowledge of our own day as the greatest medieval theologians treated the knowledge of theirs.

A second preparation is an obvious one—that critical studies should be gradual and thorough, that is to say, not a mere accumulation of startling results, but a gradual reaching of those results through the appropriate methods. Even the most familiar conclusions of New Testament critics, which distress no student in our own day, would, the present writer feels, had they been baldly put before him in his youth *en masse*, have upset his mind, and come upon him as a triumph of the freethinkers over the orthodox. The able young seminarist who cares for Biblical *exegesis* now knows that the *comma Johanneum* is only found in two Greek texts, and those comparatively modern, and not earlier than the fourth century in a Latin text. The supposition that it is a gloss would be for him, therefore, far the most natural and the most helpful even to his faith. He is accustomed again to the idea that the story in St John's Gospel of the woman taken in adultery is held by most critics of repute to be a marginal transcription from another source. He knows that many critics reject the last twelve verses of St Mark; he knows that parts of St Paul's Epistle to the Romans and of the second to the Corinthians are given up by many. Were he called upon to accept all these conclusions, and many others, it would not try him in the least. But in days when such conclusions were regarded (as they were in the present writer's youth) as part of an insidious attempt to undermine the Scriptures, when the best Christian apologists took the defensive side as part of a battle *pro aris et focis*, then to proclaim the critics right all along the line and the defenders wrong would necessarily with many minds have come as a shock and as a suggestion that "the rationalists might after all be right in their attacks on the whole of Christianity." And in communities in which such views still prevail, the result may be similar.

Both the preparations I have named have come to the rescue. The place of criticism in orthodox thought is now allowed; thus there is no suggestion that its discoveries are, as such, triumphs over the Christian theology. Moreover, the modern seminarist learns his conclusions as part of a gradual study of the subject in place of having startling results held at his head like a pistol and accumulated for rhetorical effect.

Again, the general work of preparation is helped by such works as Dr Sanday's lectures, *The Oracles of God*, written with the express object of preparing the mind for inevitable changes.

And one point Dr Sanday urges which has special connexion with the theme of this essay. We have dealt with the loss of life attendant on intellectual perplexity begotten of novel theories, and the consequent destruction of inspiring illusion. Dr Sanday turns the tables and points out the gain of life in that full reality of apprehension of the great personalities of the past which honest critical reconstruction brings:

> We are beginning to feel the warmth and the life and the reality come back to those pale and shadowy figures. Isaiah and Hosea and Jeremiah no longer walk in a *limbus patrum*, but we see them as they were among the forces by which they were actually surrounded. We see what they were as men; we see what they were as exponents of a message from God; we see the grand and glorious ideas which stirred within them in all their richness and fullness, conditioned, yet not wholly conditioned, by the world of thought and action in which they moved. We see these ideas linking themselves together, stretching hands as it were across the ages, the root-principles of the Old Testament running on into the New, and there attaining developments which may have been present to the Divine Mind, though they cannot have been present to the human instruments whose words went and came at its prompting. The famous saying of St Augustine had a deeper sense than even he imagined for it. The New Testament was latent in the Old, not merely in the sense in which the type might be said to embrace the thing typified; the Old Testament is patent in the New, not merely in the sense in which one series of events may be said to reflect another, but by a more vital and organic connexion. The further inquiry goes, the more impressively does it appear how much the leading ideas of the New Testament had their way prepared for them, and by what strict continuity of growth they spring out of the leading ideas of the Old.

The same growth of the life-giving sense of reality enters too into our appreciation of much of the teaching of Scripture. Doubtless later definitions have brought a growth in the intellectual or theological interpretation of various texts. But as an artist may fill in details in an oil portrait and yet lose some of the genius of the face which he caught in an earlier charcoal sketch, so too some of the living genius of dogma may be lost to one who reads Scripture mechanically and sees in its texts only later definitions. Here again the sense of reality which criticism brings may be a source of new inspiration as well as of new accuracy in our knowledge.

> The form of abstract dogma was not [writes Sanday] the form in which they were first promulgated, but as living, pulsating, moving truths, which came from the lips of Prophets and Apostles with genuine inspiration, and which carried their inspiring power with them wherever they penetrated. I cannot help thinking that the critical and historical way of looking at the Bible is calculated to win back some of this inspiring power. It takes them out of the region of abstractions and puts them again into relation with life. But life is the true generator of life. Let us see the fabric of divine revelation rising up around us as it really rose; let us see its different parts one after another in contact with the actual crises of history; let us observe them working like leaven in some of the strongest, grandest, richest of human personalities, an Isaiah or a St Paul; let us observe them swaying the fortunes of nations and masses of men; let us mark how the light first dawns and then broadens; how the formative force which God has implanted in His revelation draws into its vortex, absorbs and assimilates first this and then that element of extraneous or secular culture; let us trace the mighty purpose which runs through the ages down even to our own time; and it seems to me that both our hearts and our imaginations must be kindled and inflamed to the very utmost of their capacity.

Such words open out an encouraging side of the prospect which undoubtedly we need. For criticism in all the departments we have named will undoubtedly bring much danger with it, danger especially for the half-hearted who, dismayed at the prospect, will not seriously attempt that personal preparation of thought which we have insisted on as necessary for all who would enter on the new fields of knowledge. For them the fallacy of extremes is especially to be feared. From shutting out new thoughts from their minds as temptations of the evil one, they may in the end admit them so completely and uncritically and with so little preparation of mind that such thoughts may in fact amount to temptations. Here as elsewhere a policy which hesitates on the broad lines it should pursue may be fatal. New learning may be excluded and allowed to become inseparably and exclusively allied in the individual mind with anti-Christian rationalism. Then, when it becomes irresistible, it may force an entrance and bring in its allies with it. It is in the interests of avoiding such a catastrophe that so many would welcome the serious pursuit of Biblical studies in Rome itself and the encouragement given thereby to its thoroughness in Catholic universities and seminaries. And the suggestions of Dr Sanday remind us that *C'est le premier pas qui coute*. There is now a body of conservative critical reconstruction especially in New Testament criticism which to those who frankly study it gives new life to the events described, that life which comes of acute mental realization of facts. Here is the new guardian of the interests of life. It is the hesitation between the old and the new, when the new is really ripe and ready, which most inevitably brings paralysis and doubt.

That the prospect is simply a cheering one even for those who face the new problems most frankly we are far from affirming. Perplexity and difficulty exist for them also in their measure. But to face such difficulties is the duty as well as in some cases the trial which many are called upon to accept in the interests of the Church at the present hour. It is, as we have implied, the severe and anxious operation, which will endanger lives perhaps, but without which stable and healthy life is in the long run impossible. Anxiety indeed for the Church herself the divine promise forbids. But faith may die in communities and even in countries, and if we think of those whose future is largely our own, we have a full measure ready for us of work to be done without flinching, of immediate anxiety, and of ultimate hope that those for whom we most care may come through from the trial stronger Christians.

Let us once again listen to the wise words of Dr Hort:

> The enterprise is full of peril; yet its peril is but the inverted image of its promise. If we accept the command to "prove all things,"

and "hold fast that which is good," we must be prepared for the possibility of having to cast aside at last, after the most patient and watchful trial, this or that which we have been accustomed to receive as true. How far the loss, if it comes, will be other than a semblance of loss, or how far it will be outweighed by unlooked-for gains, we may not know. Assuredly many will take part in the trial unversed in all the needful discipline, enslaved to inappropriate modes of investigation, ignorant of what patience and watchfulness mean, reckless meanwhile in inflicting wanton injury on all forms of human welfare except the one or two which circumstances have enabled them to appreciate. Assuredly many a weak or hasty soul will be stricken with spiritual palsy, and many a strong soul with sadness, while the work goes on. Yet so it has been in every great crisis of the Church by which the kingdom of God has made a swift advance. If we stop to count the falling or fallen, no battle will ever be won.

This passage was written when the peril seemed in some respects greater than it does at present; when destructive criticism was rampant, and before comparatively conservative criticism had attained its present strength. But we may well bear Dr Hort's exhortation in mind as noble words which should strengthen us at moments when the outlook may seem most full of difficulties, whether from the intellectual problems of the hour or from the hesitation on the part of some Christian thinkers to meet them frankly and courageously.

One last word. Cardinal Newman in one of his latest works—the preface of 1877 to the *Via Media*—pointed out that there have been throughout the history of the Church three interests represented in her polity: the interests of truth, of devotion and of stable and wise rule. These are all essential to the Church's life, but the three interests often clash, and at different periods one or other have suffered. When the Cardinals, sick of intrigue, called a holy hermit from his cell and made him Pope Celestine V, they had found a saint to whom the devotional interests were all in all. But he could not rule, and had to resign. When in the thirteenth century the craze for Aristotle and the Arabian philosophers was rampant in the centre of Catholic learning—the University of Paris—intellectual freedom and unrestrained speculation among many of the University professors and their pupils bred scepticism and killed devotion. When, on the other hand, the rule of the Church was in peril at the Reformation, the degree of freedom needed for the wider intellectual interests of Catholics was found dangerous. The fear that Catholics would break with the Church if they were influenced by the new doctrines led to a more or less repressive system. These are familiar facts. But they contain a lesson of faith and patience which is worth pointing out. So long as we realize that these three interests are all recognized by the Church as necessary for her life, then if one of them for a time suffers we may possess our souls in patience. The faith of the simple need not be tried when work on behalf of intellectual analysis leads to new and unfamiliar paths. The faith of the men of science need not be tried when those are in power whose care is chiefly for the interests of devotion or of rule, or of both, and who consequently make the intellectual work done among Catholics for a time ineffectual. Each man will regret that interests specially dear to him should suffer. But so long as we realize that their claim is recognized by the Church in the long run, the temporary neglect of one of these interests for the sake of the others should at most try the patience rather than the faith. For this reason we have insisted on the sanction given to the claims of criticism by the functions of the Biblical Commission sitting in Rome, apart from the details of its proceedings at any particular period of its existence. For the former is what is important from the point of view we are considering. The latter will vary according to the *personnel* of such a tribunal and according to the importance attached at the moment to thoroughness and candour in research. The destruction of the old Sorbonne dealt a blow at thoroughness in theology. But it did not take from the Catholics the support of the recognition in the continued existence of the theological schools of the claim of the human intellect to give within certain limits a rational account of the tenets and outcome of revelation. The importance of the work of theologian and critic is recognized in principle by the authoritative theological and critical tribunals. And this suffices so far as the interests of faith are concerned. Their efficiency will rejoice in one generation, their defects will sadden in another the devotees of these sciences. But such excellencies and defects do not affect the testimony borne by their existence to the value of the interests they are appointed to guard.

THE REPORT OF THE RITUAL COMMISSION

IT would be an endless task to consider in detail this voluminous and technical report, and would require besides a legal knowledge of which I am not possessed; neither would it be interesting except to experts. It is more effective, therefore, to take a broad view, and attempt to diagnose roughly the alleged disease for which remedies are now proposed, the remedies themselves, and to prophesy cautiously as to the probable result. In this attempt it will be necessary, of course, to utter many platitudes.

And first the patient. Generally speaking it may be said that the Church of England includes three schools of thought, each representing a tendency dogmatically irreconcilable with its companions. That these are not practically irreconcilable is evident; for they have hitherto managed to exist in external communion; and there are not wanting those who say that their co-existence is the glory of a National Church. These persons, too, claim with considerable reason that they alone fully represent the spirit of that Church, since her body possesses these various members. Public opinion, however, is against them; and the result has been this Ritual Commission. These schools of thought may be designated and described as follows.

(1) *The "Ritualists."* It is the claim of these that the Church of England consists of two provinces, unfortunately separated from the external communion of the rest of the Catholic Church through a series of misunderstandings that had their beginning in the sixteenth century. It is their aim to restore ultimately that communion on what they call "Catholic terms"; and these terms include a recognition, at least conditional, of their Orders on the part of Western Christendom, and on the same part a repudiation of the doctrine that the Bishop of Rome is the divinely (not only ecclesiastically) appointed head of Christ's Church, external communion with whom is essential to participation in the merits of Christ's visible mystical Body.

Meanwhile, however, they claim to interpret their formularies in the light of Catholic law and custom. The Church of England, they premise, is a member of the Catholic Church; therefore she cannot intend to dissent from the doctrines or even the universally established ceremonies of that Church; they remain, therefore, in their present communion on that understanding only.

(2) *The "Moderates"* include the majority of the laity, large numbers of the clergy, and practically all the bishops. These believe that the Church of England is indeed a member of the Catholic Church; but they hold an altogether different view as to what that membership involves, a less respectful attitude towards the rest of Western Christendom, and a more emphatic opinion as to the rights of their own communion. "Every . . . National Church," they quote from Article XXXIV, "hath authority to ordain, change and abolish ceremonies or rites of the Church ordained only by man's authority"; and they further maintain that the very facts that she has composed dogmatic articles at all, some of which repudiate "Romish" doctrine; that she at least acquiesced in such significant changes as the abolition of stone altars, and, during about three hundred years, of Mass vestments as well—these prove that she claims also to dictate doctrines to her people that differ very materially from those of the Roman Church, from which she has externally been separated.

(3) *The "extreme Protestants."* These, roughly speaking, repudiating the whole of the Catholic Church, the Churches of the East and the greater portion of the Church of England as hopelessly tainted with falsehood and heresy, remain only within their present communion on the understanding that she is essentially Protestant and anti-Roman. For a steady witness to pure truth they look rather to the nonconforming sects than to the speaking voice of their own mother in these days; but they value extremely the privileges and significances of Establishment, holding that the dissolving of the bonds would be little less than national apostasy.

Now it is a great tribute to the wide comprehensiveness and tact with which the Articles and Prayer Book were compiled that clergy of these three parties have been able for so long to subscribe to them conscientiously, and to claim, each for his side, that his tenets are there authorized; but, as is perfectly natural, after a series of conflicts, the matter has come to a head. The impression has been made upon public opinion at last that all three cannot be right, and, further, that the centre party of the three is the most entitled to its claims. Further again, in practical politics the extreme Protestants are a negligeable quantity owing to their fanatical *intransigeance*, and the matter has settled down into a duel between the Ritualists and the Moderates, both parties of whom include, of course, various degrees of partisans. We may neglect, however, once more, those who fluctuate between the two, and make up our minds that the question, briefly stated, is as follows: Is the Church of England to be considered by her adherents an integral part of the Catholic body in such a sense that she has no individual rights except those of denying the Papal supremacy *jure divino*, of asserting the validity of her own Orders (for these two points appear to be absolutely necessary for her self-justification), and of modifying certain other wholly unessential details of discipline and practice, such as the married state for her clergy, the liturgical use of the vulgar tongue, and so forth? Or is she an entity rather than a dependent member, with rights to modify not only ceremonial significant of doctrine, but doctrine itself, so far as in her opinion it has wandered from primitive truth, and to base herself, not on the living voice of the rest of Christendom, but on the ancient utterances of the undivided Church as expressed in the Catholic creeds and understood in her sense?

Now we return to the Report; and it will be simpler, I think, to consider this from the point of view of loss and gain on the part of these two sections of the Church of England rather than to treat of it in itself.

First, then, the Ritualists are to be congratulated on a really important victory. They have succeeded after fifty years of continuous struggle in defeating to a large extent the purely Erastian wing of their adversaries. In '74 the unfortunate Public Worship Regulation Act was passed by Parliament with the cordial co-operation of the ecclesiastical authorities, and the result has been one of vastly increased difficulty. This Act reconfirmed the existence of a lay tribunal, representative of the Crown, for the final deciding of spiritual matters; and the Ritualists have never ceased since that moment, and indeed from the Gorham Judgement of 1850, to combat it with all the zeal at their command, which was considerable. "Spiritual courts for spiritual cases" has been their unbending maxim. Now, for the first time, the justice of their claim has been at least partly acknowledged. It is true that the substitution suggested, if it is carried out, will be far from satisfactory, for not only is the individual Bishop armed with greater powers both personally and in his diocesan court, though deprived of his power of vetoing suits brought against his clergy, and, to some extent, of judging the assurances given him by repentant and deprived clergymen, but even the court of final appeal remains primarily a lay tribunal as representing the Crown.

Two concessions, however, are suggested, and it is in these that the victory of the Ritualists will be seen to lie: first, the lay judges forming that court are to be *bona fide* members of the Church of England; and secondly, in cases of doubt respecting doctrine or ritual "not governed by the plain language of documents having the force of Acts of Parliament," recourse is to be had to the archbishops and bishops of the two provinces, and the opinion of these is to be adopted as final. This is really a very significant recommendation and marks a great advance from the old position when, at a time when Church and State were practically one body under two aspects, the judging of spiritual causes by lay judges was scarcely even resented; and the advance is wholly to be credited to the growing zeal and spirituality of the ever-abused Ritualists, who have consistently opposed the Erastianism of the former situation.

There is a second qualified victory also to be set down as at any rate probable to the Ritualists' account, and the nature of this is somewhat elaborate, turning, as it does, round a rubric that is exceedingly difficult of interpretation. Briefly the story is as follows.

Immediately before the opening of the Morning Prayer in the Book of Common Prayer are printed, among others, these words: "The chancels shall remain as they have done in times past. And here is to be noted that such ornaments of the Church, and of the ministers thereof, at all times of their ministrations, shall be retained and be in use, as were in this Church of *England*, by the authority of Parliament, in the second year of the reign of King *Edward* the sixth." Now round the question of these few lines an enormous controversy has raged; its main points are as follows. The Moderates have ever maintained, with the support of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, that this rubric has been largely superseded by some "Advertisements" of Queen Elizabeth issued in 1566, with the result that while Edwardine church ornaments are legal, the Mass vestments are not. The Ritualists on the other hand cling altogether to the rubric, and repudiate the "Advertisements," with the result that they all claim the Mass vestments, since these were in use under the first Prayer Book of Edward VI; some of them, able historians too, asserting that the rubric does not refer to the first Prayer Book, but to a prior date, claim that all "pre-Reformation" vestments and ornaments are legal; and others that, since these ornaments are legal, the use of them also is legal, even though all services in which they could be used and all references to them in the Prayer Book are wanting. As a single example of this, the censer will suffice. This was used in the "second year" of Edward VI; they say, therefore, it must or at least may be used now, even though there are no explicit directions for its use. This is not nearly so impossible a claim as might appear, since it is notorious that the conforming clergy at the end of Edward's reign were compelled by the scantiness of explicit rubrics to guide the conduct of their services to a large extent by the old traditions. Incense, for example, did not altogether cease to be used merely because there was no rubric enjoining it.

Now, roughly speaking, the bishops have tacitly permitted the claim of the more moderate Ritualists, and have not, at least for many years, insisted on the strict observance of the Advertisements, with the result that there has been a double practice. The Moderates have been content with the surplice, the Ritualists, although with a general sense among the uninstructed and the Erastians that it was contrary to law, have used the Mass vestments unimpeded. Now at last a drastic reform is proposed, skilfully fenced about with spiritual sanction, namely that Convocation shall be empowered to draw up a new rubric which shall be enforced by Parliament, thus cutting at once this almost inextricable tangle.

Now this point is not so unimportant as it may look, for with it is tied up the wholly vital question as to in what "continuity" consists. To the Ritualists the Mass vestments are an evident symbol that the Church of England intended to retain the doctrine of the sacrifice of the Mass; to the Moderates their disuse during three hundred years is an evidence that "the sacrifices of Masses . . . were blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits."*

All, therefore, turns upon the nature of the rubric that Convocation will frame, if indeed this recommendation is carried into effect; and it is in this that it seems that the partial victory will be with the Ritualists, for, although they repudiate the legality of the surplice only at the Communion Service, it is practically certain that the rubric will at least permit explicitly the use of the Mass vestments, even though it equally certainly will not universally enjoin them, and thus that shadow of illegality, that to many minds still lies over their use, will be finally removed.

Now those two points are, as well as I can see, the only advantages gained so far by that extremely zealous and devoted party; and they are far from small. On the other hand, those gained by the Moderates are very much more considerable.

First of all, if these recommendations are carried into effect, it is certain that a large number of ceremonies, usages and doctrines especially repellent to the Moderates will at once cease to be practised and taught. I say this deliberately, for I do not see how it will be possible for the Ritualists any longer to evade the new spiritual sanctions on the one hand and the civil power on the other. The Church of England is now, practically for the first time since Tudor days (or, at the best, Caroline), to be endowed with a really living and articulate authority. It is her spiritual courts that will pass judgement, and the final appeal in matters of doctrine and ritual (and all these sub-points will presently run up into that sphere) will lie to the archbishops and bishops of the two provinces. Supposing that a Ritualist should refuse obedience, he will no longer be liable to imprisonment with all its advantages, but he will be deprived and rendered incapable of holding any further office in the Church of England unless he satisfies his Metropolitan of his firm purpose of amendment. Hitherto deprivation has involved a process from which bishops naturally shrank; henceforth it will not be so. This will surely also make it clear that all the various theories of jurisdiction hitherto maintained will no longer serve the rebellious cleric, unless indeed he returns to a view certainly held once by a few of the Tractarians' descendants, that the conferring of Orders includes a conferring of practically universal and inalienable jurisdiction; and that is scarcely possible at this date. Clergy who continue to teach and practise these condemned doctrines and ceremonies will find themselves without churches or houses, without authority of any kind to preach or minister the sacraments, and capable of restoration only on condition of a complete submission.

---

* Art. XXXII.

Among the condemned points are the following—and they are condemned in such an emphatic manner by the unanimous vote of the Commissioners as to leave no doubt as to their future fate, if the recommendations are carried into effect—The blessing and use of holy water; Tenebræ; the blessing and lighting of the Paschal Candle; the Elevation; genuflexion before the Sacrament; interpolation of the Canon of the Mass; public reservation; Benediction; solitary and simultaneous celebrations of the Communion; celebrations without communicants; children's Eucharists; the invocation, in hymns or prayers, of the Blessed Virgin and the Saints; the "superstitious" use of images; the observance, practically, of All Souls' Day and Corpus Christi.

Now, many of these things involve doctrines to which Ritualists are pledged, and in such a way too that, in their eyes, the condemnation of the sign is the condemnation of the doctrine. Compared with the large mass of the clergy, those who practise all these things are a very small minority, and even those who practise any of them are not numerous; but they are numerous enough and, above all, zealous and effective enough to render this condemnation a very considerable matter. It will be difficult, too, at this date for those who believe the doctrines involved to return to the old position of "reserve in imparting religious knowledge"; it is too late for that; and this clear challenge, if carried into the lists, cannot fail to have a very wide-reaching effect upon that growing body of silent partisans who have been taught for years past that practically the whole faith of the Catholic Church can be held and loved by loyal adherents of the Church of England.

Secondly, the Moderates have gained a great victory in the reiterated assertion of, and the practical support afforded by the Commissioners to, the "entity-view" of the Church of England, together with the emendation of the old Erastianism that for so long has made that view intolerable. It is not too much to say that if the Recommendations are carried into effect, the view of the constitution of the Catholic Church held by many thousands of English Church people will have to undergo a radical change. If they continue to adhere to any theory of the Church's visibility, they will either have to hold that the Church is a kind of federation of States, with immense power conferred upon each State, even to the point of disusing one of the three great Catholic creeds—a kind of loose conglomeration of independent limbs without a visible head; or they will have to make their submission to some coherent body with the belief that such a body—whether the Church ruled by Peter or the communion of Canterbury—is practically the sole authorized representative of Christ's institution. The "Province theory" will no longer be possible. In a word, then, they will either have to return to Georgian or Caroline conceptions on this point, or become Catholics.

Thirdly, the Moderates will have gained a great victory if, as is practically certain, a better understanding is brought about between Parliament and the bishops. It is not too many cooks who spoil the broth so much as cooks who differ as to their respective duties in making it; we get now too much sprinkling of pepper, now too much dilution with water. This is what has happened in the past. Church and State have not understood one another, and, as the Commissioners observe, discipline has completely broken down in consequence. This has had a further paralysing effect upon the hands of the Moderates, who after all (to mix our metaphors) hold the reins; for they look far more for help to the State than do the Ritualists, who are content with the hearts of their people. But this, it seems, is to be changed; for Parliament, in spite of its blunderings in the past, has never, except spasmodically, really wished to interfere, and will surely welcome its new office of Compeller-in-general, so long as it is satisfied that the ecclesiastical authorities are on the side of order and homogeneity.

Now, besides these definite gains on either side, there are a number of points which, while not far-reaching in themselves, yet serve to show the general trend of the Report almost as clearly as the more directly significant criticisms and suggestions.

First, there are the statements as to sins of omission—and it is to be noted that these, as well as certain unauthorized additions, so far as they are practised by the Moderates, are placed under the heading of non-significant breaches of the law. Such things as the omission of daily service, of service on Ascension Day and other holy-days, of catechizing, of announcement of fast days, and the placing of the elements upon the Communion table at the beginning of the service—these are all said to be "non-significant," and are all practised by the Moderate party exclusively. But under this heading there are made two explicit exceptions, namely, the saying to the communicants of only the first part of the words of administration, and the omission of the Ten Commandments, divergences followed almost exclusively by the Ritualist party, and both qualified in the Report by words to the effect that the first has a "doctrinal aspect," and that the second is "clearly suggestive of a desire to assimilate the service to the ancient form prior to the Reformation." This, to an impartial critic, seems very significant indeed. The Ritualist asserts, with a great deal of reason, that the Moderates' omissions and additions are anything but "non-significant." They are, indeed, non-significant of precise doctrines, but this is just because it is not characteristic of Moderates to be very precise; and it is this very lack of preciseness that to the Ritualist's mind bears the taint of heresy. To omit holy-day services and daily service is, in truth, significant of a contempt of the entire liturgical system, of an implicit denial of what may be called the objective aspect of prayer and even, to some extent, of the continuity theory. And it does indeed seem that in this heading, as well as in the two exceptions before mentioned, we have a very clear indication that the Commissioners do not really hold the balances even—in other words, that they assume the Moderate position and issue their Report from that standpoint.

The impression is further deepened by other points. The Commissioners express a desire for elasticity, and in fact make a definite recommendation in the matter; but they do not appear to contemplate any steps being taken except in the direction of such "non-significant" changes as the regulation of harvest festivals and hymns, dedications of churches, and the extremely significant change of the partial abolition of the *Quicunque vult*. There is no hint held out that any of those ceremonies so strenuously condemned, such as *Tenebræ*, which one would have thought was significant of very little except an intense and loving devotion to the Passion of our Saviour, or some form of Catholic devotion on behalf of the faithful departed—for these, it seems, there is no hope. It is true that they deprecate these practices for the extrinsic reason of their tendency to assimilate the mind of the worshipper towards Roman Catholic methods of worship, rather than for any intrinsic evil inherent in the ceremonies themselves; but does not this again tend to show even more clearly that the root-idea of the Moderates is the root-idea of the Commissioners—namely, that preciseness is alien to truth, that superstition is more deadly an evil than incredulity, and—what follows inevitably from this principle—that the Roman Catholic Church as a representative of preciseness is more to be feared than the swamp of an undogmatic creed, towards which Moderate Churchmanship has always tended to direct its steps?

And, once more, this impression of the standpoint from which the Commissioners speak is yet further deepened by their treatment of the *Quicunque vult.*

They begin by an appearance of severity. "The disregard in whole or in part of the rubric which directs that the Creed of St Athanasius shall be sung or said on certain feast days at morning prayer instead of the Apostles' Creed" is denounced as "an important breach of the law"; but after this statement, and a quotation of the resolutions of Convocation to the effect that this symbol had at any rate best be made less prominent, they proceed to include the question of its treatment among those which may profitably be discussed during the debates on behalf of elasticity. Now, this again is surely significant, and gives some shadow to the Ritualist's complaint that a clergyman may be anything so long as he is not too zealous, too certain in his faith, too explicit in its proclamation, too faithful to the practice of centuries, too distrustful of popular innovations. A preacher may be silent or faltering on the doctrine of Virgin-birth, but he may not urge sacramental absolution; a *ceremoniarius* may dedicate dolls and puddings, but he may not go in procession on Corpus Christi. In other words, the Church of England has an elastic mouth for the assimilation of new and unheard-of devotions so long as they are significant of nothing in particular; but she clenches her teeth when the confessedly harmless ceremonies of three hundred years ago are proffered to her, for fear that she should grow too much to resemble that ancient body with which she claims identity of life, and of which she retains the revenues and buildings.

All this, however, is not our business. Perhaps the Commissioners are right in their view of the Church of England; indeed a Catholic can hold nothing else; but it is certainly difficult from the severely reasonable standpoint to dispute the Ritualist's contention that if that Church is a part of Catholic Christendom and can trace her descent, as even the Moderates are eager to assist her in doing, from the Church of St Aidan, St Augustine and Warham, she should be more friendly to her younger self, more ready to gather up what she once threw away in panic, and more distrustful of such innovations as tend to separate her from the hole whence she was digged and to unite her to those who have repudiated both her authority and her creed.

There is left the consideration of future events. And here we are on extremely delicate ground. The Report has been received characteristically by the two parties in question: with superb contempt by the Ritualists, with a pathetic welcome by the Moderates. The *Church Times*, which is more or less representative of the former, remarks that it is all very interesting to see what honest and unimportant gentlemen think of such matters; the *Guardian*, which is by now very nearly the official organ of the ecclesiastical authorities, commends heartily this attempt to give back a voice to the Church of England, and expresses itself "sincerely grateful to those who have had the insight and the courage to propose it."

There is no doubt that for the present these respective attitudes will continue, but the question is, What will happen if the identical authority (namely, Convocation and Parliament) which framed the Prayer Book gets to work on its revision? Certainly a Parliament such as the present, returned as it is in the interests of Dissent, will oppose any scheme calculated to strengthen the Establishment; but this Parliament is not eternal; and ultimately, no doubt, the Tories, who generated this Commission, will see that it is not wholly ineffective. The Church of England too, which, as we have seen, is in the main Moderate, undoubtedly welcomes the measure, and the Archbishop of Canterbury, himself one of the Commissioners, has announced his intention of setting about the task with unmistakable purpose; in fact, we may even expect in the immediate future one more widespread episcopal campaign against the more extreme practices condemned in the Report. But this latter is comparatively unimportant; it may succeed in pruning the Ritualist exuberance, but it will not touch the life of the tree itself. The real struggle will come if the Letters of Business are issued, and Convocation begins to handle the matter.

The struggle will be round three points: the spiritualizing of the Courts' authority, the Athanasian Creed, and the Ornaments Rubric.

As regards the first, the Ritualists have no case. It will be impossible for those who have clamoured to be treated as Catholic priests by Catholic bishops to resent the granting of that request; and not the most ingenious among them will be able to argue that the mere civil sanction of Parliament vitiates the new discipline, for this would strike against the principle of Establishment under any circumstances whatever. There will be protests and even recalcitrance, but these will not be far spread. Far more serious will be the conflict on the other two points.

As regards the Athanasian Creed, it will be remembered that such a sober divine as Dr Liddon threatened retirement into lay communion, if it were tampered with; but it is not likely that his more passionate disciples will be content with this. We shall see, I think, a number of secessions from the Anglican Communion altogether, if this symbol is, as seems very probable, relegated to an obscure position. I say that this act seems very probable, since even the most advanced of the bishops, such as Dr Gore, who cannot be accused of dogmatic indifference, has pronounced in favour of it to some extent.

But again, since symbols that affect the visible aspect of worship and are, too, deeply significant of doctrine, are apt to impress themselves upon the mind even more vividly than verbal documents, I think that the hottest and loudest of the conflict will be round the Ornaments Rubric. The result of this conflict will be, in my opinion, as I have already said, that the Mass vestments will be made permissible under such conditions as that a majority of the communicants in any church desires their retention or introduction, and this will no doubt satisfy many minds. But to others who regard principles rather than predilections, this step will resemble an apostasy. It will no longer be possible to assert that the written formularies of the Church of England demand the use of the vestments and imply therefore the sacrifice of the Mass, and this, I think, will lead to further secessions in considerable numbers. Clergymen will say that the newly-organized worship is not that to which they vowed adherence, and, owing to the very theory of nationally-distributed discipline which they hold, it will not be a difficult step to assert that the branch of Christ's Catholic Church established in England has withered, and that her candlestick is removed. It will not mean that Christ's general promise has failed, for "Western Christendom" still remains faithful.

Lastly, the suppression of other practices, especially those affecting the Sacrament and the doctrine of the invocation of saints, will not only cause immense distress, but will strike a direct blow at the theory of the "Church Diffusive," to which so many Ritualists cling. The condemnation of these things will yet further emphasize the gulf that separates England not only from Rome but from the Eastern Churches which, like the Anglican Communion, maintain that Catholicism is not dependent upon communion with the Pope; for it will be impossible to claim any longer that Canterbury is at one with Moscow on these points. Already the recent unconditional re-ordination of an Anglican clergyman in America at the hands of the Orthodox authorities has been a hint in this direction.

Briefly, then, I believe that the result of these recommendations will mean a loss to the Church of England of many of her most zealous children, but, on the other hand, an increased centralization among those who are left, and a restoration to a large extent of that discipline and homogeneity which the commissioners desire. But if this is not so, if the Ritualists are sufficiently strong (which, however, I do not believe) to turn the Convocations their way, to retain (if it is retention) the enjoined use of Mass vestments with the merely permissive use of the surplice, to keep the *Quicunque Vult* in its present position, and to extend the increased elasticity provided by the new regime in the direction of ancient Catholic devotions, then we may be quite certain that Disestablishment is not far off. England certainly will not bear any further "Romanizing" of her national Church, and will prefer a hundred times over the severing of the ancient bonds rather than the knitting of any new ties between her and the rest of Western Christendom. If the Ritualists, then, are sufficiently numerous and united to make a good fight of it, and at the same time really desire to retain their position in the Church of England, it would seem that they cannot do better than to throw all their weight into the scale of Disestablishment. They could not be worse off than in the hands of Parliament, and they might be a great deal better.

And, as the Mother of Saints regards the gathering preparations for battle, like Mr Meredith's Muse of History, she "compresses her lips."

ROBERT HUGH BENSON

ÆNEAS SYLVIUS AND NICHOLAS DE CUSA

Symbols of the Renaissance

The History of the Popes from the Close of the Middle Ages. From the German of Dr L. Pastor. Edited by F. L. Antrobus. London: K. Paul.

Niccolò di Cusa e la Direzione Monistica della Filosofia del Rinascimento. G. Rossi. 1894.

Nikolaus von Cusa und M. Nizolius als Vorläufer der neueren Philosophie. Von M. Glossner. 1891.

IN the readjustment of political centres at the Renaissance nothing is more remarkable than the disintegrating force of the national spirit acting in diverse ways upon the same general position. And in the world of religion the chasm that then first severed North from South has not yet been bridged; for it is still difficult to find a common term between the point of view in Italy, Spain and part of France, and that in England and Germany. The one most inadequate theory is that which supposes North and South to have been divided on a question of classical as opposed to evangelical learning. This may indeed be the later and more superficial expression of the contrast, but the root of the division lies deeper.

Symbols of the opposing points of view may be found, when the opposition was still only implicit, in the characters of Nicholas Khrypffs and Æneas Sylvius Piccolomini. Both were leading scholars of the same date. They were fast friends, yet the impressions they have left upon history are very different; they thought themselves to be toiling for the same ideals, yet the issue of their work was in opposing factions. Both began their lives as humanists, both assisted at the Council of Basle as secretaries, and both left that Council in disgust. Nicholas became a Cardinal, Æneas Pope.

With the Northerner we have critical learning, tending to save itself in a mysticism that was almost pantheistic; while the Italian is a classicist of eclectic taste, looking to a traditional authority as his best safeguard. This distinction must be elaborated for a fuller understanding of the opposition. If the Northerner seems to be more sympathetically treated than the Italian, such favour can be readily discounted; and this the more easily as the opposite valuation is given or implied in the great work on this period, Dr Pastor's *History of the Popes*. He seems, indeed, to avoid the crux of the opposition, and concerns himself only with the question of authority and its limits. That is to say, the difficulty of the time seems to be stated as it would have presented itself to an Italian and not to a Northerner. He deals only with the revival of learning, even when he believes himself to be dealing with the Renaissance. And we too shall consider first the Renaissance of that Italian type which makes it almost identical with a revival of classical learning.

Æneas Sylvius Piccolomini was born in the territory of Siena, at a place afterwards called by his name, Pienza. He appears to have gone through the humanistic studies usual at that date for one who aspired to learning. In material the subjects appear to have been centred in Latin, in which he gained some skill of diction without any too great precision; and the formal element of his learning seems to have produced in him an easy, eclectic liberalism. "When he was young," says Platina, "and not yet a priest, he published poems of a sensuous and cheery type rather than concise and weighty ones." His ponderous, devotional hexameters of a later date are not in all respects an improvement.

His public life begins with his joining the retinue of Cardinal Capranica, then on his way to the Council of Basle. The Cardinal went to appeal against Pope Eugenius IV, and Æneas Sylvius thus took sides at once. After some changing of posts he was, as a leading humanist, elected Recorder of the Council, and made speeches against the theory of supreme papal monarchy. But at the futile election of the antipope, Felix V, he departed with disgust from the Council on an embassy to the court of Frederick III

(1442). Here he lived for some time as a courtier, was crowned "poet" by the Emperor himself, and wrote the only novel ever written by a Pope, *Eurialus et Laurentia.*

In 1445 he was sent on an embassy to the Pope, and there recanted whatever unorthodoxy he may have fallen into. He was received with open arms, and apparently soon decided to be ordained priest. In that position he was of great use to a Pope who knew the value of humanists, in embassies to England and Scotland. Under the next Pope, Nicholas V, he was made Bishop of Trieste, and then of Siena; and Calixtus III made him Cardinal. At the death of Calixtus he was, unexpectedly, elected Pope (1458), and took the title of Pius II. In his short reign he expresses most clearly the Renaissance which was handed on to him from Nicholas V, and the energetic policy of Calixtus III. Thus two distinct ideas are expressed by him as by his friend the scholar and reformer, Nicholas de Cusa. It is the old contrast of contemplative and active that both these great men express, but in ways diametrically opposed.

For Pius the Renaissance was, as it was to all Italians, the revival of classical learning, and Reform meant energy in the political sphere. His expression of the Italian Renaissance is most clear in the account he has himself given us in his *Commentaries*. There we find him, as Pope, a great traveller, *silvarum amator et varia videndi cupidus.* He is filled with enthusiasm for Diana's Mirror at Nemi, for the falls at Subiaco, for the ruins of Hadrian's villa at Tibur. Manuscripts and architectural remains always excite his interest. Thus even as Pope, much as he pruned the liberal tendencies of his earlier days, his connexion with the new life is one of eclecticism and not of criticism. This is even more evident from the fact that, although he did on occasion deal with the deeper subjects of thought, he dealt with them according to the old scholastic formalism. The new spirit to him meant a reform of the presentation, not of the subject-matter, of learning. This may indeed have been the accident of a particular mind, but it seems legitimate even in this to take his character as a symbol of the Italian Renaissance. For it is remarkable that even in the extremes of unorthodoxy in a Valla, and the attempt at new theory in a Pico della Mirandola, the Italians produced no pregnant idea even so vague as the "mystic union" of Nicholas de Cusa.

As a completion to this sketch of the mind of Æneas Sylvius, we may add some details of his policy. Although the facts are a matter of common knowledge, they must be referred to, in order to give point to the contrast between the characters of the Italian and the Northerner. In the broad lines of policy, Pius II followed upon what Calixtus III had begun. The advance of the Turks on Europe naturally excited the deepest feelings of the Supreme Head of Christendom: hence the attempt to unite the European nations in order to repel the invaders. Why this attempt failed so utterly has never been satisfactorily explained. But at least it seems clear that the centre of political interest had moved northwards in the early Renaissance, and the Italians at this date were already showing that complete misunderstanding of the change that later resulted in the futile policy of the Medicean Popes. Nothing daunted by the barren Congress of Mantua in 1459—the predecessor of "European Concerts"—Pius II resolved to evoke the sentiment of Christendom by leading a crusade in person. It was on this that his best energies were spent, although he was alive to the need for internal reform in Christianity and the Church. He issued a direct prohibition of the favourite theory of an "appeal to a General Council" as against the papal authority. His spiritual interests led him to support Nicholas de Cusa in his reforms in Germany: he published a recantation of all that was scandalous in his own previous writings (1463), and even attempted to suppress those of an erotic tendency. He besought the world to "forget Æneas, and listen to Pius," and appealed in the strongest terms to the better feelings of that scandalous Cardinal, Roderigo Borgia, the future Alexander VI.

But all this was made frankly subordinate to what seemed to him the more pressing need, the war against the Turks. He was not the first, nor the last, to allow an external danger to absorb his energies to the detriment of an internal reform. The force of his own character sufficed to overcome in some measure the opposition of his Cardinals and the inertia of the Powers. He set out in 1464 with a handful of Crusaders, and reached Ancona. There, waiting for the Venetian ships, he fell ill, and he died when the long-expected galleys had at last arrived. With him expired the mock Crusade, and the last shadow of the political unity of Christendom departed.

He saw no less clearly than Nicholas de Cusa—though perhaps he has not in words expressed it—that Catholicity was no controversial principle. And in the dialectic of history he expresses that unity with the past which is the sole basis for hope of reconstruction. For it is the special worth of Pius II that he had been Æneas Sylvius, and in him we can find no mere adoption of a conservatism in policy such as might be due to a lack of insight or energy, but a conscious appeal to a conservative principle such as had within itself the re-affirmation in a higher sense of the truths of the past. The likeness, no less than the contrast, is striking, when we turn to Nicholas de Cusa.

Nicholas Khrypffs, or Krebs, was born in 1401 at Cues (Cusa), on the Moselle. He was the son of a fisherman, and was sent by a generous nobleman to study at Deventer. Hence he is at once connected with that Northern Renaissance, expressed by the Brethren of the Common Life, that produced the scholarship of Erasmus and the mysticism of Thomas à Kempis. Nicholas proceeded in secular studies at Padua, but through failure in his first legal case his thoughts were directed to the Church, and he returned to the North. Being ordained priest, he was soon appointed Archdeacon of Liège, and in the general movement of the intellect of Christendom that followed on the Schism of the West he expressed his views, unorthodoxly, in a pamphlet called *de Concordantia Catholica.* By this time he was living in Basle, where the Council for the reform of abuses and the healing of the schism was toiling at its fruitless labours. He attended the Council in the capacity of secretary, and there met Æneas Sylvius Piccolomini, the secretary to Cardinal Capranica. Both Nicholas and Æneas were frankly opposed to the side now recognized as orthodox; but both afterwards "submitted" to the Roman Pope.

Such was the early history of Nicholas de Cusa. But his power as a scholar must be dwelt upon before we continue his history as a reformer. And the point most worthy of note in his scholarship seems to be a strange prevision of the Idealist philosophy of later Germany. This man seems to be almost the forerunner, born out of due time, of Kant and Hegel. And it is as though the German spirit, which by the accident of history spent its force for years after the death of Nicholas de Cusa in dogmatic subtleties, only gained its true Renaissance in the critical philosophy.

The first and most interesting of the books of this Renaissance philosopher is entitled *de Docta Ignorantia*, a work parallel in intent to the *Critique of the Pure Reason*. For although the presentation of the main thesis is more positive than it is with Kant, the object is to establish a philosophical agnosticism in opposition to the gnosticism of the current scholastic philosophy. The book was published in 1440, but it would naturally not excite immediate opposition in so eclectic an age. The opening thesis is the impossibility of reaching the basis of existence by processes of abstract reasoning: this he establishes, no doubt often with exaggerated metaphor and too mathematical an exactness, by showing how the categories used for experience cannot of their own nature transcend that experience. The reason is therefore impotent to arrive at "God or the essence of things"; hence in so far as the ultimate unities are not reached by a purely "thinking" process we are led by our "learned ignorance" to confess that we "know" nothing. But the process is not complete when it ends in agnosticism, for as a matter of fact we have a consciousness of a stable basis to our knowledge in the resolution of contrasts.* And here the critical philosopher becomes the mystic. The intellect (*intellectus*) is given "faith"—the gift of the "Father of lights"—that it may pick its way no more with the stick of reason (*baculo rationis innitebatur*), but walk upright in the light of the "inspiring assumption" of faith. For *per fidem restaurantur illæ veritates objectivæ, quas intellectus attingere non potest.* If this represents the postulate of the practical reason, the whole process is completed by an emotional unity—mystic in its truest sense—with the ultimate Reality as given in this illuminated intellect. And the writer proceeds to elaborate the cognition of the Trinity first, and then of the centre of human reality in Christ. He prays at the end that the reader may help him to reach this truest learning.

---

* The rational basis for further progress is seen—*maximum absolutum incomprehensibiliter intelligitur, cum quo minimum coincidit* (cap. iv), but it is not explicitly stated.

But if Nicholas de Cusa is a mystic Kant in the *de Docta Ignorantia*, he is a Hegelian in the book *de Possest*, wherein he discusses the nature of ultimate Reality. The book is named from the title he gives to God, conceived as the ultimately Real: *omne posse est*, "the activity of all possibility." In the unity of this Reality all opposition is transcended; and the philosopher expresses his meaning by mathematical analogies, as for example the greatest obtuse angle and the least acute angle are united and transcended in the straight line. In God is attained the resolution of all contrasts, and for ultimate Reality all affirmation is negation. So in the mystic treatise *de Visione Dei* he tells us that God is nothing of what can be said or thought but absolute and everlasting; and again, "Should I see Thee, God, in Paradise, which is built round with the wall of the coincidence of antitheses (or contradictions), so shall I perceive that Thou dost neither include nor unfold, that Thou art neither disjunctive nor copulative, but art absolute and free from all that can be said or thought." He even speaks of a development of Reality in the world, for what is the world but the appearance of the unseen God? what is God but the unseen in all things seen?* Hence the strange theory, for a Roman Cardinal of that date, that all religions have their part in truth; he therefore believes (*de Pace seu Concordantia Fidei*) in an ultimate unity to be attained not through a polemic that rests upon distinctions of creed, but through a charity that depends upon fundamental agreement. But this is the theoretical deduction of an absolute unity of humanity, an ideal no nearer accomplishment to us than it was to him. For immediate result the deduction he makes is the ideal unity of all personality with the ultimate Person: he thus waits, with Royce in his "Concept of Immortality," for the realization of the finite Individual in God, who is the truest Individual; and the prophet of Idealism does not despise the history or the science of his date, but corrects both. He first rejected the false "Donation of Constantine," and on his work Laurenzo Valla depended. He thought it extremely possible that the earth revolved round the sun, and he elaborated a theory of the composition of the sun. He proposed the reform of the calendar that was afterwards carried out under Gregory XIII. And he was not without interest in the occultism of his day, as the elaborate treatise *de Beryllo* shows.

---

* "Quid est mundus nisi invisibilis Dei apparitio? Quid Deus nisi visibilium invisibilitas?"

His own statement of the process through which he has passed is better than any criticism. At the end of the *de Docta Ignorantia* he says:

> In these depths must be the struggle of our human mind that it may rise to that simplicity where contradictories coincide—with which the concept of the first book deals; the second draws from this some points on the world beyond the usual method of philosophers; and now I have finished the third book—on Jesus ever blessed—always proceeding from the same standpoint.*

Remembering his claim to an honoured memory in the history of abstract thought, it is hardly necessary to dwell upon his reforming zeal. But the concept of the man would be incomplete if some short reference were not made to his active life. Like Fichte, he was not only an abstract thinker. After he had attached himself to the Roman Pope Eugenius IV, he was sent on embassy to the East to negotiate the "union of the Churches"; but, like Plato's at Syracuse, his learning and his zeal were inadequate to enable him to deal with such uncouth material. He was of sufficient fame already to be voted for as Pope in the conclave which elected Nicholas V, and he was made Cardinal by that Pope in 1448. Two years afterwards he began his long and troubled labours for the reform of the Church in Germany. He was opposed, as was natural, by the secular power and by the laxists of the monastic world. An admirable account of the progress of the great Cardinal through Germany may be read in Pastor.* He was no Scribe to say one thing and do another: he lived the reform that he preached. His attempts were continued in 1452 in the Tyrol, but so virulent was the opposition from all sides to this "foreign Bishop" that even after appeals to the Pope then reigning (Calixtus III) he was forced to flee to the mountains for safety. In 1458 we find him in Rome attending the conclave that elected his friend Æneas Sylvius Piccolomini Pope under the title of Pius II. To him he was a friend in need during the troubled conferences at Mantua, and Pius writes to him, "Te istic presente, quieto animo vivimus, et nostra omnia in tuto posita credimus."

---

* "Debet in his profundis omnis nostri humani ingenii conatus esse, ut ad illam se elevet simplicitatem ubi contradictoria coincidunt, in quo laborat prioris libelli conceptus: secundus ex illo pauca universo supra philosophorum communem viam elicit rara multis: et nunc complevi finaliter tertium de Jesu superbenedicto libellum, ex eodem semper progrediens fundamento, et factus est mihi Jesus Dominus continue major in intellectu et affectu per fidei crementum. . . . Hic mundus in Jesu transformatur."

But Nicholas had more difficult work to do in the Tyrol, and there he returned, unbaffled by royal opposition to reform. There he was at last seized and imprisoned, and the indignity thus offered to a Cardinal Legate was revenged by the excommunication levelled against his opponents. The struggle continued for years, and was verbally ended by the mediation of the Emperor. Nicholas was still undaunted though much weakened, and at the request of Pius II elaborated proposals for a thorough reform of the Church, beginning in Rome itself.† He supported the almost Quixotic plan of his old friend Pius II when he attempted to lead a Crusade in person, and he was on his way to join the Pope when he died—three days before Pius himself (August 11, 1464). "Nicolaus S. R. E. Cardinalis de Cusa tituli Sci Petri ad Vincula" lies buried in Rome in his titular church, but the heart of Nicholas Khrypffs is at

---

* II, p. 107.

† Pastor, IV, p. 271.

Cues, where he left his books too, in the hospital that he founded.

Such are the main lines of contrast between a Northern and Southern point of view in the early Renaissance. It is obvious that in both lives we have the same problems of decadent society and disintegrating thought. For the abstract thought, no less than the politics, of the day was the expression of a violent change parallel to that death which is at the same time the birth of a different form. In thought men were seeking for a new and more adequate expression of the fullness of experience, and in real life the old forms had lost their power. North and South adopted methods of solution that were, perhaps unconsciously, partial, and their mutual exclusion was thereby assured from the very beginning. Nicholas de Cusa rejects the old expression of medieval thought, and seeks to revivify religion by referring to its *underlying principle* in individual mysticism. Æneas Sylvius reformulates the old rendering of experience, turning metaphysics into literature, and attempts to strengthen the best tendencies of his day by the development of the *prominent element* in authoritative unity. The lives of these two men are not isolated episodes, but are fairly typical of a broad division separating the North and South. And to this early date, when no conscious opposition marred the reforming efforts of different schools of thought, we may trace the division that afterwards widened into the opposition of Reformation and Counter-Reformation—individuality and authority.

THE FISCAL QUESTION*

WHEN it is proposed to change the economic arrangements of a community, it is but rarely that pure economics are of value in the discussion that follows. Pure economics are deductive and are established in connexion with a general and abstract principle. They resemble the science of mathematics; and there is therefore something in them which forbids their negation by any considerable body of men for any considerable time. If a change be proposed which is fundamentally opposed to the principles of pure economics, it will be rejected, perhaps not on the highest and most abstract grounds, but by a common sense which is allied to, and which works parallel with, the ultimate truths of the science. Just as a man might know how to take a short cut, though he might not be able to prove that two sides of a triangle are longer than the third, so a community will ultimately reject such proposals as the unlimited creation of fiat money or the attempt to cheapen by law some object whose production is highly restricted and the demand for which is very great.

There do, however, constantly arise proposals of another and a more practical sort, to change some part of the economic system of a nation in a manner susceptible of realization. It is often proposed in the history of nations that the currency, or the method of international trade, or the traditional basis of taxation, or some other part of the machinery of national economics shall be transformed for the general good. The discussion of such a transformation should surely proceed upon the lines not of pure but of applied economics; experience, the special circumstances of the case and analogy should decide it; yet it is remarkable that when a proposal of this kind is made, though applied economics alone are of any real value in the debate that follows, pure economics appear in the early part of that debate and at first occupy all the field.

---

*Note. The Editor does not accept all the views contained in Mr Belloc's able article, which he hopes to supplement by others written from other standpoints.

The Fiscal Question

The debate upon that great economic change which is now proposed to the people of this kingdom has afforded an example of this first phase. Those who defend our existing tariff system are especially to blame, and those who would change it have to some extent copied this fault in their opponents. The case of what is called in this country "Free Trade" as against the case of the "Tariff Reformers" has been argued as though it must be defended upon purely deductive lines and by the statement and restatement of obvious and fundamental economic truths concerning the nature of exchange.

In answer to so weak a position there have been but too many replies given in the same vein, and while the Free Trader talked as though the restriction of international exchange was in all cases, and wherever found, an evil, his opponent has thought, by destroying an error so evident and doctrinaire, to have established the positive side of the case, and to have proved the necessity for a change in proving the brief for conservation to be badly argued.

This first phase of the discussion is, however, already drawing to its close. One no longer reads even in the *Spectator* the exact and perpetual repetition of such principles as children are familiar with in *Mrs Fawcett's Political Economy;* and upon the other side the arguments for the reform of the tariff increase daily in cogency because they daily concern themselves more and more with the actual circumstances of our trade, and the existing basis upon which the future of that trade will be built.

It must be confessed that even in this first bout the intellectual force has been rather upon the side of the attack than upon the side of the defence. The most curious intelligence of the country, though certainly not the best experience, has been drawn towards Mr Chamberlain's proposals. The volume of support which these proposals receive is therefore certain to increase. A new thing, hastily misunderstood and as hastily ridiculed, but defended by men who have grasped, however imperfectly, its vital principle, is bound to grow.

On this account it is of the utmost importance that all

Englishmen concerned with the economic future of the country should grasp the problem and should attempt to make up their minds upon it before it appears (as it will probably appear in the next election or at latest in the succeeding one) as a triumphant hope or a formidable menace. In order to comprehend the issue two things are necessary: First, the system of tariffs as it now exists must be exactly stated, accompanied by a statement of the change which it is proposed to make; secondly, the material upon which the change would work, that is, the present condition of the internal exchanges of England, and of her internal production, must be laid down. Only upon such a double basis of comprehension can any useful appreciation of the arguments for and against the proposed change be formed.

Our present system, which is commonly called "Free Trade"—a name which we will in future use for convenience during the rest of our analysis—does not forbid in practice the raising of revenue by an interference with international trade. It does not even, as politicians so often pretend, forbid the raising of revenue upon articles of ordinary consumption. So far is this from being the case that we do now in this present year raise a far greater revenue upon matters of ordinary necessity to the mass of the people by our tariff system than does any other country.* What "Free Trade" determines in practice is this: that no article coming into the country shall be taxed for revenue if a similar article can be produced within the country, because so to do is to benefit the producer unfairly at the expense of his fellow-citizens; and if, as an exception, it is thought necessary to impose a duty upon such an article, it is a rigid part of our present system that a corresponding excise must be levied upon the similar article produced within our boundaries.

In a word, we are pledged to the conception *of duties for*

---

* The taxes on tea, coffee, sugar, tobacco, currants, raisins and cocoa alone are equivalent to another *elevenpence* on the income tax. If we add to these the duties on foreign and domestic fermented drinks in common consumption, the total rises to far more than the whole Tariff revenue derived by the United States.

revenue only, and the moment a duty tends to stimulate some particular branch of our production, we are bound by the principle upon which we have worked for the last sixty years to abolish that duty or to make it ineffective by a countervailing domestic excise.

The agitation for the reform of the tariff demands a complete reversal of this policy. The demand is complicated by the fact that demagogic politics have necessitated a double appeal. The change which Tariff Reformers urge upon us is represented now as a means of benefiting the colonies, and of making more complete the homogeneity of the Empire at some expense to our purses, now as a means of increasing the wealth of this country by stimulating its energies; now as an imperial, now (in contradiction) as a domestic policy; now as a political, and now as an economic idea.

The economist must be pardoned if he does not take this dual system seriously. The two objects cannot coexist. We cannot, for example, stimulate the energies of English agriculture, and at the same time give a permanent preference to Canadian agricultural imports into this country. This fatal weakness in the Tariff Reformers' political proposition—a weakness inherent in all popular cries—has already afforded sufficient merriment to those who defend Free Trade. It would be unworthy to return to it. It is enough to say here that the demand for protection, and that alone, is really worth considering. If the principal motive of the whole business had been the advantaging of our colonies, there were other courses open to us than a revolution in our fiscal system. We might have voted grants of money to those favoured provinces; we might have differentiated in their favour in such important imports as india-rubber, tea, coffee, tobacco, sugar, cocoa, wine and the rest, which cannot be produced at home. I repeat, the matter is not worth pursuing; we have not here an agitation whose strength lies in a demand to make England poorer for the benefit of the colonies. We have an agitation whose strength lies in a demand to make England richer by a protective system; and it is important at this point and at the outset of our inquiry to point out that the demand *is* an economic demand. The Tariff Reformers pretend by their scheme to make England wealthier than she is. They do not pretend to make her happier or better save as an incident of making her wealthier. This idea it is which runs through all the appeals made to the electorate, and also through all such careful expositions of what I may call the German argument as are to be discovered in Mr Amery's recent book.

The Tariff Reformer says: "Abandon your principles of not benefiting particular categories of producers. Canalize and restrict your international trade, and England will be a wealthier country. Deliberately tax (not for revenue only, but for the purposes of stimulating energies within the country) articles sent in by the foreigner which we can make ourselves, and which we do not now make in a sufficient amount."

Here, then, is the contrast between the two positions: the Free Trader says, "Our merchants and producers, left to themselves and following each his individual benefit, will produce, in international exchanges as in all others, a maximum of national wealth." The Reformer says: "No; there are conditions under which this addition of the maxima of private interests does not produce a maximum of general wealth: and we, to-day, live under such conditions."

Having said this, the Tariff Reformer proceeds to prove the first part of his statement. He is always successful in so doing; but the second (which he often avoids) is alone of practical consequence, for the question finally resolves itself into this: Does England, *as she now is, and as she probably will be in the near future*, lie under those conditions, or does she not? In order to seize the nature of such conditions, in order to appreciate, that is, the state of affairs under which a nation may benefit by protection, we must first recapitulate certain elementary truths.

The production of wealth is the transformation of human environment from a state in which it is less, to a state in which it is more satisfactory to human needs, and, as the process advances, *values* are said to be created. Here is a tree standing uncut in a forest, far from some fixed habitation. I cut it down, and so prepare it to be hauled to that habitation. I have created a value. I haul it to the neighbourhood of the habitation. I have created a further value. I cut the wood and fashion out of it a table. I have created yet another value, and so on until the consumption of the thing begins in human use. From the moment when that consumption begins, the values continue to decrease, until in the end of the process they are finally extinguished.

It is obvious that wherever the labour of a man or of a locality is specialized, it will be of an advantage to that man or to that locality to produce more of a thing than he or it may need, if an exchange of that excess against a similar excess in some other article produced by some other locality or man can be effected; for in so exchanging further values are created. Thus if of two adjacent islands one contains much iron ore and little coal, the other much coal and little iron ore, each may take to smelting, but each will be far wealthier and smelt far more if each exports to the other the excess of its own peculiar product. Such product having reached its market has evidently acquired a further value from that which it possessed at home, and this value may be properly termed *the increment of exchange.* It is to earn this increment of exchange that all trade exists, and it is the thesis of the Free Trader that, especially in a complex society, a multitude of agents, each seeking its own maximum increment of exchange, will build up a total maximum increment larger than anything that can be built up by restricting and canalizing the general process.

Given normal intelligence, similar in the producer of wealth and in those who govern him, exchange, whether domestic or international, will flow along what have been called "natural channels." We need not quarrel with this term "natural"; it begs the question somewhat, but it is a fairly just term and will serve. We would call that exchange "natural" which is effected by individuals or particular societies acting on their own behalf, apart from the interference of the State; and those to which they are constrained or persuaded by the interference of the State, one may call, for the purposes of argument, "artificial."

It is important to note at this point that any interference with "natural exchange" and any attempt to benefit it by interference must be not a normal but an exceptional thing: by which words I do not mean that interference of this sort need necessarily be rare, still less that it need be necessarily an abuse; I mean only that it involves in itself a contradiction of the general process which it sets out to foster. Now such beneficent restrictions are to be discovered scattered throughout human activity. It is conceivable that to some savage the damming of a river might seem to be a foolish action, stopping its current and breaking its force, yet we know that it is but a method of getting ultimately more force out of the river. It is a principle which applies to the endowment of education, to the reservation of seed, to every form of industry and of art. It is the principle of medicine, whereby things essentially injurious are used with the special purpose of producing an ultimate good. But the statement that such a principle is common in human activity does not prove that it *is*, but only suggests that it *may* be present in the theory of protection. A closer examination will show us that it is so present.

There are most certainly conditions under which the restriction of international exchange by the action of the State does make the whole community wealthier in the long run. In other words, there are conditions under which protection is a good economic policy.

These conditions fall into three fairly sharp categories, which one may call the static, the dynamic and the purely fiscal. That is, protection may "pay" in a community, because it would: (*a*) increase the wealth of the community under known and existing conditions; (*b*) increase it by producing new conditions; or (*c*) reduce consumption by raising revenue more cheaply or by avoiding other and greater expenses.

The first of these, (*a*), presupposes no new industry and no general stimulation of energy. It simply asserts that under certain conditions a nation can be made richer by compelling certain exchanges which were made from beyond its boundaries, to take place within its boundaries.

The second, (*b*), presupposes that protection will create new conditions, will introduce new energy, and will stimulate further production. It is wholly experimental, and those who depend upon it rely upon a real or an imaginary knowledge of the psychology of their fellow-countrymen.

The third, (*c*), is a matter for the Treasury alone. It concerns the use of protection as a method which, however expensive, is the cheapest way to raise revenue or the cheapest way to achieve certain international results.

I say it is under these three categories that the arguments for protection lie. All such other fancied arguments, as that protection "taxes the foreigner" or "provides the money to buy the dearer loaf," are of about as much value as the opposing propositions that Free Trade alone is consonant with Christianity, or that it is a peculiarly English product and therefore to be revered. They must be left to the politicians.

Recognizing then these three categories into which the true argument for protection falls, we will before going further examine each in full.

The first proposition, the thesis that protection can increase the wealth of the country *without creating a new industry*, applies only in the case of what may be called the "regional argument." This I have already developed at some length in the *Contemporary Review* for June, 1905. I may briefly restate it here.

When between two or more provinces of one political unit there exist barriers to exchange (such as racial or religious prejudice, distance or physical obstacles to commerce, etc.), it may be to the advantage of the unit as a whole that the increment of exchange in one region, at present exchanging with the foreigner, shall be lowered, in order that the increment of exchange of another region, at present deprived of trade, shall be increased to an amount more than compensating the loss of the first region.

One province of an island, for instance, lying near the mainland and purchasing coal from the mainland, achieves an increment of exchange *n*. In a further region of the island, difficult of access, there are coal mines doing for the moment little trade because it is easier for the first region to get its coal from the mainland. If the Government of the island, by erecting a tariff, makes it difficult for the first region to continue to get its coal from the mainland, the increment *n* will of course be reduced; it may lower, for instance, to *n* minus *m;* for this first region will be compelled to get its coal with more difficulty, that is, at a greater price. But the new tariff will create for the further region, which has hitherto been little developed, a new increment of exchange which we will call *o*, and if *o* is greater than *m*, the total wealth of the whole island benefits by the tariff, though the wealth of the coastal province in particular is lessened. Of this a good instance was afforded by the old kingdom of Savoy, and is now afforded by the contrast between Catalonia and the rest of Spain.

Apart from this regional argument there is probably, and almost certainly, no other which applies under this first category. The idea that a mere interference with foreign trade can, without creating a new industry, make a community richer, is illusory and has proved illusory throughout history, save under the conditions we have just described.

The second category, that which concerns the psychology of the people and looks forward to changed conditions, to new industries and to stimulated energies, is very much more various. It may of its nature apply to an indefinite number of human activities; but whether it applies or not is always a matter to be decided by an exercise of judgement and by experience; and that man can best reply to the question who best knows his fellow-citizens.

The general formula for this second argument may be stated as follows: When the domestic production of an article now imported may be created by the stimulation of the special energies concerned, and when it is known that such energies can be stimulated by increasing the difficulty of import, then so to stimulate these energies is of economic advantage, provided that the foreign exchange thus lost can be replaced by a new form of import.

It cannot be denied for a moment that protection in this form has had, especially during the vast industrial changes of the latter nineteenth century, the most prodigious and beneficial results. The admirable exactitude of French machinery and the exceptional prosperity of French agriculture, the enormous expansion of the German iron trade, the similar expansion of twenty American industries, as for instance of the American tin-plate industry, are all due to this aspect of protection.

A simple concrete example may be taken in the following instance: A nation in which the art of weaving falters is devoted to agriculture, and exports some part of its food in order to satisfy its need for clothing. Render the import of woven stuffs difficult, and you may, if you have judged your fellow-countrymen aright, cause them to produce much cloth where before they produced little, and to add so much wealth to the agricultural wealth which they were formerly bringing into being. Nor do you, by so doing, necessarily hurt their oversea trade. Their agricultural exports may no longer exchange against clothing, but if there is a supply of other foreign goods against which they can continue to exchange, no hurt has been done to the economic situation. The new cloth and the new makers of the cloth have been called into existence by protection, over and above the goods and the men which existed under the old conditions.

It cannot too often be repeated that the amount of capital and of available human energy in a country is not fixed; nay, in a modern country they are not even slow in changing. Both may rise or fall with great rapidity. And if one says of a particular country to which one belongs, "This country of mine *could* produce such and such further and additional forms of wealth, but it will not do so save under the stimulus of necessity," then a tariff imposing that necessity will, if one's conception of one's fellow-citizens is just, be amply justified by the future.

As we shall see in a moment, this particular argument might in theory be applied to certain departments of industry in England; and a great part, and the most vital part, of the quarrel between the Free Traders and the Tariff Reformers will ultimately turn upon whether the judgement framed by the latter upon the psychology of England is in practice just or not. Could we, for instance, really get the

English landlord to go in for forestry by interfering slightly with the import of foreign wood? If we could, and if the stimulus so given resulted in a great accretion of national wealth, compared with which the inconvenience and loss of the first few years of increased tariff would be slight, then obviously such a tariff would be justified. For it would not take capital from other and more lucrative employment, nor would it take men from other and more lucrative employment. The men and the capital are always going begging in an old and wealthy community. The men and the capital, once employed upon the rapid creation of new wealth, extend the boundaries into which more men and more capital can flow: but to this, which is the heart of the problem, we will return in a moment.

Lastly, we have the purely fiscal case, which we have called our third category. This is that in which the argument for Tariff Reform reposes not upon any stimulus to industry nor upon any rearrangement of internal trade, but simply upon the results obtained by the Treasury in the raising of revenue. Thus a new duty may prove to be so widely distributed and to be paid in such minute separate amounts, and with all that to interfere so little with the life of the country, that a substantial sum will be furnished by it almost unperceived. Of this we had an excellent example under the late Government when a registration duty of one shilling a quarter on imported corn furnished sufficient money to build us a battleship every year and more, and yet passed quite unperceived as a burden upon the community. Another excellent example of beneficent interference with the machinery of exchange, though not in this case involving a change in the tariff, exists in the cheque tax, which was imposed by Mr Disraeli when he was Chancellor of the Exchequer.

A second division of this purely fiscal argument for Tariff Reform is to be found whenever such reform, though expensive, proves cheaper than a war or the menace of a war. An example of this exists in the position adopted by France since the war of 1870. The various combinations of tariff scales which the French have played upon since their defeat, have been perhaps the major, and certainly a great, cause of their rehabilitation. By an alternate tightening and relaxation of the tariff boundary, one after another of all the bordering nations have been drawn into a sort of economic agreement with the French; and the slow breakdown of the Triple Alliance has been, if not mainly at least partially, the work of the French tariff system upon the Italian frontier.

Now that we have established these three categories and described them, let us see to what extent the arguments used will apply to England.

The regional argument first deserves our attention, not only because it is logically the first in the three divisions we have drawn up, but also because it is the one which should apply most obviously to the colonial aspect of Tariff Reform. It has not been used, because, as I have already remarked, the discussion has hitherto been political, that is, demagogic and futile; but it ought to be used because it is the only precise and just argument available in the matter.

We saw when we were analysing the nature of this argument that there was a condition under which a tariff wall erected round some one political unity would advantage that unity if one region, *A*, hitherto exchanging with the foreigner, were compelled in future to exchange with another and neglected region, *B*, lying within the same frontier. We saw that that condition was that the increment gained by *B* under this artificial arrangement should be greater than the loss which *A* suffered by having to transfer his trade to a less lucrative quarter. Now, if for *A* we read Great Britain, and for *B* the rest of the Empire, this argument would only apply under two reservations: first, that the great advantage we should do the colonies would compensate the Empire as a whole for the disadvantage we should do ourselves; and secondly, that the doing of a disadvantage to ourselves was not inconsistent with the political programme presented to us.

As to the first of these reservations, there is more to be said for it than Free Traders as a rule imagine.

It is of course true that if we were to produce a general scheme of Tariff Reform, and if we were to tax foreign leather, foreign meat, foreign wool, foreign everything, and let colonial produce in free, we should do this country so enormous a damage as could not possibly be compensated by any advantage conferred upon the colonies. It would be a drastic and a tremendous revolution in the whole of our system of trade, nor does anyone outside the empty field of party politics really suppose that such a revolution could be effected with sufficient rapidity to be of any use to those whom it was intended to benefit. But a careful manipulation of the tariff might quite conceivably advantage the Empire as a whole at the expense of this country.

A slight duty upon foreign wheat, giving preference to the colonies, would have such an effect. The imposition of 2s. a quarter upon wheat is equivalent in revenue to about 2d. upon the income tax. It would be less felt by far than is the income tax, for it would be better distributed, and it would have a very considerable effect upon the development of the wheat-growing colonies, especially of Canada, which has a wide margin of development. Very small differences of this sort immediately affect the sensitive international market, though they hardly affect the retail buyer.

In a word, no careful student will deny that a despotic (not a representative) system of government might so carefully manipulate the tariff as perceptibly to benefit the principal colonies, and that to an extent which, though small, would be greater than the loss that we ourselves should suffer.

But the question arises: Are we prepared to impoverish ourselves for the benefit of the colonies? Does the Tariff Reform scheme pretend to impoverish us in order to increase the total wealth of the area which is painted red upon the map? I have already said that it does not, and I may add that anyone who proposed this seriously in politics, namely, that we should make ourselves poorer in order to make the colonies richer, would be mad. As it is, the colonies are chiefly valuable to us, economically, as payers of interest on the money we have lent them; they are young and commercially flourishing communities; they do not provide an appreciable portion of the cost of that defence which we in these islands afford them and without which they could not exist as independent communities for a year. I take it, therefore, that the regional argument as applied to the Empire, though it has some force in the abstract, must be discarded altogether from practical consideration.

When we consider Britain alone, the regional argument may at once be discarded. These islands are so small in area compared with the general market of the world, they are so intersected with railways, the communication throughout them is so facile, that there is no industrial country in the world, with the exception of Belgium, to which the regional argument applies so little as to the United Kingdom.

The second department of the subject concerns us much more nearly. It is the chief province of those who advocate protection in any country. Can we, as can so many other political unities in the modern world, usefully stimulate in an artificial manner an industry at present moribund or absent?

The economic point is clear enough, though the political arguments in common use obscure it. Let me recapitulate briefly: If a nation can, by stimulating the internal production of a particular article, produce in the long run more wealth than is lost by the interference with exchange, then so to stimulate artificially such production is an economic advantage. For example, a nation capable of producing beetroot sugar imports that article to the value of a million pounds. In order to obtain this wealth it exports a certain amount of produce; to make the case simple, we will suppose but one kind of produce, and say that it exports coal. It is the argument of Protectionists in this case that though, by taxing, and therefore interfering with, the import of beetroot sugar you interfere with the export of coal (and therefore with the production of coal), and though this interference may be serious, yet when you have called the new industry into being you will have more than recouped yourself for the temporary loss you had sustained. The export of coal, they say, would soon discover some other material against which it could exchange: say, oil. The production of beetroot sugar would employ new capital hitherto lost in speculation or non-existent; it would call into being new labourers or would employ those now wasted, and striking a balance between the temporary loss and inconvenience of interfering with trade and the ultimate total production and consumption of the country, a profit would be found: for the country would retain all the coal and sugar it previously consumed, and have in addition a new import, oil.

There are a whole army of theorists in this country who blindly oppose so obvious a proposition. They speak as though the amount of capital and the amount of labour in a community were constant, and what is more, as though both were at any moment fully employed. Nothing could be more ridiculous. We are, for example, in this country perfectly capable of producing that timber which we now import from abroad, for propping up our coal mines. The waste labour which is now thrown away in the perpetual fluctuations of industry, is ten—twenty—times more than sufficient to provide the muscular force and training required for such an afforestation. The capital wasted in chimerical adventures is perhaps a hundred times yearly that which such a scheme would demand. If a small bounty or a duty could secure the result, England would necessarily be the richer.

But if a particular example be required, the best is to be discovered in the importation of French silk. We consume at the present moment as many millions of French silk as are represented by some four to five pence upon the income tax. Or again, we obtain this silk at a cost of exports which, were they retained at home, would represent in available wealth a relief of five per cent from our taxes and our rates.

The Free Trader will at once reply: "Yes, but you export against these silks something which you are better fitted to produce. The Frenchman takes your machinery, for instance, or your coal, and it is less trouble for you to make that machinery or to dig out that coal than it would be to produce the silk at home."

This is not true. There is labour going begging in England and capital going begging, which could soon produce the whole of that silk; and though in the interval of the establishment of the mills the exports now set against silk would decline, yet there is no conceivable reason why those exports should not find another market. We might soon get more oil, more wine, more dates—more of any of those products which France and the Mediterranean can give us (and which we cannot produce in these islands), as against the export of (let us say) coal which had for the moment been lowered. France and Algiers are ready enough to produce more of such articles, if we will furnish a larger market; and when, on the stimulation of such foreign products, exchanges were re-established on their old basis, we should be the richer by the new imports.

All economic problems are in the main dynamic and not static. The boundaries of economic effort depend upon no formula, though the laws of economic effort are strictly formulated. The whole system is elastic. And it is to this that must be ascribed the undoubted historical truth that where protection has been applied, not in a desperate grasping at further revenue from an exhausted people, but in a deliberate, thought-out attempt to stimulate national energy, it has succeeded beyond all expectation.

So put, the argument for protection even in this country appears at its strongest. We shall see in a moment to what weakness that argument can fall in the special conditions of Great Britain. But before proceeding to the general view, we may point out the particular aspect of this very important department of the question. The Free Trader replies to such a statement as we have put forward: "Of course, it is to the advantage of a nation to produce whatever it can produce *more easily* than can a rival; but it is only of advantage to a nation to produce a particular article, if it *can* do so more easily than can a rival. If it cannot do so more easily, let the nation turn its attention to something it has special powers to produce, and exchange that against the desired article which the rival produces with greater facility."

To this the modern man, seeing the actual conditions of modern industry, replies: "The modern facilities for communication are so great, the modern aptitudes of science so extended, and at the same time modern capital is so highly concentrated, that unless there is some secure guarantee for the investor at the beginning of his effort, that effort will not be made."

In so answering, the protectionist is right. The example of the American tin-plate trade has already been quoted. We might take this very example of silk and press it home. There are indeed, notably in the small and happy town of Leek, successful spinners of silk. But the habit has been established, the tradition reigns, that certain silk is to be obtained from abroad. What great capitalist, turning round for an investment for his capital, would put it into such silk at the present moment? He does not know that a bounty in France might not ruin him within a year or two of his establishing his mills. He is not secure in any foreign market nor even for some time in the home market; he must nowadays expend great sums in advertising, that is, in letting it be known that his factory exists. He must attempt to dislocate a whole complicated and (by this time) rigid system of commercial travelling, of foreign correspondence and of connexion between English retail and French wholesale houses. If it was true in the days of John Stuart Mill that a new industry required special guarding until it attained maturity, it is tenfold truer to-day; indeed no new industry succeeds to-day among the nations which compete under equal conditions, unless it is either sprung upon the market with an unexpected rapidity, or protected behind a tariff wall at least in its origins, or—and this is a very rare case—discovers in the country of its birth special aptitudes of tradition or of climate.

The third argument in favour of protection is that which I have called the purely fiscal. In this the statesman calculates not whether such and such a duty will stimulate the production of a country or will increase its sum of consumable values, but rather whether that duty, though admittedly *decreasing* the total wealth of the community, does not decrease it by a *less* amount than would some other form of State action.

Let us suppose, for example, that the Russians desire at some critical moment to impress upon the German Government the necessity of being friendly. They might increase their garrisons, they might lower their credit by the threat of war, they might at an enormous expense proceed to mobilization. With a flexible tariff system they can so manipulate the duties against German goods as to embarrass a great commercial section of their opponents, and to bring a most powerful pressure to bear upon the German Government.

Let us suppose another case, one which the future will show to be of the utmost moment, but which the crudity of modern English politics ignores. Let us suppose that it becomes necessary to coerce a colony into obedience. That coercion, undertaken by arms, might easily lead to the interference of one of our great rivals. But with a flexible system which would permit us heavily to embarrass the colony whose main trade is presumably with ourselves, which would permit us, for example, to touch Australia through her leather or her wool, or Canada through her wheat, we should have a weapon more immediate and more powerful than could ever be the threat of arms to small communities ignorant of war. Against our European rivals that weapon, exercised through so wide a market as is that of Great Britain, would be of great force; and among the dreams in which the Tariff Reformers have indulged, none is more plausible or more readily comprehensible than that which a member of the late Government (if my memory serves me rightly it was, by a curious irony, a late Secretary for War) called "the policy of the big revolver." The word "big" was borrowed from Mr Roosevelt, and is vulgar. The word "revolver" was accurate. If Great Britain could indeed say to France, for instance: "Do this, and I will check your export of wine to this country, which buys a quarter of it, and I will call upon those other supplies which are to be found all over the world"; if she could say to Russia: "Pursue your policy on the frontier of Afghanistan, and I will shut off your trade in wheat to this country, which is one of the largest items in your total trade"; then England would possess a weapon of remarkable power.

Now it is the chief point of the argument of those who believe themselves to be wisely attached to our present fiscal system that such temptations must be withstood. We do not deny of what value, especially in the modern world, a flexible tariff system can be. Far from it. It is as apparent to us that the torpid dogmatism of our successful merchants is intellectually worthless, as it is apparent that the torpid dogmatism of modern scientific materialism is intellectually worthless. But we do see where the living force resides in the judgement of those merchants, especially of those who attach themselves to no system, but take their view of England from a varied and personal knowledge of the circumstances of her trade.

We are a people whose average income is far smaller than our pride permits us to imagine. On account of the activity of our internal exchanges our income is counted over and over again. To take but the single instance of the income tax, here is a criterion often pointed at as a proof that our prosperity is at its height. But in the assessment of that tax a man has to consider a dozen things, provisions, clothing and the rest, which he has paid for at their retail value. He pays upon his "income," and his "income" has been spent in this way. The profit upon each of these payments of his again pays the tax, and the sub-profit between the retailer and the wholesale dealer again pays the tax; and the sub-sub-profit between the wholesale dealer and the manufacturer again pays the tax.

He pays upon an "income" out of which he is compelled to find a rent for his house. He may not, unless that house is used strictly for business purposes, deduct that rent from his assessment. Yet the rent appears again in the "income" of his landlord.

If we estimate the wealth of a nation in the values which it is able to consume every year—and there is no other true method of estimating it—our wealth dwindles very much from its apparent size. There is many a peasant in Normandy producing the things which sustain him, owning his own land, and the master of his own capital, who in money might seem but a third as rich as another man in this country whose consumption of economic values was actually less than his in the course of a year. And in general the more complex and the more active is a society, the greater the tendency to count doubly and trebly the overlapping assessments of its wealth. We are, in these islands, a community of some ten million families, of whom certain sections—whole hosts in the great towns, great sweeps of Ireland and not a few of the remoter country districts of Great Britain and of the Scotch islands—are miserably poor. It is not incautious to suggest that if the values actually consumable in these islands within a year were computed at the moment when consumption began, a thousand millions would be found to cover more than their total.

Now for various purposes more than half that sum—more than five hundred millions—comes from over seas. For the purpose of maintaining our industry, for the purpose of direct consumption, or as tribute from those who are our debtors or whom we have conquered, we import this gigantic total.

I do not desire to create an exaggerated impression. I know very well how large a portion of these imports is used up in industry and re-exported. Ten per cent. of it, for instance, is in raw cotton, some third of which upon manufacture finds an export market. But I do maintain that, with so great a proportion of the values which we really consume created outside the islands, to tamper with the present system of free imports would be dangerous in the extreme.

Here is a concrete instance: it is well known that the imposition of further taxes upon food is impossible. We have created a state of society in which it is imperative that the meat and the corn of the mass who own nothing, shall be at once obtainable. Ask any constituency in England to increase by its vote the cost of these prime necessities, and you will get your answer. Nor will that vote be uninstructed only. Its instinct will be just. The matter is too grave and too enormous to play with.

If we turn to raw material, we find the same thing. Try and put a five per cent. duty on Lancashire cotton, and see what will happen to your policy! Tax leather, and visit

Northampton! Wool, and consult Bradford! Nor is it only a selfish instinct or a particular one which would destroy so insane a proposal. The interference with our great staple industries in this respect would be felt throughout the world. For many years the handicap would be a burden, and no one could tell in the delicate conditions of modern commerce whether that burden might not be ruinous.

There remains the category of manufactured articles. It would be useless to waste time upon these. The *a fortiori* argument is sufficient. Take the case of those French silks of which we have spoken. Here is a manufactured article, a luxury, and one which eminently lends itself to the protectionist theory. Attempt to restrict the import, and what follows? Which can better afford a tariff war? We, who live by a perpetual stream of imports packed into these small islands, or the French, whose national life would not be so much as imperilled if their foreign trade should cease? The total foreign import of the French is less than that revenue which they raise without difficulty, and is but a tenth of that national debt which they easily support. Our foreign imports are four times our revenue, and are more than two-thirds of that national debt, the recent slight increase of which has lowered our credit by twenty-five per cent.

The position is not to be tampered with. It is not one upon which experiments can be played. That there are conditions, and that they are numerous in the modern world, in which the experiment of stimulation through protection can be attempted, I do not deny. That it can be attempted in Great Britain seems to me, when the detailed problem is once stated, to be self-evidently false.

But in spite of this conclusion, which is, after all, the conclusion of most of those who have deliberately weighed the question, there does lie one great danger before us: or, if the phrase is preferred, one wide avenue by which the advocates of this experiment might enter.

We have reached the limits of direct taxation. It is the consequence of our oligarchic system and of our self-content in government by the rich, that we have come to the point after which the well-to-do and the very wealthy can and will pay no more. The lower middle class can certainly pay no more; and by the tacit understanding which we have established between the governing and the working classes of this country, it is impossible to lay a burden upon those millions who consent to the lack of security and of property under the condition that, so long as they do not disturb the stability of the State, their "individual liberty," as it is called, shall not be interfered with. There is no conceivable chance of obtaining revenue now from the direct taxation of the great mass of Englishmen. It would be equally impossible to receive a further revenue by an avowed increase of the indirect taxation which they already pay when they purchase their tobacco, their beer or their tea, or to lay indirect taxation upon those necessities hitherto untaxed, such as bread, meat or the materials of clothing.

In the near future, the temptation to lay that taxation upon manufactured articles which are not immediately purchased by the poorer classes, and to lay that taxation in such a fashion that it will appear to secure employment in the various trades, will be very strong indeed. The sawmills will welcome (not only their masters, but their men as well) a duty upon cut timber; the ironworks, a duty upon the importation of all iron that has increased in value by manufacture; the woollen trade of Bradford, a duty upon manufactured wools. There will be exceptions: the masters who know how to buy rapidly in the cheapest market (that is, the most successful among the masters) will see the danger; but the men as a whole will tend, if it be put to them in a flattering manner, to accept the change and even to welcome it. The feeling in Sheffield at this moment is an example to the point.

Meanwhile there is a rising demand for reforms which can only be accomplished, either by economy in the salaries which we pay to our wealthier classes, and the commissions we pay to our contractors, or in an addition to the revenue of the country. The first road we shall not take; the wealthy governing class will not impoverish itself. The second alternative will attract our statesmen with a force which I fear will be irresistible. When they yield to the attraction, the beginning of the disaster will not be felt in our industrial system—in this department there will rather be an excitation of energy—but in that international credit of ours which has already so grievously suffered and whose degradation, if we permit it to fall further, will lose us our commercial hegemony.

H. BELLOC

FÉNELON IN EXILE

1699-1715

Fénelon's Spiritual Letters. Translated from the text edited by the Abbé Gosselin, with Preface by Bishop Hedley. London: St Anselm's Society. 1892.

Fénelon à Cambrai d'après sa Correspondance 1699-1715. Par Emmanuel de Broglie. Paris: Plon, Nourrrit et Cie. 1884.

Fénelon. Lettres de Direction. Par Moïse Cagnac. Paris.

"LES derniers jours de l'Archévêque de Cambrai, assombris par toutes les tristesses, nous le montreront arrivé par cette série d'épreuves à cette heure où la croissance morale est achevée, où la mort détache sans peine le fruit mûr pour l'éternité. . . Rien ne peut l'abattre ni diminuer son ardeur, mais son âme fut broyée, et, pareille au Vase de Madeleine, elle répandit en se brisant tous les parfums qu'elle contenait."

Thus writes Prince Emmanuel de Broglie of the Archbishop of Cambrai, whose life-story, though often told, seems never to have received full justice. Fénelon has suffered as much from his would-be partisans as from his enemies. "Liberal" Catholics and Protestants have claimed him for their own, and if his foes were relentless in their day, his later admirers have praised him for qualities and sentiments he would have been the first indignantly to repudiate. In this study we are not so much concerned with the prosperous period of his career, his position at Court, or his duties as tutor to the Duke of Burgundy, which are well-known, as with the history of the last years of his life, during which his character, ennobled and purified by suffering and disappointment, impresses us still more with its strength and holiness.

If we would picture Fénelon to ourselves and try to realize how it was that he so impressed his generation, we must turn to the description, given of him by his contemporaries, which his portraits fully bear out. The Chancellor, M. d'Aguisseau, in his grave, cold way, thus describes him:

> The Abbé de Fénelon was one of those rare men, destined to make a mark in their generation, who honour humanity as much by their virtues as they do honour to letters by their facile and bril-

liant talents. His eloquence, in fact, had more of insinuation than of vehemence, and he reigned as much by the charm of his society as by the superiority of his talents, understanding all minds and appearing to give way to others, even while carrying them with him. A personality marked by nobility and originality and a certain sublime simplicity added to his character the air of a prophet. Always original, always creative, he seemed to imitate none, and to be himself inimitable.

Saint-Simon, in his incisive, vivid style, supplements M. d'Aguisseau's impressions by his well-known words.

> This Prelate [he tells us] was a big man, thin, well-made, pale, with a big nose, eyes from which fire and genius poured forth in torrents, and a physiognomy such as I have never seen in any other, and which, once seen, could never be forgotten. It embraced everything, gravity, courtesy and gaiety; the air of the divine, the Bishop and the great nobleman were equally his, and what shone above all in his personality was the delicacy of the intellect, grace, modesty and especially nobility. One had to make an effort to cease looking at him.

Such was the man whose later years we wish to describe. Born in 1654, Fénelon was forty-three when his great trial came upon him. Up to that time his life had been singularly free from trouble. His early vocation had preserved him from the dangers and the fascinations of the world, and later on his tutorship to the little Prince and his appointment to the see of Cambrai (1697) had brought full recognition of his virtue and talents. That the former was solid, nay heroic, we have now to show.

It is not our province here to enter on the delicate and intricate history of quietism, which brought such disaster to France and which was the cause of Fénelon's misfortune and of his complete fall in the King's estimation. Begun in "gentleness and calm" between Bossuet and Fénelon, this discussion gathered strength and became more and more ardent. "Every one knows," says de Broglie, "how the Archbishop, thinking only to defend the doctrine of the pure love of God or of disinterested charity, allowed himself to be involved in the mysticism of the too famous Mme Guyon, and was dragged with her on to most dangerous ground," the result being that his book, *Les Maximes des*

Saints, was condemned by Pope Innocent VII. In 1697, while the question was being examined in Rome, and Bossuet was vehemently opposing his former friend, the King ordered Fénelon to retire to Cambrai, a command which meant utter disgrace at Court, and, as it turned out, a life-long banishment. At Cambrai two years later, in March, 1699, news of his condemnation in Rome reached Fénelon, who received the decree with entire humility and submission. "No one accepted the decision of the Holy See with greater promptitude, simplicity and unaffected humility than the Archbishop. It was his love of God working upon a temperament utterly unworldly and inclined to mysticism which led him into error. That his love for God was genuine was proved by the touching fervour of his obedience."* His first thought was to condemn his own work and to make his submission known to his flock; and he lost no time in writing the magnificent Pastoral, from which we give the following extract.

Our very Holy Father the Pope has condemned this book with the twenty-three propositions extracted from it, by a Brief dated March 12, which is now published everywhere and which you have already seen. We adhere to this Brief, my very dear brethren, as well for the text of the book as for the twenty-three propositions, *simply, absolutely and without a shadow of restriction.* We exhort you to a sincere submission and to an unexampled docility. Ah! may God grant that we may never be spoken of if it be not to recall that a Pastor has thought it his duty to be more docile than the least of his sheep.†

---

* Bishop Hedley. Preface to Fénelon's *Spiritual Letters*, vol. 1.

† The Pope was reluctant to condemn Fénelon's book, but there seems to have been no help for it. "There were errors in the book," says Bishop Hedley, "though these errors no doubt arose from the fact that the book was written so largely to break the brunt of the attacks on Mme Guyon, and still more, perhaps, because it was the first attempt to give a systematic account of the principles of the interior life in popular language. The doctrine intended by Fénelon in his book, as explained by him in his controversy with Bossuet, has never been censured, although the opposite party laboured hard for its condemnation. Fifteen years after the condemnation of his book, we find him restating to Pope Clement XI (who, as Cardinal, had drawn up the Brief of his condemnation) in careful scholastic language the doctrine intended by himself, but which he himself had misstated in his popular treatise."

Fénelon in Exile

Having sincerely accepted the judgement which condemned him, he "imposed silence on himself on those subjects which had occupied him too much," recalling, perhaps, his own words written two years earlier: "Let us humble ourselves, and instead of discussing contemplation, let us try to contemplate." He turned his whole mind to those duties belonging to the pastoral care of souls which were to be the honour and consolation of his declining years. In less than two months after the condemnation of his book we find him making one of his episcopal visitations, preaching, hearing confessions, confirming with renewed ardour. Since his consecration Fénelon had always lived nine months of the year in his diocese, and had already won the hearts of his people, no easy matter in a recently conquered country, and he had found several true friends in the society of the town, besides being now surrounded by the little band who accompanied him into exile. We will endeavour to follow him in his new life and to make acquaintance with his surroundings.

The town of Cambrai, only restored to France by the Treaty of Nimeguen in 1678, was, by its position on the frontier and its commerce, a very important place at this time. It had regretfully returned to French dominion, and the language and customs of the inhabitants still remained Flemish. Under German rule the Archbishop had been a Prince of the Holy Roman Empire, and Fénelon, while retaining this title for the portion of his diocese which was still foreign, became Duke of Cambrai on French soil. He was therefore a very great personage civilly as well as ecclesiastically, and the revenues, which, however, were very irregularly paid, amounted to 200,000 livres annually. The Archbishop was lord of ten parishes, and reigned over all the *Chatellenie* of Château Cambresis. The episcopal palace was worthy of the diocese, and was grand and magnificent. "It is preceded by a *Place*, on one side of which extends the metropolitan Church of Notre Dame. The entrance to the palace is on the right; to the west of the church, on the left, through the little door of the Archbishop's house, one enters under an open gallery or portico adorned with columns and paved with black and white marble, which runs the whole length of the courtyard and supports a high covered gallery." The rest of the palace, with its chapel, library, *chambre à daïs*, state bedroom, etc., is also minutely described in the journal of Bossuet's chaplain, the Abbé le Dieu, who visited Fénelon after his great patron's death, and he mentions specially the simple little bedroom used by the Archbishop, "furnished with grey-white woollen stuff." In spite of his great revenues, the burdens of the position were so numerous that Fénelon was far from rich. "He kept his own accounts with a scrupulous exactitude," which did not prevent his giving away with an immense generosity. His own habits were austere and simple, but he practised an amiable hospitality which on necessary occasions could be magnificent—but all with a strict economy. Order and charity ruled his household, and the Archbishop himself set the example of a life of work and prayer. His order of the day was as follows:

He woke early, says Saint-Simon; but as his delicate health did not allow of his getting up then, he said his Office and other devotions, and signed necessary papers before rising. As soon as he rose, he said Mass in his chapel, except on Saturdays, when he said it in the Cathedral, on which day he also heard the confessions of all who wished to come to him; and on great feasts he pontificated solemnly. At midday he dined, surrounded by his household, which always numbered thirteen or fourteen, including chaplains, secretaries or visitors. The master of the house sat pretty long at table entertaining and serving every one, but eating nothing solid himself, and very little of other things. After dinner the company passed into the state bedroom, hung with crimson damask, which was used as a sitting-room. Here conversation went on while the Archbishop sat apart signing documents and letters. He then retired to his study till 8.30 in winter, though, if weather permitted—and always in summer—he paid necessary visits or went to the hospitals. At nine o'clock supper was served, consisting of eggs and vegetables, and at ten o'clock the Archbishop said night prayers for the household.

Fénelon in Exile

Fénelon was a great admirer of nature, and taking walks was his one recreation. The exercise appeared to be necessary for his health, so that if the weather kept him indoors, he would walk through the apartments of the palace. He was often accompanied by his nephews or chaplains, but at other times the Archbishop would walk alone, deep in thought. "I amuse myself, I walk, I find myself in peace and in silence before God," he wrote to his nephew. Such was Fénelon's daily life all the years he spent at Cambrai, the only exception being during his visitations. Every Lent he preached in a different town of his diocese with the "facile and abundant eloquence which so impressed his audience. . . In these pastoral visits he charmed every one by his kindness and amiability, taking as much pains to please his Flemish subjects, who hardly knew French, as he had done formerly to convince the court world." When the moment came for these pastoral tours, nothing, not even war or illness, could prevent the Archbishop from setting out. He would travel simply, without any state, stopping in the humblest villages to preach and confirm, and would spend the greater part of the day in the church, welcoming all who presented themselves. In these, as in other ways, Fénelon reminds us of his great and much-loved patron, Saint Francis of Sales, who delighted in his visitations to the mountain villages of Savoy, and who said he was content to preach, even if only one old woman were to be present.

His profound faith and resignation did not prevent the first few years of his banishment from being a time of great suffering to Fénelon. The blow had been crushing, and, though striving for perfect detachment, he had not yet become indifferent. "The man of the world and the nobleman wounded in his honour were still alive in him, and more than he perhaps knew; but his hopes were set too high for him to give way for a moment to discouragement." How humbly he judged himself is often manifest in his correspondence. For instance, he writes thus on one occasion:

> There is in me an amount of self-love and frivolity of which I am ashamed. The least little personal trial overwhelms me, and the smallest thing that flatters me exalts me immeasurably. Nothing is

so humiliating as to be so tender for oneself and so hard for others, so cowardly at the mere shadow of a cross, and so changeable as to shake it off at a gleam of flattery; but all is good, God opens a strange book for our instruction when He makes us study our own hearts. I am to myself a whole big diocese, which is more overwhelming than the external one, and which I know not how to reform.

That his loyalty to the King did not falter we have ample evidence. Writing to M. de Beauvilliers on August 26, 1697, he pours out his wishes for his sovereign with unaffected earnestness. "I cannot help telling you, my good Duke, what I have in my heart," he says. "Yesterday, the feast of St Louis, I felt much devotion in praying for the King. If my prayers were good, he will feel the effect, for I prayed with good heart." After enumerating all the blessings he desired for him, and saying, "I never felt more zeal, or, if I dare say it, tenderness for his person," he adds:

> Far from feeling resentment at my present position, I would joyfully have offered myself to God for the King's sanctification. I consider even his zeal against my book as a praiseworthy result of his faith and just horror of anything that savours to him of novelty.

The isolation from his old friends and from his beloved pupil was another deep sorrow to Fénelon's affectionate nature. Devoted as he was to his country's best interests, he followed from afar the course of events, and continued to correspond with his friends, while, as we shall see, he took a very practical part when war and famine desolated his neighbourhood. He was surrounded, however, as we have said, by a group of devoted friends at Cambrai, of whom we must now speak more in detail. First in order come three priests, MM. de Langeron, de Beaumont and de Chanterac. The two first named had shared in his disgrace, and the last, his intimate friend, had been his agent in Rome during the time his book was under consideration. M. de Langeron, who was one of Fénelon's oldest friends, had been with him during his mission in Saintonge, and had followed him to court as reader to the little Duke of Burgundy, who ever afterwards retained an affection for him. Of superior talent and with a charming and amiable character, M. de Langeron, or the "Petit Abbé," as he was called, in contradiction to M. de Beaumont, who was very tall, occupied a special place in the palace and in the affections of the Archbishop, who wrote of him: "He was a friend who made the delight of my life, and who possessed with the most perfect virtue all that contributes to the pleasures of friendship." M. de Langeron was passionately attached to the Archbishop, but had his own views, and often differed from his friend, with whom he would remonstrate on occasion, without this interfering at all with their mutual affection, as this little note testifies:

> Your remonstrances, my dear child, [writes Fénelon] gave me a little pain at first, but it was right that they should, and it did not last. I have never loved you more. You would be wanting both to God and me, if you were not ready to give me this kind of pain every time you think you ought to contradict me. Our union depends upon this simplicity, and the union will be perfect only when there is perfect confidence without reserve between us.

M. de Beaumont, or the "Grand Abbé," was a nephew of the Archbishop, and is said to have been rather like him. He is described as "amiable, gay, full of animation," so that he was the life of the palace. Fénelon placed the greatest trust in him, and confided the care of the household to him when he was away. We find constant mention of his name in the correspondence under the familiar diminutive of "Panta" (Pantaleon). Here are a few lines written to him by the Archbishop during an absence in 1714:

> Where are you, my dear nephew? Where are you going? When shall I see you again *lassum maris et viarum?* I do not know, but I do know that the day of our reunion will be marked in white chalk and not in black.

The third and the most remarkable person of this intimate circle, M. de Chanterac, was also a relation of Fénelon's, and had been charged, as we have said, with the delicate and important duties of representing him in Rome, where his dignified and devout attitude had been the best advocate for his cause, and had favourably impressed every one. When the blow fell, Fénelon hastened to write to thank him for all he had done and suffered on his behalf, and to urge his return.

> Your return will be my most sensible consolation. My gratitude, my confidence, my veneration and tenderness for you are boundless. Come quickly, so that we may console ourselves in the bosom of the true Consoler. We will live and die, having only one heart and one soul.

For the rest of their days the friends were never separated.

Besides these old and tried friends, the Archbishop was constantly surrounded by his nephews and great-nephews of the house of Fénelon, among whom are specially to be noted Gabriel, afterwards Marquis de Fénelon, and his elder brother Francis, who was to be a priest. These children, and the animation they brought into his life, were a source of great delight to him; he occupied himself minutely with the care of their education and well-being, while his letters to them are among the most charming of the collection. "Fanfan," as the young Marquis was usually called, was especially privileged by growing up entirely under his eye. He became a fervent Christian and a brilliant officer, and always retained a lively affection for his uncle. Several personages of the official world of Cambrai made up the circle of the Archbishop's friends, among whom the governor of the town, the Comte de Montbéron, must be particularly mentioned. He was a connexion of the family of de Salignac, and was thus naturally a friend, but he had also been always high in favour with the King, and therefore risked much in showing his generous sympathy with the Archbishop. Fénelon showed great delicacy and prudence in his intercourse with him and his wife, who soon placed herself under his direction.

The name of Madame de Montbéron brings us naturally to the question of Fénelon's zeal as director of souls, nowhere so wonderfully displayed as in his spiritual letters, while they unconsciously portray for us his own inner life:

> That subdued but intense feeling of the love of the heavenly Father, and the burning desire to get rid of every solicitude, every attraction, every motive which is not God, recurs in letter after letter, until we almost see in imagination the thin, ascetic face, with

those eyes from which, as Saint-Simon says, fire and genius poured like a torrent.*

His letters to Madame de Montbéron, a holy but most trying woman—"the *grande dame*, so clever, intellectual and excitable, full of vivacity, imagination and sensitiveness, but at the same time of weak health and eaten up with scruples"—show the most unselfish kindness. Never was director so patient. Immersed in important business as he was, the Archbishop yet found time to write to her constantly, sometimes two or three notes in one day, to try and allay her fears and bring peace to her soul. Let us select a few extracts from this correspondence. Here are two charming letters written on the feast of St Francis de Sales, which serve the double purpose of showing the Archbishop's love for the great saint and his line of direction. On January 29, 1700, he writes:

> The feast of St Francis de Sales is a great feast-day for me, madame. I beg of him to-day with all my heart to obtain of God for you the spirit with which he himself was filled. He counted the world as nothing. You will see by his *Letters* and his *Life* that he received with the same peace and with the same spirit of annihilation the greatest honours and the hardest contradictions; but he made himself little with the little ones, and never despised anything. He made himself all things to all men, not to please every one but to gain every one, and to gain them all for Jesus Christ, not for himself. This is the spirit of the Saint, madame, which I wish to see poured out upon you.

A year later he says:

> Since you are so weak, madame, rest and do not go out. The good Saint whom we love so much will be with you at your fireside. You know how accommodating he was to all weakness of body or mind. . . Remember that if St Francis de Sales were still in this world, and if he were your director, he would forbid you to go in such a case. He does not forbid it any the less now that he is in Paradise. . . . Let us love God as he did, and we shall have celebrated his feast very well.

The next two extracts, written on other occasions in 1708, show the same patient advice which runs through the whole series of letters:

---

* Bishop Hedley.

> Take great care not to listen to your sensitiveness, which but means constraint; let your heart grow wider. I shall believe you are a real saint out of Paradise when you sleep well at night and are quite simple all day.

And again:

> Go to Communion, then, I beg of you, in the name of Him who will be your peace when you receive Him in pure faith and blind obedience. God knows the real harm you do yourself by depriving yourself of your daily Bread for an imaginary harm, in which your will had no part, and which it is only resisting with too much sensitiveness and activity. Good night. I hope that the Bread of Life will attract you to-morrow and that It will cure all the wounds of your heart.

In 1710, when his beloved friend, M. de Langeron, was dying, Fénelon wrote some touching words to Mme de Montbéron, begging her to pray:

> I have just told our patient that you have offered to come and be a third nursing sister by his bedside. He smiled and thanked you with all his heart. For myself, I feel very much, my dear daughter, all you say to me. Continue to say to God that we have need of this friend. We must, indeed, speak to God with this freedom, and tell Him our needs in His service.

We have reason to think that she was among the friends who surrounded his own deathbed a few years later, but her husband died some time before the Archbishop.

As we have said, the Archbishop, although living this quiet life "in the midst of the cold fogs of Flanders," still kept in touch with Versailles. Nearly all his old friends there had remained faithful to him, and among them none were more constant than the two dukes, de Beauvilliers and de Chevreuse. They had, wonderful to say, escaped the storm. Louis XIV, accustomed to their presence at court, designedly shut his eyes to their fidelity to their dear Archbishop, and let them keep their several charges. Among other functions M. de Beauvilliers was governor to the Duke of Burgundy, while M. de Chevreuse, who was a special favourite, kept his position as Master of the Horse as well as other honours. It is not possible here to give in full Saint-Simon's long and delightful description of the two friends—of M. de Beauvilliers, who said "he had but to wait for the manifestation of God's will in peace and submission, and to take care above all to do nothing which could give him a scruple when dying"; or of M. de Chevreuse, who was "born *vif*, turbulent, vehement, loving every pleasure," but who from the moment God touched his heart, which happened very early, "never, I think I may affirm, lost His Presence."

To these two friends Fénelon wrote constantly, and upon all the great subjects of the day, for in his letters he appears not only as the director of souls, but as the citizen who would have desired, more than he perhaps realized, to occupy himself actively for the good of his country. Above all, the letters show the increasing affection and anxiety with which he watched over the development of his former pupil. How much the King knew of the correspondence is uncertain, but we may surmise that he was aware of it, and did not wish to interfere. Perhaps he was not unwilling to hear in a roundabout way, and without compromising his dignity, the ideas of the most "brilliant, imaginative intellect of his kingdom."

The following extracts from a letter to the Duc de Beauvilliers, written about 1697, show us the writer's preoccupations regarding the young prince as well as his own situation at Cambrai:

> I am here and in peace, and with the opportunity if it please God to do good. My only thorns come from my suffragans. If the official position with the Bishop of St-Omer were settled, and if I could have a good seminary, I should be only too happy. I am grieved, my good Duke, not to see you, the good Duchess and a small number of other friends, but for all the rest I am charmed to be far away. I sing the psalm of deliverance, and nothing would cost me more than to return. I continue to love the Duke of Burgundy, in spite even of his most tiresome faults. I conjure you never to relax in your affection for him; let it be a friendship of mortification and of pure faith. It is for you to bear Him in sorrow and to bring him forth for Jesus Christ. Bear with him without flattering, warn him without worrying him, and restrict yourself to the occasions and opportunities afforded by Providence, to

which one must be faithful. Tell him the truths they wish you to make known to him, but do so briefly, gently and with respect and tenderness. . . If he were to commit some big faults, let him find in you before all else a heart open to him as a harbour in shipwreck.

These words show the great intimacy between the Archbishop and the Duke, who was, perhaps, his greatest friend in spite of their different characters; for M. de Beauvilliers' reserved and cold nature was, one might think, quite opposed to Fénelon's warmth and frankness. Very few of these letters remain, unfortunately, for us; while there are a great many of those written by the Archbishop to M. de Chevreuse. Here are a few lines of direction which show how closely he watched over this friend's soul.

Nothing ever touched me more, my good Duke, than your letter written partly from —— and partly from Versailles. God blesses you and is pleased with you for your humility. Do not cease to distrust your spirit of curiosity and reasoning; fear this taste for intellectual and learned company. As for your affairs, occupy yourself with them only so much as you see, in prayer before God, to be necessary to clear up difficulties and assist the judges to do you justice. . . Above all, reserve for yourself definite hours to pray, to read enough in order that the reading shall nourish your meditation, and to calm the natural disturbance caused by a multitude of pressing affairs.

A few months later the Duke lost a son at the battle of Carpi, and Fénelon hastened to send him a beautiful letter of consolation about the "dear child it had pleased God to take back to Himself."

The correspondence with the Duke of Burgundy himself is of course of profound interest, and in it the Archbishop pours out the hopes and fears that fill his heart for this beloved pupil, "the little Prince," as he called him to intimates. This youth, whose short life in a position of singular difficulty at his grandfather's court was worthy of his training, was born, as we know, with a very difficult character, and his childhood "made one tremble," says Saint-Simon; but after a few years, and especially from the time of his First Communion, his character changed completely.

Fénelon in Exile

From this abyss came forth a Prince who was affable, gentle, human, moderate, patient, modest, penitent, and as far, and sometimes beyond it, as his position allowed, humble and austere for himself.

That the Prince was too modest and retiring, and did not take his position in the way Fénelon hoped and wished for, his letters show, and it is touching to see how anxiously the Archbishop follows him as he passes into public life, and how he longs to see him take up his duties as heir to a great kingdom and as a worthy son of St Louis; while on his side the Prince clung to the memory of his tutor, who became to him "a sort of hero and saint to whom he gloried in being faithful," but to whom he could not even write till after his marriage. The young Mary Adelaide of Savoy, his bride, was good and charming, and the young couple were deeply attached; but at sixteen she was too young and inexperienced to be a support to her husband, who seems instinctively to have felt at this time the need of a strong friend. On December 22, 1701, he finally took courage, and after four years' silence, "placed a letter from himself in the packet the Versailles friends found means of sending secretly to Cambrai." We can imagine Fénelon's joy on receiving this letter. It must have appeared, as his biographer says, "like a refreshing shower in a land long dried up by the ingratitude and injustice of man," and he hastened to reply to it.

Nothing has ever consoled me so much as the letter I have received. I render thanks to Him who alone can accomplish in our hearts all that He wishes for His glory. He must love you much, as He gives you His love in the midst of all that is likely to extinguish it in your heart. . .

At the end of his letter the Archbishop adds these words regarding himself.

I speak to you only of God and of yourself, there is no question of me. My heart, thank God, is in peace. My greatest cross is not to see you, but I carry you incessantly before God in a more intimate way than that of the senses. I would give a thousand lives as a drop of water to see you such as God wishes you. Amen. Amen.

Not long after this he wrote again to the Prince urging him to follow St Louis's footsteps. From this, one of the finest letters the Archbishop ever wrote, we can but quote a few paragraphs.

> The strength and wisdom of St Louis will be given to you [he writes] if you beg for them while humbly recognizing your weakness and powerlessness. The time has come for you to show to the world a maturity and vigour of soul proportionate to the present need. . . True piety has nothing feeble, sad or awkward about it; it enlarges the heart, it is simple, amiable, and makes itself all things to all men in order to win all. The kingdom of God does not consist in a scrupulous observance of little formalities. It consists for each one in the virtues proper to his estate. A great prince should not serve God in the same way as an anchorite or an ordinary individual. St Louis sanctified himself as a great king. He was intrepid in war, decided in council, superior to other men in the nobility of his thoughts, without pride, presumption or hardness. He followed in everything the true interests of his kingdom, of which he was as much the father as the king. . . Be the inheritor of his virtues before succeeding to his crown. Remember that his blood flows in your veins, and that the spirit of faith that sanctified him should be the life of your soul.

In 1702 the King, ceding to his grandson's wishes, gave him the command of the army in Flanders. The Duke was the more pleased as his road thither would take him through Cambrai, and he ventured to ask leave to see the Archbishop. The permission was granted with the restriction that they should only meet for a moment, and in public. Any permission was, however, eagerly welcomed by the Prince, who wrote to announce it to the Archbishop. The latter was greatly surprised. He had, indeed, made up his mind to be absent from Cambrai to avoid any awkwardness for his pupil. The meeting took place at an inn called the *Auberge de Dunkirque*, and we are not surprised to hear that the curiosity it evoked in the bystanders caused it to be a very embarrassing moment for the chief actors. The Archbishop assisted at the Prince's repast, and "offered him the napkin" according to etiquette. At that moment the Duke said in a voice which all could hear, "I know what I owe to you; you know all I feel towards you." This brief and unsatisfactory interview caused a great stir, and was looked upon, quite mistakenly, as a mark of returning royal favour.

To Fénelon himself it was a joy mixed with pain. "I have to-day seen Mgr the Duke of Burgundy," he writes to Mme de Montbéron, "after five years of separation, but God has seasoned this consolation with a very sensible bitterness." Later in the same year, when the young Prince was returning to Versailles, he thought it more prudent not to try to see the Archbishop again, and wrote to this effect. But the note was too late; Fénelon had already gone to the place where the Duke was to change horses, and they met for a few moments and under less constraint than on the former occasion. When the campaigns of 1708, so disastrous for France, brought the Duke once more to Cambrai, he met Fénelon at the same inn, and Saint-Simon thus chronicles the occasion:

> In truth, it was at the posting-house where the Archbishop found himself and all who were at Cambrai. The oddness of this interview, which took place before every one, can be imagined. The young Prince several times tenderly embraced his tutor. He told him out loud that he would never forget the great obligations he owed him, and without ever lowering his voice, spoke almost solely to him, while the fire from his eyes, speaking to those of the Archbishop, said all that the King had forbidden to be spoken.*

This seems to have been the last meeting between Fénelon and his "little Prince," but their correspondence continued, and the former placed at his old pupil's disposition all the riches of his experience and wisdom, while to the last he showed that outspoken and uncourtly zeal for his real welfare and conduct which the Prince accepted and welcomed. During this campaign one of the Duke's companions-in-arms was the young King of England (as he was universally called in France), James III, and the latter visited Cambrai more than once. There seemed to be a mutual attraction between him and Fénelon, and the exiled Prince spent some days with the Archbishop, listening to his counsels and seeking advice for the moment, still hoped for, of his accession to the throne. Strangely enough, James possessed many of the characteristics most earnestly desired for the Duke of Burgundy by Fénelon, and we see this plainly in a very interesting letter in which he describes James's personality for his pupil's benefit. The striking history of the conversion of the Chevalier de Ramsay, afterwards Fénelon's devoted friend and biographer, is another link with our country; but this, with many other things of interest, must be regretfully passed over.

---

* Saint-Simon.

During the years 1710-11, after the conclusion of the war with Spain, Flanders became the seat of action, and Fénelon, putting aside the reserve which his position with the King had hitherto rendered prudent, devoted himself to aid as far as possible the French army, and to relieve the inevitable misery of the people, thus earning for himself a reputation of magnificent charity, the memory of which still lives in the country. At all times the Archbishop, indeed, spent most of his revenues in charity. After keeping what was necessary for the expenses of his household, all the rest went to hospitals, to monasteries or to the poor. He had persuaded the magistrates of the town to secure some of St Vincent's Sisters, then already in great request, and he himself regularly visited the sick and prisoners; but the war brought fresh needs, and, to him, fresh ardour. As often as the French soldiers, sometimes without bread, passed through Cambrai on their route, he managed to supply them with food. Once when the garrison of the town had no provisions, he sent them half of his own store of corn. As the scene of the action changed, and the defeat of the French brought both armies to the neighbourhood, he enlarged his benefactions. After Malplaquet, when the town was full of wounded and villagers with their flocks, he opened his palace to all fugitives without distinction, and every corner was occupied, while the animals found safety in the archiepiscopal gardens. This led to the legend of the cow which was sought for all night, and finally led back to its weeping owner by Fénelon himself, a story which we mention only to show the impression caused by his charity. Soon these guests were replaced by a host of wounded officers, French and foreign, for whom he provided with the same generosity. The enemy vied with his own countrymen in veneration for their benefactor. The Archbishop's lands were carefully preserved from harm so that the peasants could take refuge in them, and if he had to go anywhere in his diocese, the officers, without being asked, would beg to send him the necessary escort.

There is a famous story, related in Marlborough's Life, of the Archbishop receiving his own corn from the English General who had brought it into Cambrai, and then giving it back to the French garrison and the poor. This action was applauded on all sides and brought unlooked-for thanks from the King. "Louis," says Saint-Simon, "could not help sending him word several times that he was grateful for the help he had given to his troops."

We must now turn to quite other matters, and glance at the literary work which occupied the Archbishop's scanty leisure. This part of his life illustrates once more the saying that great men have time for everything, for nearly all his philosophical works were written at Cambrai, though the *Treatise on the Existence of God*, part of which appeared in 1712, was only completed there. The *Letters on Religion*, the *Fables* and *Dialogues of the Dead*, and other theological and pious writings also belong to this period. The famous *Télémaque* was, of course, written years before at Versailles, but it also made its unauthorized appearance while Fénelon was in exile.

It is not possible here to enter into the great quarrel over Jansenism in which Fénelon, who was its greatest opponent, took so large a share. He had remained in great favour at Rome, where his ready submission had won him the respect and confidence of the Holy See, and through his constant correspondence with Cardinal Gabriele he was able to convey to the Pope news of the Jansenist movement, and recommend the line of action to be taken in France. He himself, after much hesitation, broke the silence of years by the magnificent pastoral on the *Case of Conscience* and the *Infallibility of the Church in matters of Doctrine*, an utterance which produced a great effect, and won for him a testimony of respect from the whole body of French Bishops, which, as we can well understand, was very welcome to the author of the *Maximes*.

In November, 1710, the Abbé de Langeron died. During the few days of his friend's illness Fénelon never left him, and his death was profound grief to him. "My heart is pierced with sorrow," he tells his nephew when the illness seemed hopeless, "but the will of God is always infinitely loving even when it crushes one," and each of his letters of this date contains a word of sorrow regarding his loss. This sorrow was followed two years later by another and a greater one, but the interval brought a momentary joy and renewed interests to the Archbishop. The sudden death of the Dauphin in April, 1711, the first of those family and national sorrows which were to cloud the declining years of the *Grand Monarque*, brought the Duke of Burgundy into greater prominence, and revived all Fénelon's hopes for him. He redoubled his counsels for this beloved prince, and longed for him to show himself a power for good in the country and "a firm Christian with a large and simple heart." The possibilities for his own advancement as the friend of the new Dauphin, however, do not seem to have dazzled him for a moment.

Much has been said of Fénelon's ambition, but that he had personal ambitions we do not believe. His whole life seems to us to be a contradiction of such a theory, though that he had high ambitions for his country and Prince is no less certain; and in the coming sorrow, as we shall see, his grief for France finds expression even when he keeps silence as to his own suffering.

As we know, this time of interest and excitement which brought the last joys of Fénelon's life lasted less than a year. Early in the following February, 1711, he received the news of the fatal illness of the Dauphine and of her husband's despair, and on the twelfth the young and charming princess expired. The Dauphin, to whom she had been everything, fell ill himself, and followed her to the grave within a week, a double tragedy which filled France with dismay. Great as had been his anxiety during the Dauphin's brief illness, Fénelon's natural hopefulness of disposition had led him to think he could recover, and he wrote on February 18 to the Duc de Chevreuse, sending a long message for the spiritual consolation of the Dauphin; but on the very day it was written the prince died most piously at the age of twenty-nine, "without a regret, joyous even, with the joy of a Christian." Such a death was the greatest consolation which could have been granted to the Archbishop, and the only reward he would have desired for his long devotion. It also completed the work of detachment in his own soul. "All my chains are broken. . . Nothing now attaches me to earth," he said; and again, "God thinks quite differently from men. He destroys what He seemed to have created expressly for His glory. He punishes us, but we deserve it." And then turning his thoughts to the needs of the country, he writes: "I could give my life, not only for the State, but for the children of my very dear Prince, whose place in my heart is greater even than it was in life."

We now enter upon the last three years of Fénelon's life, that period of old age of which Mme Swetchine writes that "it is not only a time of waning bodily strength, but also the hastening of perfection in a soul always more radiant as the spiritual absorbs all else." So with the Archbishop, his pastoral work, to which he was faithful to the end in spite of failing strength, and his spiritual letters all bear witness to one who hastens his steps in sight of the goal. Two more sorrows came to sadden these days in the deaths of the Dukes de Beauvilliers and de Chevreuse, and one of the last letters Fénelon ever wrote was one of consolation to the widow of the former, in which he reminds her how short the separation will be, for "we are hastening daily to join him, and in a short time there will be no cause for tears. It is we who will die. He whom we love lives and will die no more."

On New Year's Day, 1715, the Archbishop was seized with a violent attack of fever. He felt from the beginning that he was dying, and here Saint-Simon, who was generally no friend to Fénelon, does him justice.

> Whether from disgust with the world, [he says] which had ever been so deceitful to him, and with its passing vanities, or whether rather his long-established piety was vivified still more by the sad thought of the friends he had lost, he appeared insensible to all he was leaving, and occupied solely with what he was going to, with a tranquillity and a peace which precluded trouble, but included contrition, detachment and care for his diocese; a spirit of confidence, in short, which rested on humble fear.

Fénelon in Exile

The illness, which brought great suffering, lasted only a few days, during which Fénelon prepared himself for death with his usual simplicity and humility. He had the Holy Scriptures read to him constantly, especially St Paul's second letter to the Corinthians. On the third day he received Holy Viaticum "in his Great Chamber and in presence of his Chapter," and before receiving Holy Communion he addressed a few words to those around him. On the next day the return of his nephew, the Marquis de Fénelon, and the Abbé de Beaumont, who had been absent, gave him evident pleasure. They had brought the King's celebrated doctor, Chirac, but nothing could stop the disease.

On the Epiphany the weakness was great, and the Archbishop received Extreme Unction, after which he dictated in a firm voice a letter to the King's confessor, to be sent after his death, in which he protests anew his docility to the Church, and horror of the "Novelties" imputed to him, as well as his loyalty to his sovereign. This letter, which, Saint-Simon says, contained "only what was touching and suitable from a great Bishop on his death-bed," was Fénelon's last earthly act. In the hours that followed, when conscious, he repeated to himself passages from the Scriptures or acts of abandonment to God's will.

During the last night his faithful friends and nephews, with his confessor, the Abbé la Vayer, surrounded his bedside, and at intervals he would bless them or kiss the crucifix they offered him. Towards morning on January 7, the Abbé recited the prayers for the dying, and about five o'clock Fénelon peacefully expired.

It is with regret that we conclude our task. We feel, with M. de Broglie, that it is impossible to have lived in the company of such a soul and to have had a glimpse of all the gifts with which God endowed it, without being a little fascinated by its greatness and brilliancy; and with Saint-Simon, that it is difficult to cease looking at this great Archbishop, who by his spiritual writings is still to many of us our counsellor and guide.

M. M. MAXWELL SCOTT

IS SOCIALISM RIGHT AFTER ALL?

Acta Leonis XIII. Seven vols. Tournai: Desclée, Lefebvre.

The Wealth of Nations. By Adam Smith. Edit. MacCulloch. 1863.

Die Frau und der Socialismus. Von A. Bebel. Tenth Edition. Stuttgart. 1891.

Socialism and Society. By Ramsey Macdonald. The Socialist Library. London. 1905.

TO deal effectually with any widespread opinion we must treat it sympathetically, have felt its attraction, have distilled from it the soul of goodness which it contains, above all when we find ourselves in controversy with the spokesmen of poverty.

Now the spread of socialism among Catholic workmen is a grave anxiety to many of our priesthood in the manufacturing districts, and the arguments in favour of socialism are much stronger than many of its opponents suppose.

Thus to the common objection that socialistic schemes could not in real life be made to work, because of the insuperable difficulties in assigning employment and remuneration; this might apply, it is answered, to crude, violent, instantaneous schemes, but not to gradual or Fabian socialism, which in orderly fashion would withdraw capital more and more from private hands, and concentrate it more and more in public hands, till after much experience and preparation the transfer would be complete and collectivism installed almost imperceptibly. Further, is it not mere narrowness and prejudice to say that universal State or municipal industry could not be carried on, when we remember that much is carried on in England at this hour which to the theorist in Aristotle's day would have seemed impossible, such as industrial and domestic service without slavery, or representative government that allows participation in the commonwealth to be spread over hundreds of thousands of square miles instead of being confined to a single urban district? Again, in reply to the charge of being immoral and irreligious, with doctrines destructive of family and Church, it may be answered that these doctrines, though taught by many socialists, are taught with more virulence and less excuse by many others besides socialists, and that, as the readers of the April number of this Review will remember, the anti-socialist Clémenceau is a more rabid atheist than the socialist Jaurès. In any case, these doctrines, it can be pleaded, are no part of the essential programme of collectivism, merely superfluous tenets having no necessary connexion with collective organization and control. Or are we gravely to say that because a man advocates the change from the present individualistic private delivery of letters in China to a collective imperial postage throughout that empire, he is therefore an immoral atheist? What, again, is to hinder a further evolution of socialism in a religious direction? For if the violently hostile attitude of Marx and Bebel is giving place in Germany to comparative neutrality that leaves religion alone as a man's personal concern (*Privatsache*), why not hope for a further step, and for the recognition of religion as a help toward the peaceful working of any commonwealth; a God-fearing and moral collectivist government being just as possible as a God-fearing and moral king or parliament under existing individualism? Again, if the Catholic workman is told that socialism was condemned by Leo XIII, he may be taught to reply that precisely private property is what is secured by scientific socialism, and that it was not scientific socialism which Leo XIII condemned, only the abuses of violence and communism; indeed, that by their efforts to universalize private property, to endow the present mill-hand and farm-hand and slum-dweller with their own house and home, goods and garden, to put an end to usury, monopoly and the ruthless warfare of rival traders, the socialists are the true pupils of Leo XIII, and that his true opponents are the receivers—many perhaps unwittingly, but still the receivers—through the manifold channels of rent and interest, of profits flowing from sweated labour, from slum dwellings, from extortionate prices, from foul wares, from fouler drink-shops and houses of debauchery.

Further, the socialists, pressing forward to the attack, may tell us that we are antiquated and that they are alone in harmony with the facts of modern industry and the spirit of modern science. For it is they who claim to carry to its logical conclusion the tendency of modern business toward concentration and integration seen in vast institutions like the American Trusts, or the Shipping Combines, or great distributive stores like "Harrods'" in London or the Bon Marché at Paris. And if they have grasped the true signicance of the change from competition to coalition, the socialists claim to have grasped the analogous change, set forth by evolutionary science, from egoism to altruism: the brutal battling for wealth and power, akin to the struggle for existence of beasts and plants in the jungle, being transmuted by gradual development to universal friendly service and organized remuneration.

Finally, the arguments current against socialism may be triumphantly cited as a confession of its truth. The supporters indeed of the present order of work and ownership may perhaps disclaim responsibility for popular arguments.* But their case is made no better, if they keep to the arguments of professional and professorial economists. For they meet a distressing dilemma. Either the economists fail to see the real difficulty and real point at issue, which is not the existence of private property for personal use, but rather the indefinite extension and accumulation of wealth in the hands of a single individual by employing the labour of others. (For example, even so great an authority as Professor Marshall gives us no clear explanation or valid defence of this process of accumulation, which is the very head and front of offending attacked by Karl Marx.) Or else the economists see the real issue all too clearly. For example, Adam Smith, in the eighteenth century, looks at the process with cynical amusement and takes it for granted; while a hundred years afterwards, when some justification of "unearned income" was called for, the late Dr Menger, of

---

* Perhaps typified by the work, first published in 1893, by W. H. Mallock, entitled *Labour and Popular Welfare*, and advertised as "a handbook for all public speakers and other disputants who desire to meet and expose the fallacies of socialism."

Austria, whose competence none will gainsay, could find no better justification than the bare ground of legality, the mere fiat of positive law.

> The pound of flesh 'tis mine, and I will have it;
> If you deny me, fie upon your law!
> There is no force in the decrees of Venice;
> I stand for judgement.

But who can endure such a justification or can refrain from the retort that if positive law has the power to establish property, it has equally the power of disestablishment? And in our own time by the easy methods of progressive income-tax and progressive death-duties our rulers can legally transfer all income and power from individuals to the community. The plea of legality is a weapon of defence that breaks to pieces in our hands.

Obviously then the matter before us is not simple but complicated. We need something more than mere negation, some ideal that may outshine the brilliant future depicted by socialism, if we would satisfy ourselves and convince our opponents.

Here it may be said that precisely in Christianity is the ideal we require, and that Christianity gives us an effective answer to socialism. In a sense this is true, but not in every sense; and like many another statement of truth requires much guarding and explanation, lest we be dazed by it instead of being illuminated. For the word Christian is ambiguous; and there are those who call themselves Christian Socialists, and declare that Christianity and socialism are more or less identical. Take for example the discussion in *The Labour Leader* of 1905 on "The Church and Socialism" and the following statement of the Rev. Percy Dearmer, Secretary of the London Christian Social Union:

> This is the great thing to remember. We are only partly Christianized. That is why there is not more socialism among Christians. Every Christian, layman or parson, is still half-baked—is only partly true to the Christian ideal. The exceptions to this are the saints—those few poor souls who in every generation become like Christ. But the saints and all the Christian Fathers have all been what we should now call Socialists.*

---

* Reprinted in the *Daily News*, September 11, 1905.

Nor is Mr Dearmer a solitary example; he can claim a long descent from Apostolic or sub-Apostolic times; and we can trace a chain of those bearing the Christian name who have upheld socialistic doctrines, such as the Ebionites of the first century, and later the Carpocratians, whose doctrines, with the revived wealth and civilization of Europe in the eleventh century, were renewed by the Poor Men of Lyons and the Albigenses, continued by the Fraticelli and in the popular French verses of Jean de Meung and the Flemish of Van Maelant, and later by the Lollards and Anabaptists; and lastly, when the industrial and political revolutions of the eighteenth century had again awakened the social question, were renewed once more especially in England and Germany in the various forms of Christian Socialism.

But Christianity and the Christian Church have never been synonymous; and a ring of independent doctrine more or less alien and hostile has ever surrounded, and is ever likely to surround, her long march through the centuries.

Now precisely the historical Church has been hostile to socialism, has all along preached submission and obedience, has recognized, by her very effort to sanctify it, the distinction of wealth and poverty, of master and servant; and far from the saints being "what we should now call Socialists," the Church has persistently ejected from her body those who taught terrestrial equality and counselled social revolt. And though none have denounced injustice in the acquiring and handling riches more vigorously than the Fathers of the Church following the Hebrew Prophets before them, any reasonable examination of their works, regarding context and circumstance, will disclose the gulf that separates their teaching from those who make the ownership of great estates and the rule over many servants *ipso facto* an iniquity. St Basil and St Chrysostom in Greek, St Ambrose and St Jerome in Latin, denounced the avarice and harsh dealing of the rich, warned them of their duty to share their goods with the poor by deeds of charity, and declared that God was the one real owner of all things. But they neither taught nor dreamed that the emancipation of slaves should be made compulsory, and that property should be transferred by law from the individual to the State or from the rich to the poor. Indeed the very merit of manumission and almsgiving was that such deeds should be free.*

Now, as the core of this article, let me urge against socialism that the sum and substance of its failing is its being unhistorical; man as he appears in history is one thing, man as represented by socialism is another. As far as authentic records take us back, as far back as some forty centuries before Christ, we find in all civilized societies the double feature of service and inheritance; that is, we find not merely the simple accumulation of furniture, jewelry and other means of display or enjoyment, but the complex legal and social arrangement whereby land and other sources of permanent income are in private possession, families form an undying corporation, transmitting their heritage from one generation to another, and the vast majority of men, whatever their legal status, are working *de facto* for others. The possible objection of a primitive time, with no ownership of land except what was public or communal, we can brush away. For even if we admitted this dubious historical theory as proved, it would be irrelevant; we are not studying the character of ownership and society among the Scythians of the time of Herodotus, or the Gauls of the time of Cæsar, or the Germans of the time of Tacitus, but the conditions of civilization, where there is an orderly civil power, urban arts and crafts, science and literature, and a national life, not the mere loose aggregations that may lead to it. And to find private ownership and service, and family incomes of great variety, from penury to abundance, as the inseparable companions of civilization through six thousand years is sufficient ground to declare such companionship a necessity, and socialism therefore an illusion.

Nor can the statement that civilization is artificial and the suggestion that we should return to the natural be allowed. For have we forgotten Burke's description of a "natural aristocracy," or his words:

---

* The claim of socialist writers and orators to annex the Christian Fathers has been met by Father Desjacques in the *Études Religieuses* for 1878, and more recently by Father Capart, in a work crowned by the Brussels Académie Royale in 1897, *La Propriété Individuelle et le Collectivisme*, pp. 485-501. On the prophets, see Dr Franz Walter, *Die Propheten in ihrem sozialen Beruf.* Freiburg i. B. 1900.

> The state of civil society, which necessarily generates this aristocracy, is a state of nature, and much more truly so than a savage and incoherent state of life. For man is by nature reasonable; and he is never perfectly in his natural state, but when he is placed where reason may be best cultivated and most predominates. Art is man's nature. We are as much, at least, in a state of nature in formed manhood, as in immature and helpless infancy.*

It is civilization then that is natural; whereas to return to the conditions of rude simplicity would not be natural, but artificial.

Nor will I admit the charge of being narrow and prejudiced like the classical Greek theorist, who, could our present conditions of government have been advocated in his time, would have declared them impossible. For he had before him only the scanty experience of a single civilization ill-recorded during a few centuries, while it is from many centuries and wide experience and trusty records that we can gather our induction.

But do not the socialists themselves appeal to history, and, following a biological theory of evolution, trace the gradual ascent of man from bestial origins through savagery and low grades of civilization to the heights that are yet awaiting, as their coping stone or crown, the collectivist commonwealth? Indeed, at the first glance this explanation of all history, this discernment of an order in the seeming chaos, has the charm of an illumination. But the charm is broken by inaccuracy; for the historical theory that Marx set forth so brilliantly, even when amended by modern writers,† cannot endure the test of detailed facts: an automatic upward progression in moral character is inconsistent with them. As early as we can get in touch with it, human nature appears no other than human nature of to-day. Then on all sides we can trace signs of external degeneracy as well as of advance, and know for certain that civilization has again and again reverted to barbarism. We can trace the morbid growth of vice in Greece from the better times of Pindar to the worse times of Polybius; and in Italy from the exemplary *mores* of ancient Rome to the cesspools of Juvenal;* while the slave-code of Babylon under Hammurabi is humanity itself compared with the slave-code of Rome under Augustus some two-and-twenty centuries later. Indeed, if there is an upward tendency in man, there is also a downward tendency, a trend towards depravity (*der Hang zum Schlimmen*); and the solid fact remains that as the actual present issue and climax of a whole series of civilizations we meet the appalling conditions of life in great centres like London, Paris, Berlin and New York. But if man is as socialism says he is, such conditions as the result of evolution are unintelligible.

---

* *Appeal from the New to the Old Whigs*, Works, III, p. 86.

† As in Professor Seligman's *Economic Interpretation of History*. New York. 1902.

It is not, therefore, in this theory of history that we can find our illumination. It will come rather if we recognize the supreme need of learning the distinction between the constant and the variable in the course of history, and the presence both of the upward tendency and of the downward. Then we may search profitably for some guiding principle or criterion, illuminative and accurate, that will enable us to take an intelligible survey of the facts, make an intelligible selection among them, arrange them in an intelligible order, and never land us in any contradiction with the detailed record of fact. Whether apart from the Christian Revelation and the implications of the Gospel any such historical criterion can be found, is not our immediate point, but rather that it is not found in the socialist theory of history. Whereas, if we accept the Christian view of human nature and the external world, there is no need for us to distort the facts of history in the direction either of pessimism or optimism; we shall have a criterion for distinguishing what evils are the inevitable concomitants of civilization, and what can be removed without plucking up civilization by the roots. Then we shall understand that private capital is inextricably intertwined with civilization; that to equalize for every one the opportunity of gaining wealth and power is to weaken energy, because limiting to the individual the prospect of advancement, and removing the motive to strive for the permanent advancement of family or friends. Nor shall we forget that moral frailty is not caused by indigence or cured by affluence, and that the passions of man, which have their issue in the seven deadly sins, would be at work whatever the social and political conditions.

---

* One part of this process of moral decay and of heavier-growing economic oppression can be traced in the first chapter of the late Mr Greenidge's *History of Rome*, 1904. His testimony, based on documentary evidence, is all the more striking because he has no clue to the cause of this moral decline, and seems to share the conventional and undocumentary disesteem of uncivilized man.

It was pointedly remarked by Sir Henry Wrixon some ten years ago that the Statutes of New York and the Chinese system of government appeared perfect on paper; but that men mattered, not paper; and that the men in neither place were perfect.* And more recently Lord Goschen has expressed a kindred truth:

> The socialist "ethical" man is an hypothesis just as the older economic man was an hypothesis. I am afraid that the one hypothesis will find as little its counterpart in this world of ours as the other hypothesis, and if the economic man is a monster, the ethical man, as pictured by the socialists, is an angel who will not walk on this terrestrial globe.†

In a word, the socialist theory is not humane and historical, but unreal and doctrinaire. Were men the perfect beings the theory supposes, collectivism would be no injury to home or to nation or to religion; it would work admirably, only it would be entirely superfluous. For on the same utopian supposition our present inequality would produce results no less admirable: all our slums turned into Port Sunlights or Bournevilles, our factories familiar with the sounds of prayer and praise, our country folk sitting each man under the Northern equivalent of his own vine and his own fig-tree. And hence the collectivist commonwealth has to face the dilemma of being either unworkable or unneeded.

---

* *Socialism*, 1896, p. 264.

† *Essays and Addresses on Economic Questions*, 1905. Introductory Notes.

This doctrinaire and unreal character of socialism is seen in its treatment of family life. I am not speaking of the fact that socialist writers are in frequent agreement with a school of anthropology which upholds bestial origins of marriage and family; for the opponents of socialism are tarred by the same brush. The point is that in civilized society the socialist theory is incompatible with historical, and still more with Christian, family life.

Here we may expect an emphatic repudiation of the charge, and the indignant *tu quoque*, that precisely under the capitalist regime decent family life has been made impossible for the larger half of the population—family life indeed with the tenement house as the home and the gutter as the playground. Is it not precisely the happy advent of collectivism that will secure to every family a genuine home? For it is only the means of production that are to be held collectively *pro bono publico;* while to each separate household are assigned their own house and household goods, and within the sacred enclosure of the family the enjoyment of these means of consumption. Or are we still so obstinate in misunderstanding as to persist in confusing the dreams of communism with the sober programme of scientific socialism? Or are we deaf to the eloquent words of Mr H. G. Wells, that "Love, home and children, these are the heart-words of life."*

Confronted with such a turning of the argument, though not confessing its validity, I confess to a sense of shame, because I am sorrowfully mindful of the famous article on the housing question by the late Lord Salisbury, in 1883, with the agitation it aroused, the striving after reformation; and mindful also of the actual conditions more than twenty years later of the parish of Wapping, within a brief mile of the world's financial centre, as though an impenetrable veil covered the evil. Before attempting, therefore, to meet the bitter retort of the socialists, it is indeed urgent that all who claim the title of Christian should attempt to make impossible such dwellings and such drink-shops as those of Wapping; and, before speaking against the socialists,

* *Mankind in the Making*, p. 9. 1903.

should have themselves in some way worked in the cause of social reform. Let those also be ruled out of court who for many years, in divers ways, have waged war against the Christian family, and have spread the pestilential evils of Malthusianism and divorce, so that the "heart-words of life" are failing amid great sections of the people in France and North America and even in England, yielding their place to lawless passion, transitory households, sterile unions. It is not for the teachers of these things to cast stones at socialism, or to take scandal at the notorious work on *Woman* written by the socialist champion, Bebel. Rather let them reap as they have sown, and remember that it is such as they who have made such as him both possible and plausible.

Then indeed we can enter the court with cleaner hands, and declare that though we may have been slack in carrying out our principles, the principles themselves are a sound foundation for family life, while those of socialism are a quicksand. Not merely would the Christian home be engulfed, but the family life of all healthy human races—Hindus, Chinese, Japanese—whatever is good in nature being preparatory for the gospel and a substratum for grace. For if the collective providence is substituted for the paternal; if the official, not the father, becomes the provider; the community, not the family, the unit of income; then the very well-spring of energy and of self-control is dried up, namely, the desire to provide for wife and children, to shelter them from evil, to raise them to better conditions, to be their earthly Providence. And where the father and husband is stripped of the duties that are his salvation, his children in their turn are stripped of their filial duties to their parents, of their fraternal duties to one another; whether they dwell together in unity or not becomes of no account; the delicate attention to sick and weakly members, the very field where man is seen at his best, is no longer needed; the old maxim, "Blood is thicker than water," becomes meaningless; ancestral renown and the honour of the family will be no longer words to conjure with; the salt that kept domestic relations from corruption will have lost its savour; and the socialist community for all its protestations will have assumed the forbidding shape of a gigantic foundling-house.

This is the fatal blot on the socialist escutcheon; and to plead that the shields of others are not unsullied is but the sorry justification of a copartnership in guilt. Whatever the doctrine of others may be, theirs is demonstrably antagonistic to the Christian family, and thus cancels the chief item in the happiness of the human race.

Finally, socialism is unreal and unhistorical in being cosmopolitan. For nationality is a natural growth, a mysterious principle of social cohesion, difficult to support by explicit argument, but yet from the experience of sixty centuries of civilization, a postulate of welfare. But if all men are to be equal in the sense of being given an equal opportunity of temporal advantage, and our aim is the "emancipation of all mankind, without distinction of race or sex,"* it follows that all nations must share alike, no special advantage being reserved for any of them. It is easy to repeat the formula that all capital or productive goods shall become the property, not of individuals, but of society; yet difficult or impossible to prevent the word society meaning the whole human race, and forcing us to throw into hotchpot the unequal earnings of Americans, Englishmen, Italians, Russians, Hindus, Negroes and Chinese. Why differentiate continents, or affront the principle of equality by privileges according to a man's domicile or complexion? The "white man's burden" is simply to equalize the black or brown or yellow man's burden with his own; and we are forced onwards to the necessity of an all-world State if we would escape an all-world anarchy.

In a word, the socialists have failed to see that their doctrine is a parasite: it presupposes antecedent to itself the very organized commonwealth and the social virtues that it will afterwards destroy. For the very notion of organism implies permanent inequalities of function, power and dignity incompatible with socialism; and the lasting existence of a commonwealth rests on the prevalence of a solid family life to which socialism, as we have shown, is antagonistic; and the very brotherhood of man, the very philanthropy and altruism that socialism presupposes in its adherents, are only reasonable on the base of a common Fatherhood of God, and a common need and fact of Redemption—doctrines inconsistent with the socialist contempt of "other-worldliness." Indeed, mere natural science, physical or historical, leads to no tenderness or reverence to those whom we can no longer call our brothers in Christ; and the cultured mind emancipated from the wholesome superstitions of the Japanese or from the illuminating presuppositions of Christianity is likely, far from being moved to compassion, to judge mankind as painted by Juvenal or Zola, and to feel for them, as for the Yahoos in Swift's cynical allegory, only abhorrence and contempt.

---

* *Socialist Standard*, November, 1905.

Our case, indeed, as yet is only half completed; for no one is convinced by mere negation, and if the plausible structure of socialism is only a house of cards, where is any solid structure in its place? Even a paper roof is better than none.

The objection is fair; and if the present answer is but scanty, the limits of space not of material must be the excuse.

The first point is to emphasize that neither in fact nor in theory is the choice before us between individualism and socialism. It is not an alternative between the devil taking the hindmost, or the devil taking the foremost; rather it is for the social constable to take the devil into custody. Individualism and socialism are the two vicious extremes; the golden mean of social organization lies between them. The old organization suited to simple little-changing conditions of society, with narrow frontiers, thin populations, and petty industry without science or machinery, broke down in the age of industrial revolution, and allowed the strong to prey on the weak. "Leave us alone," said the Individualist; "Pull all down," said the Socialist; "Reconstruct," said Reason. And, in fact, reconstruction in all civilized countries has proceeded apace: witness the elaborate codes of factory laws and workmen's insurance (workmen's compensation and old age pensions are part of it),* witness the immense growth of all kinds of workmen's associations, from the British trade unions and co-operative societies, to the rural banking associations in Italy; witness the development of welfare institutions, such as those connected with the names of Lever in England, Harmel in France, Brandt in Germany and Heinz in America.† Thus when Leo XIII so emphatically urged all classes to unite in the work of social reform, the State, the workmen's associations, and the private philanthropists each to contribute their share and act in harmony, he showed himself a true humanist, recognizing the good forces in existence, and promoting their harmony and vigour.

To say, then, that if we reject socialism we have no alternative but individualism is contrary to fact; and to say that every step towards social reform is a step towards socialism is to confuse antidote with poison.

The social question is not solved, but, unless for some untimely interruption of socialism, is in process of solution, new bottles being prepared for the new wine.

The problem put widely, is how to secure the material advantages of the capitalist administration of industry, and yet according to the varying circumstances of each country to control this capitalist force, so as to limit its disintegrating effect on the family and the State, and its pressure on individuals.‡ This doctrine of the reformation and not the supersession of modern industry is taught by the Jesuit Father Henry Koch; the technical changes and immense works of modern industry render the old personal and patriarchal relations impracticable and obsolete; and unless the workmen are united in associations and protected by factory laws and insurance, they are inferior to the employer in fact, though at law his equal. But the workmen are not to be excluded from the growing refinements of the age and the benefits of civilization. Indeed, the change in politics from absolute or autocratic to constitutional government must have its analogue in economics: the arbitrary must be eliminated, and the labour-contract changed from a brutal struggle into a constitutional agreement: the aim being to unite the utmost efficiency of technical equipment and business management with the liberty and dignity of the work people; an aim not more difficult than to unite constitutional with efficient government. And thus the mere tolerance, more or less niggardly, of workmen's unions is half-hearted folly; rather let them be recognized, established and wrought into the system of industrial peace. The days of mere patronage or paternalism—men's homes and fortunes, work and wages, dependent on the good will of others—these days are over, and the days of democratic equality are at hand.*

---

* The extent of such legislation can be gathered from the fact that the legislation of the world's industrial countries for the one year 1904 covers nearly 600 large octavo pages of the Belgian *Annuaire de la Législation du Travail*, Bruxelles, 1905.

† Many interesting details are given in Mr Budgett Meakin's *Model Factories and Villages*, 1905. But he forgets that the "profitableness" of philanthropy mainly depends on its being exceptional, the model works being able to attract a superior class of workpeople, and an exceptional number of customers.

‡ This is pointed out by Dr W. Cunningham, a chief figure among historical economists, *Western Civilization*, vol. ii, bk vi, chap. i.

To this let us give our welcome assent. It is the echo of Bishop Stang's practical exhortation: "Vain and unprofitable is a longing for past ages, with their domestic and social advantages; for the past will not return, and God is still with us in the present. . . . We are now in the age of steam and electricity, of machines and factories, and we thank God for it."† Such words breathe the spirit of Leo XIII, who welcomed the nineteenth century as showing "public 'vantage ampler grown, and nature's powers made known," and bade us regard the variations of times and circumstances, the needs of each age, and each historical situation.‡

---

* *Stimmen aus Maria Laach*, September and October, 1905. Practical details in abundance can be found in the work (*Die Arbeiterfrage*, popular edition, 1904) of the professor-priest Dr F. Hitze, one of the stars of the German Centre Party. American problems are fearlessly faced by Dr Stang, the Bishop of Fall River, in his *Socialism and Christianity*, New York, 1905. In France the numerous publications of *L'Action Populaire* show what can be done and is to be done: for example, *Prêtres de France*, by various authors, 1905.

† *Socialism and Christianity*. Preface.

‡ The references to the letters of the Pope are to be found in "The Political Economy of Leo XIII," *Dublin Review*, April and July, 1902.

Now the gravity of our present situation is not that we have to decide whether it shall be democratic or anti-democratic, but whether the democracy shall be Christian or anti-Christian. If anti-Christian, then indeed I see no barrier to the advent of socialism, not indeed in endurance, but in attempt. The sorry arguments I have deprecated are but fuel to the flames, a support not an answer to the socialist claim. The day of dogmas is over, they will say, and if we have given up kneeling at Christian altars, it is not that we may kneel before professional scarecrows. And the very historical argument on which I have based my defence, and the appeal to sound humanity, implies a certain identification of humanity with Christianity, implies an *anima naturaliter Christiana*, implies a living Church capable of judging what is sound and of giving us a key to the interpretation of history. Else we must be silent before the scornful objection that anything can be proved by history.

Nor will the defenders of the existing social order find their salvation in modern philosophy, as far as that philosophy is isolated from Christian theology. If it is based on Hegel, a prior claim to a knowledge of the master's true mind can be put in by Karl Marx, the socialist, Hegel's avowed disciple. Besides in a recent remarkable volume a distinguished fellow and tutor of Oxford makes the current theories of truth all crumble to dust in the face of criticism, and declares the foundations of philosophical thinking to be fatally insecure.* And then, as noticed in the July number of this Review,† and a graver embarrassment in the anti-socialist argument, another official guide and teacher of English youth openly bids us abandon Christianity. But then other things besides philosophic or theological presuppositions can be exposed to destructive criticism. Indeed, the practical reason and moral side of our nature, having a traitor within the walls, yields to assault more easily than the intellectual side. Those extremists of the higher criticism who eliminate the supernatural will find that to outgrow reverence for Scripture is to outgrow reverence for property, and all in vain as a financial basis will invoke some mystical cloud or Glory of the Lord to cover, not the Israelite tabernacle, but their balances at Coutts's and their investments in Kaffirs. Who is to hinder the coming of the collectivist commonwealth or induce an anti-Christian democracy while the power is in its own hands to leave the property in another's? Nay, if the very nature of truth is unknown to us, and no lessons but the lessons we like can be learnt from history, who am I or anyone else to say presumptuously that socialism must issue in failure?

---

* *The Nature of Truth*, by Harold H. Joachim, Oxford, 1906. The author, indeed, deprecates scepticism; and whether his work, by clearing "much sham knowledge" away, may not be invaluable for philosophic reconstruction is well worth inquiry.

† p. 216, notice of *The Religion of all Good Men*, by H. W. Garrod.

This then is the menacing prospect that needs more than garden cities or secular philosophy to lighten it. The natural cannot suffice without the supernatural; or, put in another way, the natural divorced from the supernatural ceases itself to be natural. Then the sanctity of family life, the reverence for authority, the love of country, can be reasoned away, and the very grounds of human welfare crumble to dust. But grace presupposes nature, and a supernatural Church presupposes a natural world. When, therefore, the foundations of natural civilization begin to totter, the supernatural Church supports them, fulfilling the function of the guardian of humanism and of the religion of humanity. And it is the socialists themselves who unwillingly bear witness in her favour. For on the continent of Europe they pursue the Catholic Church with implacable hatred, and in America regard her as the one great obstacle to their victorious spread.[*] For wherever the Catholic Church is a social force to be reckoned with, there, just as the serpent writhes at the shadow of the eagle soaring in the sky overhead, so the socialists, whether in Germany or Belgium, in Italy or France, in Spain or the United States, instinctively recognize their unconquerable foe.[†]

[*] Dr Stang, *Socialism and Christianity*, p. 33.

[†] Let us not be misled by the mildness of our English Fabian socialism, or the looseness with which the word socialism is made convertible with any social reform. Even the word collectivism is used in Mr Dicey's *Law*

In the second century before Christ two noble brothers, Tiberius and Caius Gracchus, sought to stem the social evils of their time, and to set the economic structure of Rome on a secure basis. They failed. But we, threatened with dangers not altogether dissimilar, can succeed where they failed. For it is on the rock that we raise our social edifice, not on the sand; and as the base on which we build we have Him of whom it is written, "Other foundation no man can lay."

---

and Public Opinion in the general sense of State intervention, quite unlike the precise and technical sense which the word usually bears. And the so-called Australasian socialism has little in common with genuine socialism, but by its advocacy of small rural property, stringent factory laws, workmen's associations and conciliation in labour disputes, is closely akin to the Christian social action urged by Leo XIII and Pius X.

C. S. DEVAS

GUILDFORD SLINGSBY AND JOHN MORRIS

Two Servants of Lord Strafford

The Tryal of Thomas, Earl of Strafford. John Rushworth. 1680.
A Contemporary History of Affairs in Ireland from 1641 to 1652. Edited by J. T. Gilbert. Irish Archæological Society. 1864.
Collections towards the History of Pontefract. Richard Holmes. 1882.
England's Black Tribunall. 1660.
Cobbett's State Trials. 1809.
History of the Rebellion and Civil Wars in Ireland. Clarendon. 1719.

THERE are times when the by-ways of history prove more alluring than its wide high-roads, clangorous with great issues; when the mind is seized by an immense curiosity concerning the lesser lives linked with the dominant figures of their day. For they were there, those lesser lives, bound by service, ambition or allegiance to the great persons, as Clarendon loves to call them, who, to the imagination of the after-world, show in a superb and tragic isolation. In such a mood it may be interesting to follow the course of two lives out of the many which made up the household of Dublin Castle during the viceroyalty of Lord Wentworth. They were by no means conspicuous figures, those gentlemen who in their different ways served the great minister in his Irish work. Thanks chiefly to the Lord Deputy's own letters, it is possible to gain a very clear impression of that viceregal court, the splendour of which was praised by Howell: "Except that of the Viceroy of Naples, I have not seen its like in Christendom." Among the despatches devoted to grave political matters, the subduing of Irish misrule, the upbuilding of Irish industries, the humbling of the strong and the protection of the poor, the enforcing of order—all that benign and terrible policy of "Thorough"—are many glimpses which reveal the daily life of the household. Lord Wentworth is not always overawing Parliaments, organizing his army and fighting rivals and enemies; he has time, now and again, for hawking, for reading his favourite poets, Donne and Chaucer, for building and beautifying his house on the Naas. Building above all seems to have appealed to him, a significant enthusiasm for that lover of structure and order. There are many references to his improvements of Dublin Castle, though he forewent the decoration so dear to many of his predecessors, the line of rebels' heads spiked along the ramparts.

Amid all these records of great affairs and personal interests, names come and go, bewilderingly, some of them to be written large on the pages of later history. Strafford had the power of impressing on those who served him the stamp of his own unswerving will and unfaltering loyalty. After his fall, Ormond, proud and fiery, who had begun his friendship with the Lord Deputy by a defiance and thereafter held to him through disfavour and mortal peril through a generation of stormy years, carried on his work. George Radcliffe, Strafford's closest friend and counsellor, after long and thankless service to the exiled Charles II, wrote that he would abandon the task, "save for the honour of his old master." Others, less closely linked with the Lord Deputy, must yet have felt the influence of that commanding personality, and these two who had served him as secretary and soldier remembered their early master to the death.

Very direct and simple is the story of Guildford Slingsby, whose brief record is summed up in a paragraph in one or two old volumes, and who for the rest has slipped out of remembrance. He has not even won a place in that gathering of great and small, the *Dictionary of National Biography*, where so many a minor fame finds its niche, slender and secure. Henry Slingsby, his cousin, staunch servant of King Charles, is remembered for the sake of his stately memoirs no less than for his death on the scaffold in the time of the Protectorate.* Guildford came from the same house, the Slingsbys of Scriven, who held their lands in the West Riding of Yorkshire. The account given of him by Rushworth is of the shortest, and affords no more than an outline of a life of loyal and gallant service. Being Yorkshire born, though educated first at St Andrews and then at Oxford, young Guildford Slingsby came naturally enough into the service of that great Yorkshireman, Thomas Wentworth, when he was ruling as Lord President of the North. He appears to have entered that service about the time that Lord Wentworth was setting out for his wider and more perilous dominion in Ireland.

---

* It would appear from a letter in the *Calendar of Domestic State Papers*, 1641-3, p. 179, that the Robert Slyngesbie who had a somewhat marked

This study deals, not with those Irish years of strenuous endeavour, immense achievement and final failure, but with Guildford Slingsby's life after the tragedy in Westminster Hall, which cut short his service with his master's life. It is in the test of those tragic days that the secretary first stands forth a living man, vowed in full and unswerving allegiance to a fallen lord. Before that, Guildford Slingsby, Lieutenant of the Ordnance and Vice-Admiral of Munster, is but a shadow and a name, but the man on whom Lord Strafford leaned in the hour of his mortal peril claims a place in memory.

Once or twice in the course of his long struggle, with its pageant of legality and its essential lawlessness, Slingsby was called as a witness on the Earl's behalf; but his chief work for his master was done silently and has passed almost without notice. "His lord made choice of him before all others, to stand by him and manage all his papers during his confinement and trial," writes Rushworth. What that sentence implies can be but dimly divined, even by those who have studied the records of that momentous trial, in which all the acts and even the unconsidered words of twelve crowded years were searched, with the keenness of concen-

---

naval career was a brother of Guildford. He writes to Sir John Penington of "some of the Parliament having made scruples concerning my fitness for that employment [in Ireland] in respect of my brother's near relation to my Lord of Strafford." Robert and his brother Walter were in Bristol in 1645, where the former was on Prince Rupert's Council of War. Interesting details of Robert Slyngesbie's life are given in Hollond' *Discourses on the Navy*, Navy Records Society, 1896, vol. vii, trated hate and fear, for proofs of the great minister's treason. The mere mass of evidence to be sifted, the strain of memory, and the patient vigilance required to baffle the ever renewed attacks of ever reinforced assailants, a sense of all this dizzies the mind even to-day. That a defence so firm—so convincing, had that tribunal been open to conviction—should have been presented when every possible difficulty was thrown in the prisoner's way, witnessed, not only to the genius of Strafford himself, but to the untiring devotion of the few who served him.

It must have seemed for a brief moment to Lord Strafford and his adherents that the ordeal had been triumphantly passed, when it became clear to all men that the fierce inquisition of so many days had brought forth no act which could be wrested into treason. Not in vain, it seemed, had Slingsby toiled among those innumerable papers, records of an activity so manifold and arduous. Not in vain had Strafford himself nerved a broken body to confront the hatred of three nations with a courage so indomitable. But the sense of release was but for a breath. The Commons, abandoning their useless weapon, grasped one new-forged for the occasion, and by the Bill of Attainder proclaimed him a traitor whom they had just failed to convict of treason. Whatever the guilt of the great absolutist had been in defying the awakened spirit of England and seeking to compel a nation to content according to his ideal, not its own, it must be admitted that his antagonists, in the protesting phrase of their own associate, committed murder with the sword of justice.*

After the reverberations of the trial a great silence appears to fall with the final sentence. In that stillness sound the last words of the fallen minister, the "grand Apostate to the Commonwealth," the "Protomartyr for Religion and Allegiance." Among the letters which he found time to write in the few days still left to him was one to Guildford Slingsby:

> I would not, as the case now stands, for anything that you should endanger yourself, being a person in whom I shall put a great part

---

* Speech of Lord Digby, April 21, 1641.

of my future trust; and therefore in any case absent yourself for a time, yet so as I may know where you are, and therefore send your man back, that I may know whither to direct anything I have to impart to you, and after that let your man come as little about the place as may be. Your going to the King is to no purpose. I am lost; my body is theirs, but my soul is God's; there is little trust in man. God may yet (if it please Him) deliver me, and as I shall (in the best way He shall enable me unto) prepare myself for Him, so to Him I submit all I have. The person you were last withal at court sent to move that business we resolved upon, which, if rightly handled, might perchance do something; but you know my opinion in all, and what my belief is in all these things. I should by any means advise you to absent yourself, albeit never so innocent, as you are, till you see what becomes of me; if I live, there will be no danger for you to stay, but otherwise keep out of the way till I be forgotten, and then your return may be with safety. I mean indeed to leave you one in trust for my children, and thank you for your readiness to look after it.

Time is precious, and mine I expect to be very short, and therefore no part of it to be lost. God direct and prosper you in all your ways; and remember there was a person whom you were content to call Master, that did very much value and esteem you, and carried to his death a great stock of his affection for you, as for all your services, so for this your care towards me all this time of my trial and affliction; and however it be, my misfortune to be decried at present, yet in more equal times my friends (I trust) will not be ashamed to mention the love to their children for their father's sake.

Your affectionate friend,
STRAFFORD.*

"The person you were last withal at court" may not improbably have been Denzil Hollis, who, as Strafford's brother-in-law and the close associate of Pym, Hampden and Vane, held a position strangely equivocal and perplexed. Hollis worked out a plan by which he believed the death penalty might be changed to banishment, a plan assented to by the King and frustrated by the King's wavering. It may be noted that this letter, showing Slingsby to have been away from his master, is yet another disproof, if disproof were needed, of the fantastic story of an attempted escape of the prisoner, concerted between Strafford and

---

* Rushworth, *Tryal of the Earl of Strafford.*

Slingsby, and overheard by convenient eavesdroppers. The tale, like the exaggerations concerning the Army Plot, appears to have been set afloat to intensify popular indignation and keep Whitehall besieged by a mob clamouring for justice and death to Strafford.

"I am lost, my body is theirs," wrote the Earl from his prison, and the foreboding was darkly justified. On May 12, 1641, young John Evelyn stood on Tower Hill to watch the fall of "the wisest head in England." The people who had waited, awed and silenced, to see their victim pass, more like a general "at the head of an army, to breathe victory, than like a condemned man to undergo sentence of death," went home to ring bells and light bonfires to celebrate their triumph—and the beginning of twenty years of civil war.

When Guildford Slingsby next appeared in England, the King's standard had been set up, and England was slowly learning the meaning of Strafford's question uttered from the scaffold, "whether the beginning of the people's happiness should be written in letters of blood." Slingsby had taken his master's counsel and left the country for a time. He was received into favour by Queen Henrietta Maria, who meanwhile had seen reason to repent her long hostility to her husband's mightiest servant, and was perhaps inclined to show Strafford's friends the gracious countenance she had always withheld from himself. But Slingsby was not long to enjoy Queen's favour, nor did he ever take up that office of secretary to the Prince of Wales to which he was appointed. The war in England was calling him, and he turned his face towards Yorkshire, towards his own home, where, though his estate was but small, his name carried weight, and men would rally to the Leopards' Faces and silver bugle horn of Slingsby of Scriven.*

There was no long space of martial work for the secretary turned soldier, but the brief time was crowded to the full. He brought over some veterans from Holland, and with these seasoned men to rely on, began to organize a regiment, soon raising eight hundred foot and eighty horse, which he quartered at Gisborough in Cleveland. Eager work this riding to and fro, mustering and drilling on the wild Yorkshire moors. Different indeed this martial stir, wind of movement and clash of steel, from the last struggle in which Guildford Slingsby had taken part—the quiet deadly grapple under the vault of Westminster Hall, fought out with measured words, forms of law, and a steady, immitigable purpose. If Slingsby found in the open battle a hope of vengeance for that earlier, hopeless struggle against the "two-handed engine" of Parliament, the mood can only be guessed at.

---

* Foster, *County Families of Yorkshire.*

In fact it is all guesswork except the end, which came sharply. Sir Hugh Cholmly, or Cholmondeley, who had resisted Strafford in Yorkshire and been called as a witness against him at the trial, now marched to encounter Strafford's servant. The two men were of kin, as so often happened on those Yorkshire fields, where well-nigh every house was divided against itself. Cholmly, with 1,500 horse and foot and some brass "drakes," marched on Gisborough, January 16, 1643, and was gallantly charged by the Royalist leader. It was Slingsby's first day of battle and his last. He routed the enemy's horse, but was checked in the pursuit by the crash of encounter between the two bodies of the foot. Seeing his men reeling into disorder, he dashed his handful of horsemen upon Cholmly's foot regiment, and after a short, fierce *mêlée* fell, his charger riddled with case-shot and himself desperately wounded. Cholmly took 140 prisoners, captured the town, and won the commendation of Sir Thomas Fairfax.

The episode—it was no more in the story of the war—had its touch of chivalric courtesy. Sir Hugh had his wounded kinsman borne back into the town and sent word to his widowed mother. "The Lady Slingsby," says the brief narration with unwonted feeling, "hastened from York—between hopes of life and fears of death—to Gisborough, where she found the late hope of her family and support of her age lying dead; and Sir Hugh was as much concerned as his parent* for the loss of so accomplished a gentleman."

* Relative.

But the story does not end there, nor even with Slingsby's burial in the noble old minster at York, then all unwitting of the troublous days to come and the approaching tramp of the Ironsides who should hold their thanksgiving for victory within those loyal walls. The Sir Hugh Cholmly, who conquered, cared for and mourned his kinsman, was soon to take up that kinsman's work. After serving for some time under Fairfax and even holding Scarborough for the Parliament, Sir Hugh suddenly proclaimed himself for the King and continued thenceforth in the royal service. Many explanations were given of his change of front: ambition, discontent, the personal influence of the Queen, who by that time had reached England. Sir Hugh himself gave his reasons with an air of disdainful disinterestedness: "I did not forsake the Parliament till they did fail in performing those particulars they made the grounds of the war when I first engaged; namely, the preservation of religion, protection of the King's person and liberties of the subject; nor did I quit them for any particular ends of my own, but merely to perform the duty and allegiance I owed my sovereign, and which I did in such a way as was without any diminution to my honour, either as a gentleman or a soldier." The declaration may well be true, and it is probably but a fantastic imagination which looks for some connexion between Hugh Cholmly's change of course and the three days during which his kinsman lingered between life and death, and talked, it may be, of the cause he was to serve no more. Since such indirect influences can be at best but guessed at, Guildford Slingsby's service must be held to have ended on that winter morning in the trampled clay of the Cleveland hills. It was, if brief, a gallant one, not unworthy of the man for whom Strafford "carried to his death a great stock of affection."

After the meagre record, the short, straightforward career of Slingsby, Colonel John Morris presents himself as an enigmatical figure, yet withal a very living one. Here the difficulty lies in disentangling the conflicting stories, and the task is not easy, for it is necessary to disregard the elaborate misstatements of Clarendon on the one hand and

and John Morris

the concise misrepresentations of Carlyle on the other. In this way a great deal of picturesque fiction has to be foregone, but Colonel Morris is a striking enough personality in himself, and his history requires no added touch of romance.

Like Slingsby, with whom he must have been on terms of easy acquaintance, if no more, John Morris entered the service of Lord Wentworth before the Lord President of the North had become Lord Deputy of Ireland. One of the family of Morris of North Elmsall, he came of a stock which supplied more than one servant to Lord Wentworth.* John Morris was brought up in "that honoured house" of "my dear Lord and Master Strafford," as he recalled with pathetic pride at the gallows' foot. Page at first, he was made an ensign in Wentworth's Irish army—that amazing little army which, though organized by a civilian, was regarded as a model by the military men of the day. Since he was chosen as officer, it may be concluded that Morris showed some marked capacity for soldiership, for no incapable man served under the Lord Deputy, except those silken gentlemen occasionally forced on him by court influence. It is indeed stated that Wentworth prophesied of the young soldier that "he will out-do many of our old commanders," but there remains no record of any exploit by which Morris justified so high a commendation.

Morris emerges unmistakably into view amid the desperate confusion and bloodshed which followed Strafford's fall and the outbreak of the Irish Rebellion. But it is to be regretted that Dugdale, who speaks of Morris's many valiant exploits in Ireland, did not see fit to record them more fully. He was made serjeant major to Sir Francis Willoughby, major general of the King's army there, and marched with the forces under Ormond to the attack on Rosse Castle. A bloody attack that was by land and sea, in which, despite the renewed onslaughts on the "assayllable breach" broken by their cannon, Ormond's men were at length forced to draw off. Morris was severely wounded and carried thence in a litter, in which state he is said to have performed an exploit worthy of a paladin of old romance. "The English forces in another encounter against General Preston being routed and flying by him, when by persuasions he could not prevail with them to stand, he got upon his led horse, though with much difficulty, and by his courageous example rallied the disordered troops, and charging the enemy in the very head of them obtained an absolute and honourable victory."*

---

* He was akin to that Richard Marris (the name is indifferently spelled as Morris, Morrice, Marris and Marries) who had charge of the Lord Deputy's Yorkshire estates, and whose death in 1645 caused his master regret and evident perplexity.

The place and name of the battle are not given, but it would appear that the incident must have taken place in the fight off Ballibegg (also called the Battle near Rosse), when Preston endeavoured to cut off Ormond's march at "a badd peace of rough, marish and boggish waie"† near a "little forde"—one of those fords so significant in Irish history and legend, from that by which Ferdia fell by the hand of his friend to the one which ran red with Raleigh's blood. The gallant rally is in keeping with the man who later took Pontefract Castle well-nigh single-handed and broke with one comrade through Lambert's lines. Ormond, it is evident, kept a warm memory of his soldier, for eight years later, in his hour of mortal peril, Morris spoke of a letter just received from the Marquis of Ormond, "wherein he pleases to let me understand the great care he hath of me, and that whatever shall befall me here the like shall be to those whom he hath prisoners there."‡

That glimpse of Morris springing from his litter to head the charge is the last sight of him in Ireland. Thenceforward, while Owen Roe O'Neill, back from his defence at Arras and defiance of Richelieu, hurled the clans against Ormond and Leslie, while Charles planned and disavowed secret treaties with the Irish, Morris took his place and played his part in English warfare. Yet even in England a cloud of uncertainty hangs about his career, and it is only

---

* Dugdale, *Visitation of Yorkshire.*

† *An Aphoristical Discovery of Treasonable Factions.* Edited by J. T. Gilbert.

‡ Cobbett's *State Trials.*

and John Morris

in the final scenes of his life that the doubts fall away. It would be a simple matter to keep to Clarendon's dramatic account, and indeed there is no small temptation to do so. The Colonel Morrice who figures in the *History of the Rebellion* is so convincing a character, so effectively presented in sharp light and deep shadow that to doubt him seems an ingratitude to the master artist.

A little closer acquaintance with the real man, however, suffices to recall the fact that the Cavalier historian did much of his work far from documents and witnesses in the years of his exile, and sometimes called in a creative imagination to make good the deficiency in mere facts. His Colonel Morrice, who, "out of the folly and impatience of his youth," flung himself out of the King's service and entered that of the Parliament, whose licentious life and "free censure of their affected behaviour" brought him into disfavour with his godly associates, who, displaced in the "new modelling" of the army, betrayed the confidence of a friend to win back Pontefract Castle to the King—this Colonel Morrice is a living personage, convincing in his very inconsistencies. It must be confessed, moreover, that Clarendon proves to be little less misleading than Carlyle, who, in a characteristic passage, terse, emphatic and decidedly untrustworthy, arraigns the "desperate man" and his comrades for "murder or a very questionable kind of homicide." The "murder" of which Morris was guilty will appear in good time; as for Clarendon's allegations, they are more difficult to disprove, since too little is known of Morris's actual career in the earlier part of the Civil War.*

It would appear by Morris's own testimony that he was in the King's army until the fall of Liverpool in 1644, when he was made prisoner. After this he returned to his own estate of North Elmsall, until, in his own rather enigmatical words, "I was persuaded by Colonel Forbes, Colonel Overton and Lieutenant-Colonel Fairfax, whom I

* Richard Holmes, in his *Collection towards the History of Pontefract Castle*, has gone minutely into the question, as into all else connected with his subject, but his book is rather a medley of interesting and suggestive notes than an attempt at sustained narrative.

took for my good friends, to march in their troops, which I did, but with intention still to do my King the best service when occasion was, and so I did." In the course of marching with the troops of the Parliament, Morris took part in the siege of Pontefract Castle, but his connexion with the Parliamentarians must have been brief and half-hearted and scarcely have given opportunity for those notable services with which Clarendon credits him. It is, at any rate, evident that his entrance into the Parliamentary army neither took place "early in the war," "out of the folly and impatience of youth," as the historian of the Great Rebellion would have us believe, nor ended because of his displacement in the course of the "new modelling" of the forces, a process which was completed some time before his withdrawal.

In 1646 his name is linked with an attempt to surprise Pontefract on behalf of the King, and he narrowly escaped imprisonment. Perhaps "the clearness of his courage and the pleasantness of his humour" stood him in good stead during the examination before the Council for the Northern Association. Holmes fixes the time of his withdrawal from the service of the Parliament as August, 1645—only a few months after he had entered it—and suggests that "the abolition of the Book of Common Prayer and the establishment of the Directory which took place in that August had revealed to him, as it did to so many others, the abyss into which the independent faction now becoming predominant were about to plunge the country." The explanation is somehow more plausible than convincing. Morris was a good Churchman, and there is a ring of real devotion in his last words; but it is difficult to picture the soldier of Rosse, the assailant and defender of Pontefract, stopping in his somewhat reckless career to devote himself to questions of divinity. It would seem quite as likely that the shattering of the Royalist cause and hopes at Naseby roused in the some-time soldier of the King a realization of and recoil from the complete triumph of rebellion. A half-extinguished chivalry and loyalty might well be fired by Charles's utter need, nor is it perhaps fantastic to recall, as Morris himself may have done, that when "the grand Apostate to the Commonwealth" passed from the side of the Commons to that of the King, he chose the moment of that King's humiliation and defeat and the unbridled triumph of the popular leaders. It must be confessed, however, that the story of Morris's change of front is but a perplexed one, which leaves its reader vainly groping for the key of the cypher—some obscure personal passion, it may be; some impulse of love or hate, of which history has lost the record; or perhaps some vain dream of reconcilement between the parties which looked not so vain when Morris, Overton and Fairfax, brave men and true soldiers all, though set in opposing ranks, talked together "of this warre without an enemie."

The last year of Morris's life presents no problems, but is as full of movement, valiant achievement and more valiant failure as any border ballad. And, like so many a tale of border chivalry, that of Morris and his atoning loyalty centres in an ancient castle, its capture, its defence and its fall. Twenty miles south of York, high above the silver windings of the Aire, stands to-day the ruin of Pontefract Castle, shattered now like the broken bridge of its significant name. The superb stronghold, with its feudal memories, where, if tradition speak truth, the blood of Richard Plantagenet was shed, where the poet-king of Scotland, James I, dreamed his dreams, and another princely captive, Charles of Orleans, linked his sweet rhymes in praise of peace, beneath whose walls Warwick, the King-maker, slew his charger that he might conquer or die for the White Rose, —that many-memoried castle played a great part in the Civil War. Early garrisoned for the King, it had borne a twofold siege before yielding on July 20, 1645. At that final siege Colonel Morris was present among the besiegers, but according to the evidence of Cotterell he was even then in sympathy with the Royalists, and only a month later was endeavouring to obtain possession of the castle for the King.

Three years went by, however—years of deepening darkness for the Royalist cause, and Pontefract Castle remained safely in the possession of the Parliament. In 1648 the first Civil War was over, England in the main sullenly quiescent, and the King in the hands of his enemies. Then came Hamilton's Scottish attempt, and the smouldering fires of Royalism sprang to life in many places. Morris felt that the time had come to carry out his long-cherished purpose, and he joined himself with a handful of determined men. The first attempt was made towards the end of May by bribing certain soldiers within the castle, and was disconcerted by the untimely drunkenness of the corporal who should have assisted the assailants. Another sentinel took his place, who fired on the scaling ladder which had been set against the wall, and by which Morris was preparing to mount. There followed an alarum within the castle, and without, a sudden and noiseless scattering of the "privately listed" Royalists who had mustered for the surprise. Nothing but the scaling ladder remained in the hands of Cotterell, the Parliamentary governor; but that was proof sufficient of a concerted attempt. He resolved accordingly to strengthen his garrison by drawing in the soldiers who had been billeted in the town, and with a praiseworthy care for their comfort he ordered additional beds to be brought in for them. Here the indomitable Morris saw and seized his opportunity. He dressed some nine of his men as countrymen and constables to carry and guard the beds or mattresses, while he and Captain William Paulden, "like country gentlemen, with swords by their sides," quietly joined the little procession. In they went, beds and escort, across the drawbridge, through the great gate, into the thick of the main guard. Here the conspirators threw down their burthens, and their leader gave a crown to some of the soldiers, bidding them fetch ale that all might drink together. Having thus diminished their enemies, Morris and his men flung themselves on the remaining Roundheads, driving them in a struggling mass down some thirty stairs into a convenient dungeon, where they were promptly secured. The drawbridge was raised, and Paulden made his way to the lodgings of the governor.* Cotterell started up from the bed where he was resting "with his cloathes on and his sword (being a long Tuck) lying beside him," and he and his Tuck made a fierce defence. At length, being wounded and his sword broken, the governor asked quarter, and was lodged for the time in the great dungeon with his soldiers. The "honour of Pomfret," proudest stronghold of the North Country, was won for King Charles, won by some ten men, on June 3, 1648.

---

* Clarendon's elaborate account of Morris's intimate friendship with Cotterell and his betrayal of the Puritan's trust appears to be founded on

Soon the forces of the Parliament closed in, and Pontefract was besieged by 5,000 men under Sir Edward Rhodes and Sir Henry Cholmondeley, cousin of that Sir Hugh who defeated Guildford Slingsby. At first the blockade was but slackly carried on, and the garrison was able to indulge in more than one venturous sally, some of them too venturous, as the one in July which ended in the rout of Willoughby Field.

The capture of Sir Marmaduke Langdale, the noted Yorkshire loyalist, led to a daring and much-misrepresented exploit on the part of the defenders of Pontefract. Carlyle sums the matter up with a brevity which is truly remarkable when one considers how many misstatements are made or implied in his three lines: "Sunday, October 28, a party sallied from this very Castle of Pontefract; rode into Doncaster in disguise, and, about five in the afternoon, getting into Colonel Rainsborough's lodgings, stabbed him dead—murder or a very questionable kind of homicide." As a matter of fact, the little party left Pontefract on Friday, passing the enemy's horse guards under cover of darkness, and riding to Mexborough and Conisborough; and their purpose was not to stab a defenceless man in his lodgings. Langdale, it has been seen, was a captive, and the Parliament, regarding this new outbreak of hostilities in the light of rebellion, was threatening to refuse him the rights of a prisoner of war—a threat which it carried out in the case of Lisle and Lucas and later in that of Hamilton, Langdale's general. It was even suggested that Lang-

a confused memory of the friendship between Morris and Colonel Overton, a former governor of Pontefract. It is absolutely disproved by all the evidence, including that of Cotterell himself.

dale should be brought before Pontefract and there hanged, unless his old comrades would ransom him by surrender of the castle. In these straits the men of Pontefract bethought themselves of obtaining an important hostage to hold for the life of their brother-in-arms. They set about this work with a light-hearted audacity very characteristic. Morris as governor could not join the sally in person, but confided the command to Captain William Paulden, regretfully, no doubt, for the enterprise was after his own heart. Rainsborough, on his way to supersede Cholmondeley, was quartered with 1,200 men at Doncaster, twelve miles from Pontefract. Hither came Captain Paulden with two-and-twenty men, and was met by the spy he had sent in advance, and who, as the preconcerted sign that all was well, carried a Bible in his hand. The blithe mockery of that particular signal given the camp of the godly adds a final touch to an enterprise worthy of d'Artagnan.

The sheer recklessness of the onslaught helped it to success. The guards at one point of the barricade were surprised and dispersed; the cavaliers then entered the guard-chamber of the main guard, and "getting between them and their arms bade them shift for their lives." Four men then made their way to Rainsborough's lodgings with a pretended message, and while he was opening the blank paper told him that he was a prisoner, but "not a hair of his head should be touched." He yielded in his bewilderment, and he and his lieutenant were disarmed and conducted to the street. Here, unluckily for him, the Puritan leader recovered his sense of proportion, and, seeing only four men opposed to him in the heart of his own camp, he raised an alarm. Thereupon ensued a brief mêlée in which Rainsborough was run through the body. The cavaliers drew together and "made a noise," and in the confusion came safely off. None was killed or hurt at Doncaster save Rainsborough and his lieutenant, "and they too very much against our will," says Paulden plaintively, evidently feeling that it was perverse of the Puritan leader not to allow himself to be quietly carried off by twenty-two men from the midst of twelve hundred.

Soon the circle of the blockade drew closer; the "high, stately, and famous and princely impregnable castle" was entirely surrounded by the earthworks thrown up by the Parliament army, and food began to grow scarce within the walls. Early in November came Oliver Cromwell and an end to slackness. His letter to the Derby House Committee confesses the strength of the Royalists' position, and enforces the need of money, men, arms and tools for the siege; the imperative, reiterated demands strike home with the force of a battering-ram. He summoned Morris to surrender with the same emphatic brevity. The governor indulged in some pretty parries as to Cromwell's authority before refusing the summons. Having organized the siege, Cromwell did not remain long in the North. Darker work claimed him; the Judgement Hall of Westminster was making ready for the trial of the King.

There is no space to chronicle the cannon-shots. Two months went by with much battering of the loyal walls of Pontefract and an occasional sally to keep up the hearts of the besieged. Then on February 2 or 3 came word of the scaffold at Whitehall. The King was dead. The fatal news was expected to crush the last desperate hope of the Royalists; but one of the Parliamentarians confessed ruefully that they "seem to be the more resolute upon it."* No sooner was it certain that Charles I was dead than Morris and his comrades proclaimed Charles II with such martial pomp as Pontefract could afford. They struck coins, too, in his honour; significant tokens, rudely shaped, bearing the device of a castle and the motto, *Post Mortem Patris pro Filio*.

The loyalty was futile enough; there was absolutely no further hope of relief. The governor, having served his King to the uttermost, had his soldiers to consider. His own shrift was likely to be short if he fell into the hands of the Puritans, and this he realized. Had he not in an early attack encouraged his men to the defence by the reminder that he himself would be "torn in pieces first of any"?—a grimly accurate prophecy. Despite his own hopeless position as a renegade and "excepted person," he entered into negotiations for surrender, but for some time the garrison utterly rejected the idea of a clemency in which their leader should not share. The cavaliers bore themselves defiantly to the end. "Morris, in his letter of overture, saith they are not ashamed to live nor afraid to die, and they give out they will die with swords in their hands like men, but certainly they are brought into a very low condition."* Lambert was not a man to press brave adversaries ungenerously, but his instructions were strict: Morris and five of those concerned in Rainsborough's death were excepted from pardon. The Castilians, as the garrison were termed, "declared that they could never be guilty of so base a thing as to deliver up their companions."†

---

* Thomas Margetts to Capt. Adam Baynes. See Holmes's *Sieges of Pontefract*.

Morris, however, "could not endure the thought that so many brave gentlemen should perish for his sake," and ordered the conclusion of the treaty. In the end it was agreed that the fated six might attempt to escape through the besieging forces before the hour of rendition, and not be actually delivered up by their comrades. Three out of the six hid themselves within the castle so skilfully as to evade discovery, and later made good their escape. Morris was still of the same forthright temper as when he flung himself out of his litter to head the charge in Ireland. He and Cornet Blackburn cleft a way through the enemy and rode into a hazardous safety. Whereupon the garrison, shrunk to 140 men, surrendered on Easter eve, March 24, 1649‡ (new style).

While Pontefract Castle was given over to its destroyers, its sometime governor and his companion made their way into Lancashire, hoping to take ship for the continent. Here, on the brink of final escape, they were seized and carried prisoners to York, in direct disregard of Lambert's chivalrous promise that if Morris "could escape but five miles from the castle he should not be liable to any further question." Morris demanded that as a soldier he should be tried by court martial, but he was over-ruled and brought before the York Assizes in August. The trial was conducted, in the words of Clement Walker, as though justice had "a sword to strike, but no scales to weigh withal." The brutalities of Judge Pulestone, the evident foregone conclusion of the trial, did not shake Morris's equanimity. He fought for his life, not with courage merely, but with a self-control and skill, a deft handling of points of law, which prove him a fine fencer with more than steel. The defence of course was vain; Morris's commission was pronounced invalid, since signed by Charles while still Prince of Wales, though he was then captain-general of the King.

---

* Margetts to Captain Adam Baynes.

† Boothroyd's *History of Pontefract.*

‡ The exact day is not absolutely ascertained, but March 24 seems probable.

Morris was condemned to the extreme penalty of treason. He made brief and grave protest against the illegality of the trial, bidding the court do with him as with his "dear and honoured master," Strafford, and "make an act that this my suffering shall not be a precedent to any soldiers hereafter." It was not the near prospect of death which broke for a moment his complete self-mastery, but when he and his companion were manacled, all his soldier pride revolted. He flamed out into resentment, into angry pleading, offering to pay himself for a heavier guard if they feared his escape. "This is not only a disgrace to me, but in general to all soldiers, which doth more trouble me than the loss of my life."* The doomed man's last request was disregarded, and he was heavily fettered.

The fear of Morris' exploits was after all not unfounded, for on the night of August 21 he and Blackburn broke from their confinement,—it was said with the connivance of certain soldiers of the Parliament who sympathized with the soldiers of the King. The prisoners attempted to let themselves down from the wall of York Castle by a rope. Morris succeeded, being light and active, but Blackburn fell heavily, injured his leg, and lay helpless. At his trial Morris proudly affirmed that he had never been guilty of any unsoldierly or base act, nor was he guilty in this last and sharpest test. He remained by his disabled comrade while the night waned, till the alarm of their escape ran through the Castle and they were borne back to captivity. Blackburn was, in his own simple words, "not a gentleman by birth," but a common trooper; there were no ties of equal friendship between him and Morris, but both had served and suffered for the King, and in the hour of extremity the soldier was not forsaken by his captain. Two days later, August 23, 1649, the two shared the same fate. As Morris came forth to the sledge which was to bear him to the gallows, he abandoned the gallant Cavalier extravagance with which he had earlier protested that had he as many lives as there were stars in the firmament he would give them all for the cause. Instead, he looked on the ignominious sledge and said simply, "I am as willing to go to my death as ever to put off my doublet for sleeping." The words were a strange echo of those used by Strafford as he stood beside the block, and once again in his last speech Morris spoke of his "dear lord and master."* In that hour, it may be, he felt he could rightfully claim the great loyalist as his leader, and certainly in his death he renewed the old allegiance. He made it his dying request that he might be buried at Wentworth Woodhouse, near the Earl's grave.

---

* Cobbett's *State Trials.*

According to a recent discovery, Strafford was in reality buried in profound secrecy at Hooton Roberts.† If that be so, the story of John Morris, with its errors and its expiatory heroism, closes on an ironic note, and his dismembered body was laid beside an empty tomb. However that may be, the Governor of Pontefract, the prisoner of York, had assuredly drawn near in spirit to his "dear and honoured lord."

---

* *England's Black Tribunal.*

† See the very interesting article by the Rev. B. A. Gatty, LL.B., in the *Cornhill Magazine* for July, 1905.

THE DANCE OF DEATH

Adapted from Victor Hugo's "Fantômes"

OH, many, many thus have died, alas!
Children—poor things—the grave will have its prey.
Some flowers must still be mown down with the grass,
And in life's wild quadrille the dancers gay
Must trample here and there a weak one in their way.

Yes, thus it is—after the day the night,
A night that has no waking. Who shall tell?
A hungry crowd sits down to feast aright,
Yet always some one guest, where all seemed well,
Gets up and leaves his chair and hears the passing bell.

I have seen many go; cheeks rosy pink,
And blue eyes wide as if entranced with song,
And forms so frail, it seemed that on Death's brink
The soul bent down the branch to which she clung,
So weak the body was, the tyrant soul so strong.

One knew I who in her delirium
Uttered a name which troubled all around,
And then, like a lost chaunt for ever dumb,
She left us, smiling. In her breast we found
Some faded violets hid, by a blue ribbon bound.

Poor flowers, poor souls, and only born to die!
Fair fledgelings torn untimely from their nest!
Halcyons our earth had borrowed from the sky
For one short spring, and then, as if confessed
Unworthy that high charge, given back to heaven's breast!

Such have I known; and such, alas! was one
Whom now I picture sadly here. Her eyes
Had gleams where April's fitful beauty shone.
I know not why she heaved so many sighs;
She was sixteen, perhaps, and cared not to be wise.

The Dance of Death

Yet think not it was love that was her death.
  Love had no song for her of any tone.
Her heart had never beat too fast for breath.
  Though all men called her pretty, there was none
  To whisper that soft fable in her ear alone.

No. It was dancing, dancing which she loved
  Beyond all else, that caused her thus to die.
Her very dust, methinks, by night is moved
  When the pale moon beneath heaven's canopy
  Holds revel with the clouds in the quick circling sky.

Balls she adored. Each evening that she danced
  She thought three days and dreamed three nights of it,
And visions brave where goblin partners pranced
  Beset her pillows, till she could not sit
  Still in her bed, but she must rise and dance a bit.

By night and day her fancy framed the sight
  Of scarves and flowers and ribbons bright as noon,
And jewels gleaming with unearthly light,
  And skirts of gossamer in wild festoon,
  And lace like spiderswebs of spiders in the moon.

When the ball opened, she was first to come
  With her proud father, honest gentleman.
Like a little mouse she ran about the room.
  Oh, how she laughed and rattled with her fan
  And beat her pretty foot, until the dance began!

It did us good to see her dance. Her feet
  Twinkled like stars in a dark firmament.
They moved so fast, they made our pulses beat
  Lest those frail laces should be overspent,
  And her white satin shoes be whirled away or rent.

She was all movement, laughter and mad joy.
  Child! How we followed her with our sad eyes,
Forgetful of the fever and annoy
  And rush and dust and nameless miseries,
  The punishment of souls too proud or old or wise.

The Dance of Death

But she, borne on upon her pleasure's wing,
  Whirled round and round. She never stopped for breath.
She seemed to drink the fiddlers' fiddling in.
  She seemed to smell the flowers of every wreath,
  To dance with every step the dancers danced beneath.

'Twas joy to her to leap and bound along,
  To feel as though she had a thousand feet,
To grow so giddy in the turning throng
  She knew not where she was. Her heart so beat
  She could not see the chairs to find herself a seat.

Alas, alas that ever morn should come
  On such sweet nights! Alas, that she must stand
Those hours of woe in the chill waiting-room.
  Oh, often ere the coach was at command,
  The dawn had touched her shoulders with its icy hand.

'Tis ever a sad waking the next day.
  No laughter now, but only a dull cough.
The crumpled dresses have been put away.
  Pleasure is dead, and there stands pleasure's scoff,
  Fever with cheeks all red and tongue all white and rough.

She died at sixteen, happy, loved by all—
  Died as she left off dancing. All of us
Wore mourning long in token of that ball.
  She died upon the threshold of the house
  In her white robe and wreath and sable-lined burnous.

Death took her thus that she might ever be
  Dressed for new dancing. When she wakes again,
She shall be ready for Eternity;
  And, if in heaven such raptures are not vain,
  Shall tread fair measures still to seraph angels' strain.

WILFRID SCAWEN BLUNT

The CATHOLIC MISSIONS in the Congo Free State*

A DEVELOPMENT of a serious nature has recently taken place in the campaign against the Congo Free State. The accusations against Europeans in that State are no longer made against rubber-collectors and Government officials only: they are directed with equal precision of detail, and even greater bitterness of denunciation, against the Catholic missionaries in the Congo, and, through these missionaries, against the Church herself. Belgians hostile to Catholicity join with foreigners to Belgium in these attacks. It is a Belgian, M. Félicien Cattier, professor at the Liberal University of Brussels, who has formulated the most sweeping charges against the Belgian missionaries, declaring in his *Étude sur la Situation de l'État Indépendant du Congo*, "Posterity will say that the Catholic Church never more openly betrayed her mission and the morality of her Founder."

Stated succinctly, the charges against the Catholic Church in the Free State are those of complicity with King Leopold and his Government in exploiting the natives in the interests of the missions.

"The missions and the State are made to understand one another," says M. Cattier; and history, it must be freely admitted, bears out his statement. In the early days of the Congo it needed all the personal influence of King Leopold, repeatedly exerted, to prevail on the missionary orders, whose labours were already great in heathen lands, to undertake the evangelization of Central Africa. It was the King who negotiated the formation of the Congo Vicariate with Propaganda, and who bore all, or most, of the initial expenses of the settlement of the missionaries in the new State. The Congo Government has ever since its formation continuously favoured the missions by grants of land to build on, by great reductions of taxation and by entrusting them with numbers of native children to educate. Those who accuse the Congo Government of maladministration declare that by the bestowal of its favours the State has obtained the criminal complicity of the missionaries.

---

* We gladly publish this article on the Congo question communicated to us by Mr de Courcy MacDonnell, who desires to place before readers of *The Dublin Review* the opinions which, with the somewhat exceptional opportunities of an Irishman resident in Belgium, he has been led to form on some of the matters in debate.—EDITOR.

> During thirteen years [says M. Cattier] they have seen the system of the Labour Tax applied around them with all its consequences. They have seen the population decimated; they have assisted impassive at the burning and pillaging of villages. They have remained silent. Their journals have published nothing but panegyrics of the King-Sovereign, nothing but "victorious replies" to the calumnies of the Protestant missionaries. For this fault there is no excuse.

This charge, coming after the publication of the Report of the Inquiry Commission, which brought to light a long string of abuses to be remedied in the Congo, was felt to be a serious one. Friends of the missionary orders, who never were in the Congo, and who never, seemingly, made a serious study of Congo affairs, sought to reply to it by saying that, though evil existed in the Congo administration, it did not exist in the immediate vicinity of the missionary stations and did not come within the purview of the missionaries, who were absorbed in their educational and evangelistic labours and tied down to their missions.

Very little consideration is needed to show that such an explanation of the attitude of the missionaries cannot be accepted. It may be doubted if evil can exist in any place where a Catholic priest labours without its coming to his knowledge. It is certain that evil such as is said to exist in the Congo could not exist there without accounts of it being carried daily to scores of mission stations and poured daily into the ears of hundreds of missionary workers, men and women, priests, lay-brothers and nuns.

The explanation of the attitude of the missionaries is quite other. Their attitude is due neither to ignorance nor to half-knowledge: it is due to their full knowledge of the Congo, to their wide comprehension of the situation, of the needs and the possibilities of that dark but hopeful land in which their lives are spent.

The missionaries continue to praise the Sovereign of the Congo, although there are evils multiform and grievous in his State, because of the good he has done in the Congo, and of the good he plans to do by abolishing the evils remaining in the land, which are not inherent to the system of government, but are rather the remnants or outcome of the condition of barbarous and savage cruelty which that system was created to stamp out and is stamping out.

Had the system of the Congo Government been such as the enemies of the Congo State represent it to be, it is certain the Catholic missionaries would long since have denounced it. These missionaries have not kept silence regarding abuses. They have not hesitated to denounce offenders, or to present reports detailing evil or harsh practices. Nowhere can a more accurate idea be formed of the real state of the Congo than from the perusal of the numerous publications of the missionary orders, in which the accounts and letters of the missionaries, priests and nuns are regularly printed. These accounts bring home to the reader the full horror of that savage land, in which the gleaming teeth of the cannibal still snap with more than wolfish lust at the sight of the weak or wounded.

It has been said that a European's nature deteriorates after some years passed in the grim surroundings of the forest: it should be said that Christians and Christianity come forth with a triumph supernatural. In the Congo two armies are fighting, united, for two united causes: the armies of the Church and State are fighting for Christianity and civilization. Those who represent the Church and those who represent the State are agreed that the native can only be led into the higher paths into which they desire to lead him, by making him work. If the native is not employed in regular, that is in constant, labour, contact with civilization will still further debase him and accelerate his destruction. Men differ as to how the native should be led into habits of work, but those who know the Congo native best—such great authorities as Mgr Augouard, Bishop of the French Upper Congo—viewing the Congo as it actually is, and after taking into account the nature of the natives, resolutely uphold the labour-tax system. Writing of this system of "obligatory labour" in a letter which he has reproduced in his recently published work, *Vingt-huit Années au Congo*, Mgr Augouard sums up his reasons for upholding the system :

> The black, not having any needs and living from day to day without troubling himself about the future, will only work if he is forced. The black will only be civilized in spite of himself; and since France has extended her protectorate over these countries, she has assumed the obligation of introducing into them progress and civilization. This theory, I do not doubt, will raise clamour and cause cries of slavery; I can reply that having been in the Congo for more than twenty-eight years, and having sacrificed my life for the cause of the unfortunate blacks, I am in a position to know what is most fitting for France and for the blacks themselves.

The natives of the French Congo are of the same races and in the same condition of development as those of the Belgian Congo, and what the Bishop of the French Congo with the weight of his great experience says of the one is applicable also to the other. Once it is admitted that the natives must be made to work, it seems impossible to deny that the system of a labour-tax is the only one which can be justly and evenly applied; for any other system would inevitably result in the strong and the powerful forcing weak women and domestic slaves to do the labour, while they (unemployed even, as formerly, in warfare or in the chase) wallowed in idleness and sank lower in bestiality.

The evils which white men committed in the Congo were not the outcome of any system, but sprang from the greed for gold which led men to violate the Congo laws and evade or distort the regulations of the administration. Before the Congo Government was formed or its system adopted, that same greed for gold led to the commission, by traders in the Congo, of crimes more murderous and more appalling. The report of the Inquiry Commission, which King Leopold sent to the Congo, caused a flush of generous indignation at the misdeeds of the miscreants in the Congo. That report extenuated nothing. Yet it is well to emphasize the general fact, lest it be lost sight of in the indignation at individual misdeeds. This Commission, which sought out and signalled evil, was obliged to record the fact that in the very districts where grave violence had formerly been committed "all the witnesses acknowledged that a great amelioration has been produced in recent times."

It is this amelioration, and the State's efforts towards it, which the Catholic missionaries constantly recognized, and for which, actuated by true Christian spirit, they gave the State and its well-deserving officials due praise. It is not only Catholic missionaries or Commissioners of Inquiry who recognize and admit the amelioration of the Congo under King Leopold's Government. I have quoted M. Cattier, of the University of Brussels, as attacking the Congo missionaries and the Congo Government. I can cite M. Henri Rolin, Professor of Colonization and Colonial Policy at the same university, as replying to and refuting M. Cattier. In his articles on "La Question Coloniale" in the *Revue de l'Université de Bruxelles* M. Rolin, advancing proofs for his assertions, insists that "it is beyond doubt that the moral and material condition of the natives is better in 1906 than in 1880, in 1885 or in 1890." It is by such amelioration that the State justifies its existence and merits defence.

There is a mass of evidence on this subject into which I shall not enter. The names of many writers on the question, who tell of what they themselves have seen, such as Colonel Harrison and Lord Mountmorres, will suggest themselves to English readers, but it is unnecessary to quote further. Enough has been brought forward to show that the charge of complicity between the Church and State in the Congo is proved and justified, but that there is a complicity in civilizing work.

The other charge which is made against the Catholic missionaries in the Congo, that of exploiting the natives, is based on a passage in the report of the Inquiry Commission, in which it is said that the missionaries procure abundant labour by recruiting children under cover of State authority for their agricultural and technical schools. In this recruitment they include children who have passed the age of twelve years (beyond which no children can be brought to the missions against their will), as well as children who are not abandoned or who are not orphans, and even some who are married "according to the native custom," whom they forbid to see their wives.

Though the charge itself is false, the main fact on which it is based is true. The missionaries do recruit children. The enlistment of heathens whom they convert, of young savages whom they civilize, is the main object of their lives; but they do not utilize the abundant manual labour which the children taught by them provide, to create or gather riches for themselves or their orders. The agricultural and technical schools, or as they are called the School colonies, are of two descriptions: State colonies, regulated and supported by the State; and Free colonies, regulated and supported by the Catholic missions. The State colonies are situated at Boma and New Antwerp. They consist of native children placed by the State under the instruction of the Fathers of the Congregation of Scheut. The Commission of Inquiry has criticized the State system in these establishments, but they need not be considered here. The Free School colonies, which are those to which the criticism refers, are only placed under the control of the State inasmuch as the Government must approve of the conditions in which education is conducted in them and of the programme of instruction, and must regulate the penalties inflicted on the pupils for infraction of the rules. The children in these Free colonies are, primarily, children freely entrusted to the missionaries by their parents, relatives or chiefs, and free to leave the schools when they will. The missionaries, in their replies to the criticisms of the Commission, say that it is amongst this category of children, to whom, since they come and go freely, no age limit applies or need apply, that the children obviously past the age of twelve years are to be found. They say also that the report that they prevented any, young or old, who were married from seeing their wives is untrue. The latter charge they believe to have sprung from a confusion, in the minds of those who made it, between marriage and betrothal, betrothals being customarily made of native children in their early infancy, and leading frequently to an abuse which it is desirable to check.

The Commission of Inquiry and the Catholic missionaries differ in their opinion of the treatment of orphan children by the natives. The Commission holds that native children ought seldom to be placed in the category of orphans, since those whose parents are dead are cared for by their relatives. The missionaries contend that the care of relatives is harsh and so ill-directed as to be worse even than neglect. The weight of evidence seems to lie on the side of the missionaries. There was, however, ample reason for the criticism by the Commission of the law which obliged those placed as orphan or abandoned children in the School colonies to remain under the tutelage of the State until they reached their twenty-fifth year. The Commission declared that this decree ignored the conditions of native life, and kept the pupils of the State in a "quasi-perpetual minority," the adult age commencing in the sixteenth year and seldom reaching, in the natives, beyond thirty or thirty-five years. The Commission applied this criticism to State colonies and to the Free School colonies, in which children sent by the State are received; but stated that at the Free colonies which it visited, those of Kisantu, Bamanya and New Antwerp, the excellent state of the buildings was in contrast to those of the State establishments. Of the Free School colonies it recorded that it had assisted at the lessons given in the classes, and visited the workshops, and "had pleasure in recognizing the zeal with which the missionaries occupy themselves with the instruction and the technical education of their pupils. These, it must be added, have generally a good appearance."

The criticism regarding the recruiting of children follows this passage in the report of the Commission, and it is said that complaints have been made of children being recaptured and punished for escaping. It is not only in Africa, or from orphanages, that schoolchildren try to escape, or that captured runaways are punished. In the Congo the unpenetrated forests tempt truants; and, since of those who stray none can be forced to return save the small number of State pupils, the wonder is not that there are runaways, but that there are so very few of them. The fact is that the children are placed freely in the missionaries' establishments by their relatives and remain in them both voluntarily and gladly.

> Not content [says the Report of the Inquiry Commission] with keeping in the missions a considerable number of young men who do not fulfil the conditions required by the decree, the Fathers establish others, by groups of fifteen or twenty, in the hamlets surrounded by cultivated land which are found in great number in the district, and which take the name of farm-chapels. The farm-chapels are veritable detached posts of the mission. Their inhabitants are maintained by the Fathers in the strictest tutelage. They do not possess anything, so to speak, of their own; the produce of their cultivation, the farm-produce which they raise, is, in general, destined for the mission. They rarely receive authorization to marry or to return to their villages. Most of the natives who people the farm-chapels are neither orphans nor workmen engaged by contract; they are demanded from the chiefs, who dare not refuse them, and it is only a constraint, more or less disguised, which enables them to be kept. The system, pushed to its farthest consequences, has led, then, to illegal proceedings, which seem to have only a distant connexion with the decree on abandoned children.

The reply of the missionaries to the charge of illegality made in this passage is the same as that made by them regarding the children in their technical and agricultural schools whose age passes that prescribed by the decree on abandoned children: they say these children were never taken by them in virtue of the decree, but were freely entrusted to them to be instructed and educated in Christianity, by their relatives and chiefs. They say that no constraint is used by them either in getting or in keeping their young catechumens; that so far from the inhabitants of the farm-chapels owning nothing and being obliged to hand over all the produce of their toil to the missions, they are given by the missionaries the implements and stock necessary for these farm-chapels, and allowed to retain for themselves all the produce of the farms. The missionaries buy from them, as in the open market, such of their produce as they can spare for sale and the missionaries can use; and far from preventing their catechists from marrying, it is one of the missionaries' preoccupations to procure them wives and to establish them at the head of Christian families.

The "chiefs" of the farm chapels are not all married yet however, for scores of these black pioneers of the faith are sent out to found Christian settlements close by the villages of their savage kin before they have reached a marriageable age. Quick as the growth of the body is amongst the savage tribes, the growth of the minds of those snatched in infancy from barbarism is as quick, and at ten or twelve years native lads, educated by the missionaries, can be relied on to hold firmly by the faith and to preach its doctrines. It is children who form the *capitas* of the farm chapels. The companions given to them by the chiefs of the villages to be educated as Christians are equally young. The chiefs frequently invite the missionaries to found farm chapels in their midst, in the belief that a settlement made by "the white men of God" will protect them from ill-treatment by the servants of commercial companies; but in every case, whether the missionaries establish the settlements by invitation or not, payment, not compulsion, is the base of the transaction, for it is a rule of life of the savage Congolese to give nothing for nothing, and the chiefs insist on being paid for their benevolence.

While by far the greater part of the population of the farm chapels consists of these children sent to them by the neighbouring chiefs, and neither orphans nor strangers, hundreds of orphaned children, neglected or abandoned, are collected by the State officials and brought by them into the missionary schools to be educated gratuitously by the missionaries. As to the meaning of the decrees or their application, there is no quibbling on the part of missionaries or State officials. The missionaries admit that the child in the Congo, according to the native custom, belongs to its maternal uncle, and not to its father, and they admit, what all must see it would be folly to deny, that as long as the savages can profitably retain any child as a domestic slave, they will have no thought of abandoning it. For every valid worker eager claimants press their rights, and the child-slave, knowing no relative, is taught with blows to call his taskmaster "father."

The decrees which the Inquiry Commission condemned are the State's strongest weapons against domestic slavery. They do not relate only to abandoned children, as the passage quoted from the reports suggests, but in addition to abandoned children and to orphans they extend the State's right of tutelage over those children whose parents neglect to support or educate them. The number of children who could be placed under the latter category alone is practically unlimited. The "natural protectors" of the native children too often push them towards vice, and even those who travel by railway through the lower Congo have their ears assailed by the cries of the children who are driven by the cupidity of their protectors to inhabit the camps along the line, in which vice reigns so openly that "they are even more infamous than the native villages."

Children such as these, caught up into slavery at a parent's death or driven into vice—into what the savages themselves know to be vice—are truly the orphan or neglected children of the decrees. The abandoned children are the invalids, the weaklings, who being useless are cast out of the native settlements to die of exposure or starvation, if they are not taken into the missionaries' homes. Large bands of these small, pitiable outcasts, the dying wrecks of savagery, are found at the infirmaries of all the Congo missions.

Sometimes the tiniest mites are found abandoned. These are brought to the convents of the nuns, on whose establishments the Congo State makes as great and as incessant calls as on those of the priests. In a letter written on December 12, 1905, and published in the *Missions Belges* of June, 1906, the Superioress of the Ki Santu Convent describes the manner in which the State utilizes that convent. She says:

> We suffer at this moment from what might be called a crisis of abundance, for since the month of September caravans arrive at

> every moment with ten, twenty, thirty and even eighty girls at a time. It is because the sleeping sickness and diverse epidemics have decimated the population; from that there are hundreds of orphan boys and girls. The State is touched by the miserable condition of these children, who, abandoned without help, are exploited by the village chiefs, and the girls in particular sold to the highest bidder. The State has declared itself tutor of these orphans, and it voluntarily transfers its tutorship to the religious associations which apply for it. . . One Saturday afternoon, without any previous notice, a black policeman presented himself at the house of the Reverend Father Superior (the head of the Jesuit mission centre at Ki Santu), bringing eighty-eight girls of from six to thirteen years. The good Father Banckaert put himself at the head of the battalion, and marched for the Sisters' convent. . . I heard a commotion in our courtyard, and leaving my room met the Father, who said to me, "This time there are only eighty-eight."
>
> "We needed room already. Means had nevertheless to be found for placing all this interesting little world. . . Since then other contingents have arrived; the number of our pupils is over 500; some very miserable, delicate little children, who were lodged in our infirmaries, have already succumbed.
>
> "You see how we are situated. . . Just up to the present we have been able to nourish our little people; we are building new dormitories; we gave clothes as long as we had any to give. The little girls last arrived run about still in their rags of clothes. Our *capitas* willingly devote themselves to the care of the smallest. Sixty children are already baptized; none have died without baptism. Fifty of our girls will be married without delay. We would like to keep them longer to form them better, but in the actual circumstances they must make room for younger ones.

This letter is typical. From every missionary centre of the priests and nuns in the Congo similar reports come month by month, and are published in the periodicals of the missionary orders in Belgium. The only difference between the reports of the priests and nuns is due to the fact that, the priests' establishments being larger, more boys are received into them than it is possible to receive girls into the convents; but everywhere the convents and schools are being enlarged, and already between them they harbour thousands.

In proof of all their statements the missionaries have produced and published since the appearance of the report of the Commission many returns and collections of statistics, the perusal of which leaves no doubt that their statements are true. Indeed, such rebutting evidence was not needed to prove that the members of the Inquiry Commission, who did not happen to be Catholics themselves, in collecting the evidence in the Stanley Pool district, were led into error by the statements made to them by the non-Catholic accusers of the Catholic missionaries, who are particularly numerous in that district. For example, it could not, on the face of it, be true that the natives in the farm-chapel settlements were prevented from marrying. No Catholic needs to be told that the sacrament of marriage is promoted in every land by Catholic missionaries.

King Leopold in appointing the Inquiry Commission made a concession to a public opinion which was not that of his own subjects. His desire in selecting the members of the Commission was to select men whose names afforded every guarantee of fitness and impartiality, while leaving untouched the sovereign and independent rights of the Congo. The accusations were accusations made by Protestants against Catholics. To have named Catholics to inquire into and report on Catholic institutions would have been to leave the report open to a charge of partiality which could not but weaken its effect. Most wisely, then, the King selected men who were not Catholics, but whose abilities and impartiality in the weighing of evidence were proved and admitted. These commissioners kept constantly in mind the fact that their mission was one to search out and report on abuses; they carefully collated the evidence of abuses tendered to them, and founded on it the unflinching and impartial report which does honour to them and to the Sovereign whose commission they bore. But biased evidence was tendered to them, and had they been Catholics, or more in sympathy with religion than they were, they would undoubtedly have pierced through the bias where religious interests were concerned.

As it was, they confined themselves solely to examining the strictly legal aspect of the case. Looking for evils to expose, not for things to praise, they passed by unnoticed the immense good which the Catholic missionaries are effecting in the Congo, and restricted their observations to the evils they were told existed in the system of the Catholic missionaries. Catholics in Belgium, knowing the great labours and the immense achievements of the missionaries of their race in the Congo, were indignant at finding that the Report contained no word in their praise; but, in truth, as Catholics they have nothing to complain of. The errors the Report contained regarding the exploiting of natives, the compulsion of the Christian catechists and their hindrance from marriage were at once detected and at once admitted. While, as to praise of the missionaries' work, it was accorded more emphatically than before by the public which read, by those who travelled and saw for themselves, by the governing State and by the King.

Those who know anything of continental politics do not need to be told of the exceedingly bitter feeling which the Press of one party displays towards all who are of another party; nor need they be reminded of the ceaseless war which those who call themselves Liberals on the Continent wage against the Church and, above all, against religious orders. The day has passed when men could be found in the ranks of continental Liberalism to echo the saying of Gambetta that anti-clericalism is not an article of exportation. It is, then, significant, as Father Ivan de Pierpont has recorded in the preface to the chapters on the Kwango mission in the work just published, *Au Congo et aux Indes*, that "even Liberal journals had the loyalty to take up the defence of the Belgian priests whom some had thus calumniated"; but more significant still is the marked public action of the sovereign of the Congo regarding the missions, since the publication of the attacks on them.

As soon as the report of the Inquiry Commission was presented to him, King Leopold nominated a second commission to study that report, and suggest the best means of carrying out its recommendations. This second Commission consisted of legislators, jurists and colonial authorities. It held many sittings in Brussels, and, in its turn, presented a detailed report to the King, who had it considered, in conjunction with still another report forwarded by the Governor General of the Congo, by his Secretaries General of the Congo, and caused them to prepare and present to him a long series of draft decrees embodying every improvement which seemed to him possible and desirable in the Congo government.

These draft decrees dealt with every subject on which the Inquiry Commission had touched, and thus embraced the whole body of colonial administration. Like the Congo laws, to which they are now joined, they contain admirable provisions, and there is, at least, reason to believe that, loyally applied, they will prove adequate; but I have not space to refer to them further here, or to the remarkable letter in which King Leopold announced his adoption of them, except in so far as they relate to the missions.

The Inquiry Commission suggested that in the place of the farm-chapel system of the Catholic missionaries there should be introduced a system of compulsory education into the Congo; that the missionaries should be invited, or required, to give secular instruction to the native children in their day schools, but that they should be forbidden to give religious instruction to any of those children whose savage parents required that they should be exempted from it.

King Leopold deliberately ignored these preposterous suggestions. In place of giving heed to them he took decisive means of assuring the stability of the missionary foundations; and, singling out a paragraph in the report which his Secretaries General had prepared under his direction, which acknowledged that "the Catholic missionaries are as a rule the only people who take native pupils into their establishments," he took the opportunity, in his subsequent letter, of emphasizing the debt the Congo owes to those whom he pointedly called "our missionaries," and of saying, "Our duty is to support them in the accomplishment of their noble task." On May 26 he caused a convention to be signed with the Holy See by which the Congo Free State undertook to concede to the Catholic missionary establishments the lands necessary for their religious work;

and, furthermore, King Leopold caused a letter to be addressed to the heads of the Catholic missions, thanking them for their great work in the Congo.

Thus, the report of the Inquiry Commission, which the enemies of the Church rely on to pull down its establishments in the Congo, results, chiefly, in bringing into the full light of day the excellence of these establishments, and in causing their stability to be assured.

The outcry of dishonest and envenomed adversaries continues, but no one has any excuse for being misled by it. It is not even necessary to have recourse to the evidence now produced to find accounts of the real condition of the farm chapels. Many writers on the Congo have described them, and all the descriptions written by those who have given themselves the time and taken the trouble to examine thoroughly these institutions tally with each other in a remarkable way.

One typical description of the farm chapels in the district of which the report of the Inquiry Commission treats is that of M. Charles Buls, ex-Burgomestre of Brussels, an anti-Catholic politician, who says in his *Croquis Congolais:*

> Three stations have been founded in this territory, which is four times as large as Belgium: Ki Mwenza, Ki Santu and N'Dembo. There are as many educational colonies; the girls are educated there by the Sisters of Notre-Dame. To preserve in these children their native simplicity, while correcting in them the faults of the race, is the programme. The instruction is most elementary for the boys and girls; efforts are made above all to teach them a useful trade.
>
> At twelve years the girls are married. If the mission wants spouses for its catechumens, it buys them from the neighbouring villages. Father Liagre told me that the negotiations often cause him to lose much time in palavers, and he roared with laughter in recounting to me how he is obliged to become a matrimonial agent. It must be remembered that the purchase of the woman is the form of marriage according to the native custom.
>
> The young household is established in a village of the district; a farm chapel is constructed for it; some children are lent to it as workers. This installation becomes a centre of cultivation and

evangelization. It receives from time to time the visits of a Father; he assures himself that the catechists maintain themselves in the right way, that they work and apply the precepts of their education. The mission of Ki Santu has already united 360 blacks, those of Ki Mwenza and of N'Dembo, 267. Markets are held regularly in the three principal missions, and furnish another occasion to the Fathers of maintaining relations with their pupils, and making them render accounts.

Left a certain time to themselves, obliged to look to their own cultivations and to their herds for their sole means of existence, the pupils of the Jesuits show an activity and an intelligence which is not seen in the catechumens of the other missions. They often become even the chiefs and judges of the villages where they are established. Those who obtain the best results are enrolled on the roll of honour, and their example serves for the emulation of the others; small presents—a cock, hens, a goat, seeds—recompense the most zealous.

In the Kwange district, "four times as large as Belgium," the Jesuits have established 300 farm-chapels. In the whole of the district there are seventeen priests, nine lay-brothers and fifteen nuns of the order of Notre-Dame de Namur. The constraint which the seventeen priests exercise over their 300 farm-chapels, it is evident, can only be a moral constraint. The fact is, the chiefs and heads of families welcome the establishment amongst them of these farm-chapels, which bring agricultural prosperity in their train; while the children who have once been instructed in the Christian belief, embrace religion heartily, and live under the Christian rule, not only voluntarily, but eagerly and gladly. Belief in the Supreme Being is never distant from the mind of the African; the untutored savage lives in cowering terror of the devil. With joy he hears the message of salvation, and accepts assurance that the powers of hell shall not prevail. The Christian faith has spread throughout all the immense territories of the Congo State. Everywhere in them the natives press into the missionary stations, demanding that Christians shall be sent to their villages to instruct and baptize them.

Weighing all the evidence most carefully, it seems no exaggeration to say that at least one-half of the population of the Congo to-day believes in the God of the Christians and in the message of salvation, and would at once be baptized were it not that the missionaries insist that the adults demanding baptism must first give proof of their intention to live according to the Christian rule. The Christian rule means a complete abandonment of the native customs; it is surpassingly difficult for adult natives to make the change it requires, and, at the present time, the masses who seek for salvation resign themselves, perforce, to having their children made Christians, and to awaiting themselves the baptism in the hour of death which the Church refuses to none who demand it. "It is hard to live as a Christian," they say, "but it is better to die one." In communities where no adult Christian is to be found there are savages who aspire to become Christians before they die, and who now administer to the dying and to infants the sacrament they themselves have not yet received.

Counting priests, lay-brothers and nuns, the total number of Catholic missionaries in the Free State does not yet reach 300. The conversion of the millions of inhabitants in the State could not be carried on as it is by this small number of Europeans without the assistance of the native catechumens and the spread of native stations or farm-chapels. The necessity for the spread of such stations shows itself in all the missionary districts. In a letter from Hemptinne in the Upper Kassa district, published in the *Missions en Chine et au Congo* for February, 1906, Father Vervaeke, one of the Scheut missionaries, says:

> Independent of the Balubas villages which surround the mission, and where all the young follow the lessons of Fathers Seghers and Savels, thirty other settlements are visited daily in turn by fourteen native catechists. Those enrolled voluntarily in them number 1,831, comprising 1,600 young people, boys and girls. The others are old slaves or the wives of chiefs. The latter hardly trouble themselves about religion for themselves any more than the grown men; but they look favourably on their wives, their old servants and their children learning to read; and you will encounter in this way numbers of little negroes, naked as if in the terrestrial paradise, but proud of knowing how to recite prayers and catechism.

All, then, would be for the best if we possessed more farm-chapels, I mean posts distant from the centre, where, by means of some lands given over to the cultivation of a small group of Christian families, catechists could live and radiate through one neighbourhood. Of this kind we have only the farm-chapel of Saint-Rémy, where there reside twelve baptized families and four catechists.

In the districts placed under the Scheut missionaries, the Upper Kassa and the Apostolic Vicariate of the Belgian Congo, which comprises the Equator and Lake Leopold districts and the whole centre of the Congo within the bend of the great river, the missionaries at first gathered their converts into large settlements in which thousands of native Christians lived; but the terrible ravages of the sleeping sickness wholly swept away one settlement, Berghe-Ste-Marie. To quote the words of the Vicar Apostolic, Monseigneur Van Renslé, the families collected there had lived under almost ideal conditions. The sleeping sickness threatened many others with a like fate. Moreover, the difficulties of keeping up a constant food supply in such settlements made it apparent that smaller establishments, linked together by the farm-settlements of native Christian families, in which native catechists could live and work, were more desirable. The establishment of each farm-chapel costs about £80. This money is, in the majority of cases, provided by Belgian donors, after whose names, or the names of whose patron saints, the farm-chapels are called. It is spent on farm utensils, farmyard stock, seeds and chapel furniture, all of which, as already stated, are presented to the Christian families established at each farm-chapel, which support themselves by the produce of the farms. There are 491 secondary posts and farm-chapels on the Congo, each of which is a centre of instruction, with over 22,000 Christians, over 42,000 catechumens, and about 10,000 schoolchildren.

Each smaller settlement and farm-chapel is self-supporting; each is worked by native Christians who have been taught agriculture, building, brick-making, carpentry and other trades in the mission schools; and from each on

Sundays and holidays the inhabitants flock to the Masses and religious services at the principal stations of the missions. The catechists in each of these establishments instruct the children of their own families, of the families of their companions, and of the savage native families of the neighbouring villages in the rudiments of religion, learning, trade and agriculture; each is visited, and its inhabitants instructed, as frequently as may be, by missionaries from the chief stations. It is thus that Christianity, introduced into the State of the Congo by the Government of King Leopold, is rapidly spreading throughout the State by the labour of the Belgian missionaries and their native pupils.

It was in 1876 that King Leopold first sought the aid of the missionary orders established in Belgium for the evangelization of the Congo. "From 1876, after the Geographical Congress, and afterwards in 1879, successive overtures were made in the name of the King," says Father Vermeersch in his recently published work on the Congo question, "to two institutions, unfortunately too much engaged in other apostolic enterprises prudently to attempt, with the men and the resources at their disposal, to assume the responsibility of a new and immense charge. . . These two institutions were the Congregation of the Missionaries of the Immaculate Heart of Mary, called of Scheutveld, and the Society of Jesus. The approaches were made to the first in 1876, 1884, 1886, 1887. The Society of Jesus was solicited in 1879, 1885 and finally in 1892, the year in which the Kwango mission was ceded to it." At the same time the co-operation was sought of the White Fathers of Cardinal Lavigerie, who already laboured in the district infested by Arabs on the borders of Lake Tanganyika, through which King Leopold's first expeditions were sent into the Congo. These Fathers entered what are now the Congo territories in 1879, under the protection of the Belgian pioneers. By an arrangement with Cardinal Lavigerie a Belgian branch of the Pères Blancs was established, and to this branch of the order was entrusted the missionary work in what is now the Vicariate of the Upper Congo. This Vicariate was created at the close of the Arab

War, at which time the Vicariate of the Belgian Congo was also created and placed under the Fathers of Scheut. The decree of Propaganda by which the Kwango district devolved on the Jesuits was made in April, 1892, and this district was erected into an Apostolic Prefecture, under that order, in 1903. The prefecture of the Uele was established under the Premonstratensians in 1898; the Trappists and the Redemptorists undertook work in special districts within the Congo Vicariate in 1892 and 1899 respectively; while in 1897 the Priests of the Sacred Heart undertook the evangelization of the district of Stanley Falls, which district was erected into an Apostolic Prefecture, under their control, in August, 1904.

The story of the settlement of this order, whose prefecture comprises 250,000 kilometres in the Stanley Falls district, is told by the Priests of the Sacred Heart in their publication, *L'Almanach du Congo*, for this year:

> The Free State of the Congo, not content with favouring the existing missions, pre-occupied itself with the necessity of increasing their number. For this end it appealed to new soldiers of religion, engaging them to accept the perilous honour of the Congolese missions—an intelligent policy as much as a generous and Christian one, which knows, in effect, that the missionary is *par excellence* a civilizer, that he is the best and most powerful auxiliary of the civil authority, and that at times his moral ascendancy is in efficiency equal to an army ranged in battle.
>
> His Excellency, the Baron Van Eetvelde, then Secretary of State of the Congo, went, therefore, to Rome, to ask for new missionaries from Propaganda. There he met the Very Rev. Father Dehon, Superior-General of the Congregation of the Sacred Heart of Jesus, imparted to him the desire of His Majesty the King, and asked him to send Fathers of his community to the Congo to found a new mission, at the same time pointing out the Falls in the Upper Congo as very favourable for this purpose.

The recruiting of new forces for the army of the Catholic Church in the Congo continues in the same manner. Within the last year English Catholic missionaries from Mill Hill have, at the invitation of the Belgian Government, joined their labours to those of the Belgian missionaries in the

Congo. They are working on the same lines and under the same protection.

It is, then, no falsehood and no libel to say that the Church and the State understand one another in the Congo, where the missionaries exploit the natives. Church and State understand one another and work with one another in the cause of civilization, and the missionaries exploit the natives for their bodily welfare and their souls' salvation. Never did the Catholic Church prove herself more faithful to the mission which is given to her: never did she more nobly uphold the morality of her Founder.

JOHN DE COURCY MACDONNELL

Brussels, August 7, 1906.

WINCHESTER MOTHER OF SCHOOLS

EVER since its foundation, more than five hundred years ago, Winchester College has held its own in the very front rank of English schools. Up to the Reformation, after which Eton came forward to take that place as our leading school which it has never since lost, Winchester occupied by unanimous consent the very first place of all. The headmastership offered both "the highest rack and the deepest manger"; it was at once more important and better paid than any similar post in the scholastic world; and, accordingly, on more than one occasion it was filled by the migration of the head master of Eton. In each case the migrants were originally Winchester men, and in one, that of William Horman, Eton again claimed him as her own, by electing him as a Fellow. Even to-day, although, of course, Winchester has long been passed in the race for pride of place by the younger but royal foundation, there are few, at anr rate among Etonians, who would not place Winchester second, and certainly there is no school at the present time to which parents make more strenuous endeavours to ensure that their sons shall go.

Now this long continued prosperity, lasting for more than five hundred years and outliving the most striking and drastic changes in its environment, is in itself a very noteworthy phenomenon, and all the more so when we consider that it has not been accompanied by any change of corresponding importance within the school itself. Since the time of the Public Schools Commission in 1857 considerable modifications have, no doubt, been introduced, many of which had become necessary in the changed condition of the world since 1393, though with regard to others some doubt may be allowed whether their influence has been wholly for good. Even so, however, the changes in the distinctive characteristics of the school are few and unimportant. For more than 450 years, from 1393 to 1857, the original statutes of William of Wykeham remained in force, and were the actual authority according to which the school was carried on. The account of its customs written in the sixteenth or seventeenth century remained, as Bishop Moberley used to testify, true in its minutest details of the early part of the nineteenth, and would probably have been equally true of the fourteenth and fifteenth. No place is so conservative or so retentive of past customs as a great school of boys, and accordingly in every essential point, save and except only in the most essential of all, Winchester has continued the same throughout its long history, and still remains the triumphant monument of the practical wisdom of our Catholic ancestors, and of their ideas of what a Catholic school should be for English boys.

William of Wykeham is generally credited, and undoubtedly justly so, with having made in his foundation of Winchester so important a step forward in educational matters, that he has come to be given the title of the Founder of the Public School System. When, however, we examine closely into the matter, it is a little difficult to say exactly wherein the new departure consisted. There were schools in England, one need hardly say, long before Wykeham's time, and boarding schools too. A school of this kind had been for centuries the almost invariable appendage of every cathedral church. It was a necessity, if for no other reason, in order to ensure a supply of boys who were sufficiently instructed in the rudiments of education to be able to go on with profit for the studies necessary for the priesthood. This school was the Bishop's school, connected with the diocese rather than the cathedral, and presided over, in the case of those cathedrals with secular chapters, by the Chancellor. Where the chapter was monastic, as was the case at Winchester itself, the school was under the Bishop directly, and not in any way connected with the monastery; and evidence exists both before and after the foundation of Winchester College that such a grammar school was actually being carried on. This grammar school needs to be carefully distinguished from the monastery school, which was for the younger members of the monastery alone.

But it was not only in connexion with cathedrals that these schools had been founded. Other collegiate churches had followed suit, though in their case there was no such impelling necessity as was imposed upon the cathedral by the need for educating clergy for the diocese. Almost every such collegiate church, and there were great numbers of them founded about the thirteenth century, had its school attached, so that it came almost to be looked upon as an integral portion of such a foundation. There was nothing new, therefore, when Wykeham built the collegiate church of St Mary of Winton, in his attaching to it a school for boys.

Nor again was there any fresh departure in the connexion of the school with a college at the university. In this point, indeed, Wykeham was directly imitating the action of Merton, who had established a school for boys at Malden in Surrey, with the express design that it should act as a feeder for his college at Oxford. Such a subordinate school was almost a necessity in those days, if the college was to be supplied with students who were capable of really profiting by university education and did not need first to be instructed in the lower branches of learning.

In no one of these points, therefore, can we say that Wykeham made any innovation on practice that was already established. With regard to every one of them he could point to existing instances already in actual and successful work. Yet there can be no sort of doubt that the foundation of Winchester does mark an epoch in the history of English schools. All these things had been done before, but separately and on a scale comparatively small; Wykeham combined them all at once, and did it on a scale of magnificence that till then had never been imagined. Cathedral and collegiate churches had had their schools from time immemorial, but as a mere appendage and not as an essential part of the foundation. Wykeham raised the school at Winchester to be the equal of the church to which it was attached; nay, more, he built and endowed the church for the sake of the school, the latter rather than the former being the principal part of the foundation. For the first time boys had a great institution founded for themselves, and not as a mere department of a foundation with other objects. It shows the strength which the custom of attaching schools to churches had obtained, that it does not seem to have occurred to Wykeham, or to Henry VI in later days, that a school was quite able to exist without being connected with any ecclesiastical foundation at all. After long centuries both at Winchester and at Eton the collegiate church has at length passed away and has practically become a mere school chapel, while the schools themselves in both instances have grown to dimensions which their founders can hardly have contemplated.

The original scheme for the college does not seem to have included any provision of Fellows. It was to consist of a Warden and seventy scholars, and the formal designation of the college for legal purposes still runs in that form, "The Warden and scholars, clerks." Fellows were added, however, almost immediately, to the number of ten, all appointed for life and only removable for misconduct. They had, normally, nothing whatever to do with the boys, their duties being confined to the proper carrying out of services in the church, which included a daily High Mass as well as the recitation of the whole of the Divine Office. With them, since our present interest is with the school and not the church, we need not further concern ourselves. The Warden had the general supervision of the whole foundation, and to him the Master was to appeal in case his authority was set at naught. But under ordinary circumstances he does not seem to have had much to do with the school or with its discipline. The two departments of the foundation, the church and the school, were organized separately, the Warden alone, or the Sub-Warden in his absence, having a general control over the whole. For the church there were provided the Wardens, ten Fellows, three Chaplains and three lay clerks, besides sixteen choristers, who were less than twelve years of age on appointment. The seventy scholars, and such other boys as were allowed to join the school, were under the jurisdiction of a Master and an Usher or second master, who had no duties to perform in the church except on Sundays and holidays. It is interesting to note, in view of the recent discussion in connexion with the head-mastership of Eton, that no stipulation is made in the Statutes that either of these masters ✓ should be a priest. Wykeham appears to have held that the ecclesiastical side of education was sufficiently secured by the connexion of the school with the college of priests, and saw no reason why the actual teachers should not be laymen. As a matter of fact, although in many cases it is difficult to trace how the matter stood, it is yet quite clear that some head masters in early times were not in Orders. Christopher Tonson, for instance, who was head master from 1560 to 1571, was certainly a layman and practised after leaving Winchester as a physician in London.

The seventy scholars were not as a rule to be more than twelve years of age on admission, and were to stay on until the completion of the eighteenth year, with an extra year thrown in in case they were on the roll for New College. The stipulation is made that they must be *pauperes et indigentes*, but this needs a word of explanation. There can be no doubt of the general intention of the founder that they should be sons of parents who could not comfortably afford to educate them otherwise, but they were not by any means to be regarded as mere charity boys. The choristers on the other hand were such; they were to be appointed *intuitu charitatis* and to be fed on the broken victuals of the priests and scholars, and all the conditions of their life point to extraction from a lower class. But the scholars might have an income of their own of five marks a year when they were elected, a sum which was the equivalent of the second master's salary, and therefore a large amount for a child under twelve to possess. It has been suggested, and probably with justice, that the insertion of this phrase *pauperes et indigentes*, which occurs regularly in the statutes of almost every similar foundation of that period—as, for instance, at Eton and All Souls, Oxford—was a mere device of the lawyers to prevent appeals being made to the provisions of the Canon Law against the appropriation of churches, since the poverty of the inmates of houses receiving such appropriations was the only justification legally allowed. In practice, probably, the scholars were drawn from the smaller gentry and more substantial burghers, very much the class indeed from which such scholarships, both at the public schools and at the universities, are generally filled up at the present time. That they were not "poor" in any other sense is clear enough alike from the names borne by those who were earliest admitted, and from the fact that the statutes contemplate, both at Winchester and at Eton, that sons of the noble classes should come to live with them and share their education as commensals or commoners, an institution of which we shall have more to say presently. Royalty itself, in the person of Henry VII, is said, though perhaps on doubtful authority, to have shared the lot, as a "commensal," of the "poor and indigent" scholars of Eton, and among the similar scholars of Winchester we find such names as that of Henry Chicheley, afterwards Archbishop of Canterbury, whose father, Sir Robert Chicheley, was thrice Lord Mayor of London.

It is not very easy, from lack of information, to draw a detailed picture of school life at Winchester in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. The Statutes do not give us very much help. A lively Latin poem, which for a long time was looked upon as the work of Tonson, the head master in the middle of the sixteenth century, is now thought to be a hundred years later; but, thanks to the unchanging conservatism so characteristic of schools, the actual date of the document is of comparatively little consequence. Gaps, too, in our information about Winchester can often be filled up from Eton, since the two foundations at that date so closely resembled each other, even in the small details of their arrangements.

The buildings at Winchester have altered so little in the five hundred years which have elapsed since their original foundation that we can recognize without much difficulty each portion of the structure referred to in the Statutes, and this is a great help in reconstructing the system. The outer quadrangle was entirely given up to the external works connected in those times with a foundation of this kind, which would have to be self-supporting in many ways which would not now be thought of. This outer quadrangle therefore contained the slaughter-house, the wood-house and the brewery, together with granaries and storehouses of various kinds. Through these all had to pass before reaching the actual school buildings in the inner quadrangle. This seems to us to be an odd arrangement. We should have expected these buildings to be at the back and approached by another entrance. It is, however, an arrangement which can be paralleled in other similar buildings of the same date, and was probably designed for the sake of greater security in an age when town and gown rows were not infrequent, and were of a very much more serious character than the modern "rag," which has, to some extent, taken their place.

The real life of the place passed entirely in the inner quadrangle or "Chamber Court." Access to it is gained by an archway under a gate tower, and here on each side may still be seen the statues of our Blessed Lady, crowned and bearing the Holy Child, which were placed there in the founder's time and must be among the very few pre-Reformation statues left standing in England. The south side of the court was wholly taken up by the chapel and the hall, built end to end after the plan so often followed in later times at Oxford, and the remaining three sides were given up to residential purposes, the Warden occupying the chamber over the central tower and the remaining members of the foundation being grouped around him. The buildings were of two stories only, and were divided up into six large chambers on each floor, the lower ones being the quarters assigned to the boys and occupied by them, eleven or twelve in each chamber. The floor of the lower chambers was originally of chalk "rammed hard on a bottom of flints, like the floor of any old Hampshire barn," and it was not till 1540, after the school had been in existence for 150 years, that this was replaced by a flooring of oak. The only furniture provided by the college consisted of about ten beds in each chamber, the smallest boys, under fourteen, having to share one between two. Any other furniture, if there was any, had to be provided by the boys themselves, and consequently, since no mention of it is made in the inventories, we have no information about it. It is not likely that there was much. Boys, in those days, were made to live the simple life.

The upstairs chambers were rather sets of rooms than single chambers and were assigned to the senior members of the foundation, three to each. There was a gallery running along the whole floor, so that the occupants of each chamber could visit others without descending into the court. Otherwise the "chamber" was cut up into one large room which all had in common, and three little apartments, which were assigned to each separately as his private study. First, second and third chambers were occupied in this way by nine of the Fellows. The tenth Fellow, the Head Master and the second master or Usher, occupied the "sixth." "Fourth" was assigned to the Warden as a reception room for guests and so forth, and "fifth" remained unoccupied and unassigned, a fact which was destined to lead to most momentous consequences in the early future. The sixteen choristers had a special "chamber" assigned to them on the ground floor and known as "seventh." They also had a special schoolroom of their own, and the room over this was occupied by the three Chaplains.

Washing in chambers was strictly prohibited. If the Fellows spilt water in the first floor rooms, it ran through and wetted the boys' beds below, and, in like manner we can understand that spilt water would not add to the comfort of a floor composed of chalk and mud. A penthouse was provided outside the kitchen and near the hall, with a stone trough and basins, and this was used by the boys, while a similar conduit in the cloisters behind the chapel provided all that was then required by their seniors.

School was carried on in one large room, under hall, in what is now called "seventh chamber." It is the only school building of the fourteenth century in England which still survives, and is, therefore, of exceptional interest. Its measurements, which have since been curtailed, were about forty-five feet by twenty-nine, with a height of fifteen or sixteen feet. There were four wooden columns which held up the ceiling, which was also the floor of the hall, and it was lighted by three windows in the southern wall. Opposite on the north wall hung a great map of the world, while on the west wall was the famous device of the mitre, the crozier and the rod, with the well-known motto, *Aut disce, aut discede, manet sors tertia, caedi.* "Either learn or else go. There remains a third choice, to be whipped." There was a *rostrum* for declamation under this device. At each end of the room were the thrones or "desks" of the Head Master and the Usher. In the windows were raised seats, occupied by some of the elder boys, known as prefects, whose duty it was to overlook the others and keep them in order.

These "prefects" form an integral part of Wykeham's plan, and are provided for in the Statutes. They were to be eighteen in number, as they still are, and were to be assigned three to each chamber; being chosen from among their schoolfellows on account of their age, knowledge and general worthiness, in order that they might exercise a general office of supervision, look after the behaviour of the juniors and report anything that might go wrong to the Master. It is the earliest mention known of a very characteristic feature in English schools, and it may be that Wykeham originated it. It seems more likely, however, that in this he was merely carrying out an existing and well-established custom which had grown up in similar schools. In any case this plan of carrying on the government of a school largely through the instrumentality of the bigger boys has become almost universal in English schools, and perhaps constitutes the most marked difference between them and the schools of the continent. No doubt evils may result in some cases, where the wrong boys are put into power and there is not sufficient supervision exercised by the masters; but, in the main, the system has proved its value by the great increase it brings about in the initiative and self-reliance of the boys. If English public schoolmen have been able, in spite of the undoubted deficiencies of their schools in matters of teaching and bookwork, to build up and maintain such a world-wide empire as has never before been known, it is largely due to the prefect system which first taught those men how to rule, and which was ultimately derived from the wise provisions made by William of Wykeham and by other Catholic founders in the ages of faith.

The boys who were not prefects sat, apparently, each in his own fixed place near the master to whose "book" he belonged. No record of the exact arrangement has been handed down, but the traditional "scobs" or wooden desks with arrangements for holding books, etc., seem to have come down from very early times.

In summer the school was held in the cloisters instead of the schoolroom, and the stone seats beneath the windows on which the boys sat are still to be seen. The practice of doing lessons in the cloisters was given up perhaps two hundred years ago, but the summer term still goes by the name of cloister-time.

Such then were the principal buildings and chambers in which the boys' lives were passed. The course of the daily routine can also be reconstructed with a certain degree of accuracy.

The day began at five o'clock with "First Peal," and the prefect in each chamber called the sleepers. In later times this, with other unpleasant tasks, fell rather to the junior. They hurried with their clothes, for, as soon as the bell stopped, a Latin psalm had to be recited. At Eton they said Matins of our Lady while they dressed, and this may be the meaning of the phrase used at Winchester. After this prayer was finished, there was no time to be lost, for beds had to be made, hair brushed and face and hands washed at the conduit outside, and all had to be completed before half-past five, when "Second Peal" went for chapel. There is no stipulation in the Statutes of either Winchester or Eton that the boys should go to daily Mass, but the fact that in later and Protestant times they did go each day to chapel at half-past five and stayed there for half an hour, seems clearly to show that in Catholic times they heard Mass always at this time, and probably it was the *Salve* or "Morrow Mass," the votive Mass of our Lady ordered in the Statutes, which they attended.

At six o'clock school began, and went on apparently for three hours. Breakfast was at nine, an informal meal consisting, no doubt, of bread and beer, and was allowed only to those under sixteen. No one else, from the warden downwards, had any food until dinner. The bell which summoned the boys to hall for breakfast served also to announce the High Mass, which at the same time began in the chapel. Judging from the analogy of Eton, though we have no record of the practice at Winchester, on their way down from hall they went into the chapel for a few minutes, and remained there in order to adore at the Elevation of the High Mass. After school there was probably a break for play and perhaps for "preparation" done privately in chambers, for there was no more formal school until eleven, when the bell rang again and they went in for an hour.

Dinner was at midday, and they went in straight from school. At this meal all the community met together. The warden, the vice-warden and the head master sat at the high table with three of the senior Fellows. The other Fellows, the usher and the chaplains dined at "senior end" of the side tables, just as bachelors do in most college halls to-day, and the other side tables were occupied by the boys in no particular order. The lay-clerks and the choristers waited at table, and had their dinner afterwards. One of the scholars read aloud from the Bible, the Lives of the Saints or some theological work, and silence was kept all through both dinner and supper. There was a fire in the hall, or an open hearth in the middle, and it was apparently the only fire provided, except, of course, in the kitchen. On feast days in winter after supper, but at no other times, all might stay in hall and gather round the fire, and spend a certain time in singing or talking or other amusement.

After dinner work began again, and lasted apparently till five o'clock. Probably the actual school hours were two to three and four to five, with a break in the middle, but there is no exact information available. At five prayers were said as a close to the day's work, consisting of our Lady's antiphon according to the season, and some collects. After that all were free till six, when supper was served in the hall. After supper all went to chambers, and preparation went on till eight, when there was evening chapel. This at least was the custom in later years, but in Catholic times it seems more likely that chapel was earlier, as it certainly was at Eton, where Vespers of our Lady were said just before supper. If chapel was as late as eight o'clock at Winchester, it will have been for night prayers said in common, but these at Eton were said not in chapel, but in long chamber. After prayers immediately came bed, so that nearly nine hours were allowed for sleep.

Such was the routine on Mondays, Wednesdays, Fridays and Saturdays; but Tuesday and Thursday were half holidays, and on those days after dinner names were called at Middle Gate, and forthwith, if weather permitted, all went off to "Hills." They walked two and two until Hills were reached, but once there they broke up and amused themselves as they pleased with games, till the time came for return, when they marched back as they went, two and two. What games they played in Catholic days there is, alas, no means of knowing.

On Sundays and feast-days no work was done, but all the services of the Church were attended in chapel. That involved getting up an hour earlier than usual, in order to attend Matins at half-past four, so that holidays cannot have been an unmixed joy.

There were no regular holidays in the sense of vacations. Boys came to school to stay there, and did not as a rule go home during the whole course of their school life. The distance from their homes in most cases rendered this inevitable, and the position resembled that of those boys who at the present time are sent to the English College at Valladolid or at Lisbon, or who come home to school in England, while their parents are detained for some reason abroad. But there were holidays at school—at Christmas, at Easter and in the summer—and at those times some at least of the boys went to friends in the neighbourhood, for the number of scholars "drawing commons" can be traced from day to day in the old account books, and often falls at such times to forty-five or fifty. Recognized vacations did not begin until 1518.

All the seventy scholars, of course, were clerks, definitely preparing for the priesthood, bound to receive the tonsure within their first year, and dressed suitably to their condition in a gown of dark colour, with an especial prohibition of shoes that were red or green, the wearing of a sword or dagger, or a gown that was striped or particoloured. The general appearance must have been not unlike the Blue-coat boys of modern days, especially as no covering was allowed for the head, but it lacked the yellow stockings which form so marked a feature of the modern dress.

Wykeham's first object, the training up of a learned clergy, was thus carried out in the seventy scholars; but there were other boys for whom a liberal education was equally needed, but whose position or tastes kept them from turning towards the priesthood as a career in life. Apparently these were not thought of in his original plan, but pressure, we may suppose, was almost immediately brought to bear upon him, and, by what appears to be an insertion into the Statutes, he made provision for them. Fifth chamber on the upper floor remained untenanted, and gave the opportunity. Ten boys, sons of nobles, and special friends of the college, might be admitted to live there and share the education of the scholars. A similar provision was made at Eton, but for twenty such boys, who at each school bore the name of commensals or commoners, from the fact that they lived at a common table with the scholars. At Eton, too, from the first, there was a provision made that boys living in the town, either with their parents or under due supervision, might come in to be taught in the school. At Winchester this was not possible, because there was already a grammar school which had a monopoly for such boys. Hence the two schools have developed somewhat differently. At Eton the "Oppidans," or town boys, have become by far the larger portion of the school, and the "Commoners" seem soon to have died out altogether. At Winchester the history is very obscure, but a system of the same kind seems to have grown up very quickly, and to have led in 1412 to an appeal to the Bishop, Cardinal Beaufort, from the master of the grammar school. In consequence of this, perhaps, it was that at Winchester outsiders seem always to have lived after this date on premises belonging to the school and under its control, and not to have lodged, as they did at Eton, with people in the town. At Eton we learn from the Paston Letters that precisely the same system was already in vogue in 1478 as lasted on to within the present year, and ended only with the lamented death of Miss Evans, "the last of the Dames." William Paston, aged eighteen, lives with a lady whom he calls "my hostess," and is responsible to one of the Fellows, who has the title of "my creanser," the forerunners respectively of the Dames and Tutors of a later day. The system at both schools now is identical, for at Winchester "Commoners" has been supplemented by masters' houses, following the example of Eton, where the Dames have been gradually replaced in every case by masters in the school. Hence has arisen a somewhat perplexing nomenclature, for the boys, with their usual conservatism, have retained the old names, with the result that "my dame" now probably denotes a mathematical master, while "Mrs my dame" is his wife, and "my dame's dame" is the lady who acts as matron in his house. So too at Winchester we have hundreds of "Commoners," not one of whom has etymologically the smallest right to the name.

This arrangement of boarding boys out in masters' houses is now almost universal in English schools. It provides by far the best method of obtaining the advantages which are natural to a large school, without sacrificing the personal influence which is so necessary, and yet so difficult to ensure when the numbers are at all large. Certainly it was never thought of by William of Wykeham, and yet it is the direct development from his arrangement for receiving "Commoners" into the vacant fifth chamber on the upper floor.

The influence of Winchester upon other schools has indeed been astonishing. Eton, of course, is an actual daughter, and is proud to own the relationship. When Colet was refounding and enlarging St Paul's, it was to Wykeham's foundation that he looked for inspiration, and the school founded by Elizabeth to occupy the monastic buildings at Westminster is almost as closely related to Winchester as Eton herself. Of Bedford School, founded in 1566, almost as much may be said, while of the more modern schools of the last century there is scarcely one but must confess its debt. Winchester has always been, not only the first and oldest of our public schools, but the fruitful mother of other schools built up in the main on her traditions.

The main points of the system which has thus grown up and spread about, and which, as we have said, was in its origin no other than the old Catholic system of English education, may be summed up as follows, and stand out in marked opposition to the characteristics of the schools which are ruled according to the ideas which found vogue upon the Continent.

The English schools aim at a mixed education of boys preparing for the priesthood and others whose career will be passed in the world. The "Church boys" were to some extent separated, wore a different dress and lived under a stricter discipline, but in all other respects mixed with the others on equal terms. The government of the school, as such, was wholly and entirely in the hands of the head master, there was no dual control, no "Director of Studies" and "prefect of discipline." As far as possible the order of the school was preserved by the boys themselves, and not by masters. No one, for instance, slept with the boys in chambers, or accompanied them when they went out to play on "Hills." At these times, and even in hall, school and chapel, order was preserved by the boy prefects. The principle acted upon throughout was that boys can and ought to be trusted, and that confidence of this kind, under wise and judicious supervision, is the best and surest way to draw out all that is good and strong in their characters.

At present, of course, almost all Catholic schools in England are ruled mainly on the continental system. That was the inevitable result of the penal laws, which made it unlawful for Catholics to have schools in England. Hence we have "prefects of studies" instead of head masters, and "professors" instead of assistant masters, with a good deal also of the continental system of restrictions and supervision. Yet, even so, Wykeham is not wholly without influence even in modern Catholic England. When the Oratory School was founded by the late Cardinal Newman it was principally from Winchester, and from Westminster which is Winchester's daughter, that he drew his ideas, so far as they differed from those generally held in other Catholic schools. In earlier times too it is possible that a similar influence was exerted and has left its mark on two of our schools, St Edmund's, Old Hall, and St Cuthbert's, Ushaw.

The Wykehamist influence at Douay in its earliest days was exceedingly strong. John Martiall, who helped Allen at the time of the foundation of the college, had been "usher" or second master at Winchester under Hyde, and Hyde himself gave up his head-mastership in 1560, went abroad and lived for years at Douay, where he died as late as 1593. Among other Wykehamists who were connected at this time with Douay or Rheims we find Thomas Harding, Nicholas Harpsfield, John Rastell, Thomas Stapleton, Owen Lewse, Richard Whyte, who was professor there for thirty years and died in 1602, William Rainold, Nicholas Sandars, John Pits, Ven. John Body, Ven. John Munden, Thomas Dorman, Thomas Gage, Regius Professor of Divinity, Gilbert Bourne, John Bustard, John Cullam, John Fisher, Richard Harley, Adam Horne, Thomas Shelley, John Fen. All of these spent more or less time at the English College, many of them were for years on its staff, and all of them had been Scholars of Winchester and almost all Fellows of New College. Such a body of men, so numerous and so distinguished, could hardly fail to leave their mark upon the little school which even in those early years was coming into existence. The *Douay Diaries* prove clearly that almost from the first there were boys in residence at the college who were not training for the priesthood, but were sons of good English families seeking abroad the education which was denied them at home. After the band of Wykehamists died out at the end of the century, the college fell under Jesuit control during the presidentship of Father Worthington, who had taken a vow of personal obedience to Father Persons, and the period left its mark very clearly on the school, which from that time was carried on, in its main lines, on the continental model.

Still, without being fanciful, we may trace in the plan of mixed lay and clerical education at the two schools which are the daughters of Douay in England; in the much greater liberty allowed to their boys than is usual in continental establishments; and lastly in the system of boy prefects which exists at St Edmund's, the influence which was exerted three hundred years ago by the memories of Catholic Winchester—Mother of schools.

ARTHUR STAPYLTON BARNES

The CHURCH of FRANCE and the French People

THE Holy Father having prohibited the Associations for Public Worship to which, as an extreme concession, the French Act of Disestablishment promised the devolution of Church property and the highly conditional tenancy of churches, the duty of French Catholics, at least in a negative sense, is plain; and, to the disappointment of their adversaries, every day multiplies the expressions of loyal adherence and filial submission to the injunctions of the last Encyclical. That the Sovereign Pontiff will be obeyed is certain, however Catholics may differ as to the best means of securing the vitality of their religion in these difficult times, however greatly some have doubted whether it be indeed the lesser of two evils that has at length been chosen. The following pages are an attempt to expose the risks involved in either of the alternatives which for so many months have distracted the Church of France. The writer will necessarily travel beyond the defects and merits of a legal text to consider some essential factors in this anxious and complex situation generally overlooked or misappreciated by the English daily press. For its abundant but mechanical comments on French affairs are too often vitiated by its respect for party labels and its obsequious acceptance of deceitful abstractions. It tells us too little about the aims and spirit of the parliamentary coalition which for the last seven or eight years has directed the domestic policy of the Republic and the exceptional circumstances which have given it a relative stability. It does not care to explain the false associations by which the Church and the democracy have been thrown into an apparent opposition; it neglects altogether the latent force of public opinion in France, and of traditions and instincts only spasmodically articulate. Yet surely no judgement on the present conflict can be valuable which is not confirmed by some study of these elements.

The Church of France

I

The Encyclical *Vehementer Nos* was a protest. The Encyclical *Gravissimo* is an injunction binding on all the faithful—not to *disobey* a law regularly passed by the French parliament—but to refuse the precarious advantages, burdened with vexatious conditions, which it offers.

The proposed Associations for Public Worship are the means by which the State, having withdrawn its aid and countenance from religion, resumes control over its exercise, which it submits to exceptional legislation. The Act of Disestablishment deprives the sees, chapters, incumbencies and vestries of their legal status. It assumes that Catholics (and members of other denominations) will use their right of combining—a right guaranteed and regulated by a recent statute—to ensure the continuance of public worship; but it provides that only such Associations as conform to a number of additional requirements shall be recognized as the heirs, in some sort, of the suppressed *établissements publics du culte*, shall succeed to their property (and their liabilities), shall dispose of churches and chapels indefinitely, and of bishops' palaces, presbyteries and seminaries for a limited period. Assimilated in many respects to clubs and public companies, they must submit to numerous restrictions from which other associations are free. Their object, public worship, is exclusive. They are bound, at least once a year, to assemble in full numbers in order to examine and approve the acts of their executive. Their receipts and expenditure are to be audited by government officials. Their available capital is strictly limited. Their rival claims, their disputes, are deferred to the Council of State. They are liable on various grounds to dissolution by order of a court; and on various grounds also to summary eviction from churches, presbyteries, etc., by ministerial decree. Failing the constitution of such Associations by a certain date, the "public establishments" hitherto recognized by law die, so to speak, intestate. Church property is to be placed under seal and eventually made over to local charities and hospitals; and churches and chapels pass absolutely into the hands of their "owners," the State, the Departments and, most usually, the Communes.

Pius X has decided that the Church of France would incur greater dangers by placing itself under the protection of this regime than by rejecting it. Many eminent French Catholics, including several prelates, while of course determined to respect the Papal decision, are or were of a contrary opinion. The churches closed or profaned, their treasure confiscated, the clergy homeless and persecuted, a clandestine religious worship barely tolerated, the horrors of civil war—to the prospect of such disasters they would have preferred almost any accommodation; and up to the last they hoped that it might be possible to reconcile the constitution of the Church with the requirements of the Act, and, by uniform statutes regulating the life of the proposed Associations, to safeguard the principle of unity, the principle of authority and the immutable rights of the Catholic hierarchy. "The Law," they said, "however inquisitorial in some respects, does not meddle with the internal order of these corporations; nothing prevents the *curé* from presiding *ex officio* over each. They must contain at least seven, fifteen or twenty-five persons, according to the population of the locality concerned; but they need contain no more. The Law expressly allows the grouping together of any number of Associations under a central authority (the Bishop). They may be called by any name. Above all, though the Law pedantically ignores the hierarchy, it supposes that the Association will "conform to the normal organisation of the religion" in whose interest they are established. If the Church knows nothing of *associations cultuelles*, cannot a canonical existence be given to some form of parochial assembly (*paroissiales*, *fabriciennes*) which will constitute Associations within the meaning of the Act?

Various schemes, which need not be discussed here, have been suggested. The Pope has finally rejected them, and his prohibition rests, not at all obscurely, on the ground that, granted some form of association "at once canonical and legal" could be brought into existence, yet while the text and above all the spirit of the Law remain what they are, there is absolutely no security against the danger of indiscipline and schism, compared with which all other risks

—spoliation, destitution, heavy penalties—are as nothing. If we may presume to expound the most significant phrases of the Encyclical *Gravissimo*, the answer of Rome is, in effect, the following: It is for the ecclesiastical authority to frame the statutes of the Associations (by whatever name called) to which it is invited to deliver the property in its trust; and they may be so framed as in the first instance to secure the dateless principles of Church government. But what is to prevent—since the Law recognizes no other religious organization than the Associations—the modification of those statutes by a general meeting; or the secession of one or several Associations, corresponding to so many parishes, from the union which corresponds with the diocese; or the dismissal of an incumbent by his parishioners; or the rebellion of an incumbent, supported by his flock, against the authority of the Bishop; or divisions in the parish, ending in an attempt to form a rival Association under the leadership, let us suppose, of a *vicaire* who has quarrelled with his *curé?* In all such cases, should the spiritual and canonical sanctions which the Bishops dispose of be insufficient, an appeal to law could never be made with any confidence, and might entail dissolution and eviction. The Council of State, to which disputes affecting the Associations are to be referred, passes for a court of just and moderate men. But it is recruited from time to time by nominees of an ephemeral Government; its interpretation of a law, which on many points is obscure and evasive, may be biased by the spirit of its authors; unlike the ordinary courts, it is without the guarantee of public hearing. Lastly, cases may be easily imagined in which it may be called upon to pronounce judgements on matters not merely of ecclesiastical discipline, but virtually of doctrine. However remote these contingencies, the Church of France must face them.

II

The principle which underlies the attitude of Rome in this matter is clear, consistent and incontrovertible. The State proclaims its indifference to religion; it ignores the constitution of the Church; it has suppressed the means of negotiating with its head: yet it claims the right to legislate for Catholics, to control their organization, to limit their material resources and to decide their differences. The Act of Disestablishment is not so much an act of liberation as an act of neutrality. The dominant fact in the situation it creates is the hostility of its authors to the Church. The men who made it have openly and repeatedly declared their purpose to "uncatholicize France"; and they have explicitly confessed that they regard the Act only as a provisional measure in the accomplishment of that end. It is perfectly true that as it stands the text is far less illiberal than at one time seemed likely, thanks to the tenacity of the moderates and to the misgivings of the majority. But there is every reason in the world why Catholics should suspect as Danaan gifts the temporary concessions and the precarious privileges it seems to offer.

There is a question of right and a question of opportunity. It is sometimes said: Although the hope of schism, the unreasoning hatred of the clergy, the desire to reduce the social mission of Catholicism, a pitiful jealousy of the means by which the worship of God may assure its future, are manifest in many of its provisions and alone explain them, the Act, tyrannical and defective as it is, is not intolerable. Why not attempt to make the best of it? Why prefer certain destitution along with an autonomy which can never be complete, to a partial subjection which time and the ingenuity of jurists may mitigate, and which leaves Catholics, at least for the present, in possession of their patrimony? Why anticipate calamities which are only contingent, and voluntarily abandon, from the first, the parish churches and all they contain, the seminaries, the houses of bishops and priests—because sooner or later they may be forfeited? Thus negatively put, the question of expediency would appear to admit of only one answer. It is possible, however, that the Pope's decision is something more than a choice of evils. By resolving that the life of the Church shall continue on the basis of the Common Law rather than on that of a unilateral contract, has not the Holy Father appealed from the French parliament to the people of France?

III

The appeal, it may be said, has been made, and it has failed: the recent general elections resulted in a decisive victory for the party in power; approval of the policy of separation could hardly have been more clearly expressed. It is perhaps worth while at this point to glance at the parliamentary situation, and to notice how ambiguous, to say the least, are the lessons of the polls.

The existence of a permanent majority in the Chamber of Deputies, such as that upon which its last four Cabinets have all but constantly depended, is something abnormal in French politics. Our two-party system has no traditions across the Channel, where, indeed, the sanctions of party discipline are seldom strong enough to overcome the French dislike of continual accommodations. The Right, which constitutes an irreducible opposition to the Republican principle of government, is not, in our sense of the word, a party at all—being excluded logically from the very hope of power; nor since the Republic became secure is "the Republican party" more than an empty phrase. For more than twenty years French Cabinets were the nominees of small political groups formed in parliament itself under rapidly changing designations which had hardly any currency outside it. They lived as long as they had the confidence of a powerful, but always a precarious and occasional, association of such groups, but they could never count upon an ascertainable number of supporters in the division lobby. Their proverbial instability, however, by no means implied so frequent a change of general tendency as of responsible chiefs.

In 1899 M. Waldeck-Rousseau took office at an emergency with his famous coalition ministry, and the system of little groups and haphazard majorities was suspended. An old disciple of Gambetta's and an essentially pliable politician, whose authority in parliament was due as much to an impressive sobriety of manner as to an acknowledged gift of strategy, he had the ability to prolong, without aggravating, a difficult situation, to seduce the Socialists—until lately an insolated group—into a steady alliance with other sections of the Left by the prospect of concessions eternally postponed, and alternately to disarm the Centre by exciting fears for the Republic itself and to throw moderate Republicans into the arms of its enemies. Fortune favoured him and the Radical groups, which had only partly recovered at the elections of 1898 the advantageous position formerly won by their energetic repulse of Boulangism, and compromised by the Panama revelations. The Dreyfus agitation had long become disproportionate to the occasion—a highly technical question of fact—and served to rally politicians of very different schools. A formidable obstacle to the cooperation of the Socialists had been removed by the defeat of M. Jules Guesde, the consistent advocate of Marxism in its most uncompromising form; the leadership of that section in the Chamber passed to a man more easily flattered, a waverer and a man of words, M. Jean Jaurès. Finally, an unpremeditated escapade of M. Paul Deroulède made it possible to involve Republican patriots without any excessive improbability in a grotesque conspiracy with some harmless adherents of lost causes; while the windy fulminations of a religious newspaper furnished an excuse for representing all the regular clergy as obsequious servants of militarism and incorrigible preachers and teachers of monarchical doctrine.

M. Waldeck-Rousseau did not initiate a single important measure of social reform; but he saved the Republic repeatedly from phantom dangers, and he embodied in the Associations Act some vindictive legislation against the Religious Orders, which indeed was not all unjust or unnecessary, but of which the application was with flagrant injustice left to the mercy of partisans. He presided over the elections of 1902 and then retired, bequeathing to his successor a trained and organized force, sufficient to have stood, if necessary, against the disappointed Collectivists as well as against the old Republican Centre and the new Nationalist group, a group which could only justify its existence and undertake an efficacious opposition by confounding itself with the Monarchical Right.

The achievements of M. Combes, a far less supple personality, are fresh in all minds. His Government applied the Law of 1901 without any respect for the public and private assurances of his predecessor, multiplied vexatious measures against religion, broke noisily with the Holy See, impaired the public services, became a proverb for nepotism, kept together a reluctant majority only by amazing acts of servility, succeeded in disgusting Socialists like M. Millerand and Freethinkers like M. Doumer; and finally raised the indignation of the whole country by the system of Masonic delations exposed in the Chamber and the press by M. Guyot de Villeneuve.

It fell to M. Rouvier, a resourceful man of affairs with a chequered past, who retained few convictions, to carry through the Act of Disestablishment and commence its application. Preoccupied by a diplomatic crisis and by financial considerations, M. Rouvier, like most politicians, was entirely unprepared for the disorders which arose in many parts of the country in connexion with the valuation of Church property. He had alienated a number of his supporters (indeed, the Socialists as a body had never trusted this friend of capital) by fitful attempts to conciliate the Centre; and on the other hand he dared not, in the last resort, give a legitimate satisfaction to those who feared a religious war and deprecated violent repression. He fell between two stools: the vote which overthrew him was chaotic and composite; but the Jacobins and the Socialists alone reaped the advantage and remained the masters of the Government over which M. Sarrien nominally presides.

The elections of 1906 were awaited with more than ordinary anxiety, because indications had not been wanting during the last eighteen months that public opinion had been deeply stirred, in a sense unfavourable to the party in power, by grave events and scandalous revelations. The neglect of the navy, the antipatriotic propaganda of M. Hervé and his friends, the affair of the *fiches maçonniques*, the forced retirement of M. Delcassé, an unusual number of strikes necessitating the intervention of the troops, finally the inventory riots in Paris and the provinces—these things had certainly impressed an electorate which moves slowly and remembers long. The result was a victory for the Government, a victory which can certainly not be explained away, but which admits of various interpretations. For, if numerically the groups adhering recently to what is called the policy of the Republican *bloc* are considerably stronger than they were before the elections, there are signs that individually these groups are inclined to assert their independence of each other. The reappearance of M. Guesde affirms the vitality of the dogmatic Socialists, who will no longer be content with promises. The return of M. Biétry shows that the immense mass of French workmen who resent the tyranny of strike committees are growing conscious of their needs and of their strength. The reduction of the Progressives, the reward of an inconsistent and inactive leadership, the collapse of Nationalism illustrate the danger of a negative programme and of equivocal alliances. And the impartial spectator of French affairs must acknowledge, finally, that the firmness and common sense of our enemies, MM. Clémenceau and Briand, deserved a personal triumph. The timely concession which put an end to what seemed likely to degenerate into a religious war in certain districts, the dexterous dealing with the Flemish strikers, the frank repudiation of antipatriotic doctrine, made a legitimate impression on the eve of the elections. But those who would construe their results as an endorsement of the Combist policy forget that the principle of separation was never yet submitted to the French electorate; that it was confronted by a *fait accompli;* that the repeal of the Act was beyond the courage of any party which could conceivably have succeeded to power; that the religious question was never presented *by itself;* lastly, that the French elector is not accustomed to express by his vote his approval or disapproval of a party, but his positive wants and his concrete fears.

IV

The apparent apathy of most French Catholics, the energy and cunning of their adversaries, have deceived the world into believing that a little faction has the strength of a whole people behind it. Favoured by all sorts of circumstances and half a dupe himself, the Jacobin has exploited the traditional aversions and apprehensions of the ordinary Frenchman, and masked his attack upon what in his heart the ordinary Frenchman loves. Clericalism—the abuse of spiritual authority—was once a living force, and it was the ally of privilege and the buttress of secular tyranny, in the days when the sons of an infidel nobility came back full of a new bigotry from exile. Historical accident has associated a stern republicanism with unbelief, and has invested the faithful friends of proscribed dynasties with a power of patronage which gives them a disproportionate place in the counsels of the French Church. Among the 38,000,000 of French Catholics—the largest number assembled under one flag—very many, no doubt, are indifferent (far fewer, we may note in passing, than the Protestant tourist supposes, when he computes the active forces of Catholicism by the number of men he counts at High Mass on Sunday in a French cathedral): it is a more pertinent fact that nearly all of them are Republicans—easily alarmed by the bogey of monarchical conspiracy, always jealous of ecclesiastical encroachments. Hitherto, the Jacobin has contrived so to complicate the religious question with foreign considerations that he has been able to reckon on the passivity of the great body of French Catholics. The Jacobin, an exception in the nation, but a thorough Frenchman in his dogmatism and combativeness, holds Christianity for a mischievous superstition, and looks to what he calls science for the true sanctions of Catholic morals. In his zeal he has accepted the alliance of men whose hostility to the Church has quite different foundations—Huguenots and Jews; he has trafficked with subversive sects which regard the Church as only one of the great social forces they desire to destroy, who hate the idea of a country as much as they scoff at the idea of a God; and he has used a secret and essentially undemocratic agency to spread his anti-Christian propaganda and to maintain the discipline of active unbelief. In his precipitancy, his indifference to the means, lies the hope that the French people may suddenly awake to the aims of their rulers. Already a curious result has been seen—the accession to the ranks of militant Catholics of a considerable number of intellectual

Frenchmen who do not accept the Catholic dogmas but see in the Church the great preservative of the national traditions.

To startle the lethargy of the people nothing will suffice but the sudden spectacle of its concrete and uninterrupted effects upon their ordinary way of life. It is possible that the Pope's verdict upon the *associations cultuelles* may have such an awakening for its consequence. There was never, in the uneducated part of the nation, any enthusiasm for the idea of separation: at most, there was acquiescence in a theory which seemed logical enough—a free Church in a free State: the priest no longer a functionary. But what is very certain is that no great change was contemplated by the people—least of all the spoliation or the closing of the churches, or any hindrance to the familiar ceremonies which are the landmarks of so many tranquil lives. If the mere formality of the inventories raised so great a storm all over France, because the popular imagination saw in the intervention of the authorities the symbol of a robbery, what would happen if the letter of the law were forcibly executed and the people excluded from the sacred buildings which are the pride of every village, where all the tender and religious sentiments of the humble meet? No French Government would dare to take the risk except in some very few districts where local patriotism, as well as piety, is dead. But the mere threat, it may well be, would shake off the apathy which has enabled the enemies of the Church to triumph for so long.

V

There is a disposition in some quarters to exaggerate the purely legal consequences of the *non possumus.* The Act of Disestablishment itself lays down freedom of worship as a first principle; the right of meeting is secured by statute; the penalties against persons who should lend their houses for the purposes of worship no longer exist. If, therefore, the French Episcopate should decide that it is expedient to abandon the churches voluntarily—and the contingency of forcible expulsion need not be seriously considered—nothing but a new law could hinder the organization of religious worship in buildings lent or leased by private owners. But the Law, which restores the churches (failing the establishment of the Associations) to the Communes, does not forbid the Communes to grant their use, gratuitously or at a nominal rent, to the representatives of the faithful. It seems most probable, at the date at which we write this article, that, in at least a very great number of parishes, the difficulty will provisionally be solved in this way. Public worship, protected by the common law, will thus continue, subject to the formality of giving notice of each service to the local authority—from which the Associations would have been dispensed. That the advantage would be immense goes without saying, for, among the immediate dangers which seem to threaten the Church of France in consequence of the Holy Father's decision, none perhaps is graver than the danger that, by deserting *la maison commune* and accepting in some sort the pious hospitality of the rich the French clergy may rapidly lose contact with the people and compromise the Church still further in the eyes of its enemies by a yet more intimate dependency on persons who are believed to dislike the form of government which France has chosen for herself.

SOME RECENT BOOKS

Under this heading will be noticed a limited number of books to which the Editor desires, for one reason or another, to call attention.

NO one, whatever conclusions he may have reached on the subjects handled in this *Special Introduction to the Study of the Old Testament* (Part II. *Didactic Books and Prophetical Writings*. By F. E. Gigot, D.D., Professor of Scripture in the New York Seminary, Dunwoodie. New York: Benziger Bros), will deny that knowledge of the Bible is a necessary condition in judging of its origin, texture and significance. To state the case first of all, as it appears when the whole evidence from documents and monuments has been gathered in—that is the task to which Catholic writers must set themselves. It is not so difficult now, thanks to the labour of experts and the record of them in various encyclopædias or special textbooks, as it was a few years ago. But in English we have none so full or exhaustive from a Catholic point of view as these admirable introductions, given by Professor Gigot in the shape of lectures and here made up into a printed series. The opening treatise had a cordial reception in America and other countries. We are inclined to rate its continuation more highly still. It is clear, interesting, well-shaped, exact and supplied with references by means of which the student can follow up any statement to its original sources. Almost invariably the writer, as he tells us in a short preface, refrains from dogmatizing on questions not yet defined. He is copious in quotation, but modest and dispassionate in assertion. Whether we look for the scientific or the religious temper in his learned pages, we shall find it constantly exemplified.

Since Professor Gigot does not put forward theories of his own, to select particulars is hardly needful. He certainly allows the composite origin of Psalms, Job, Proverbs; and he states the arguments for a like dealing with most of the Prophets persuasively. On the Isaianic problem, on Daniel, he writes at length (116 pages are devoted to these inquiries), and is pretty nearly complete. To his treatment of Ezekiel something might be added. He has not always noticed extreme views, such as those in which Dr Cheyne indulges almost everywhere; but we should like to hear him on the subject of Musri and Jerahmeel, à propos of the Psalms. Dogmatic problems which have to do with inspiration he leaves to the chair of divinity; in his first volume they were discussed perhaps enough for the immediate purpose of critical students. There is no attempt at picturesque or homiletic suggestion; and the minuteness of detail, without which a book of this kind would be so much waste paper, demands an attention it will reward, if the Scriptures themselves are consulted at the same time. It is not for the professor to anticipate decisions which rest with authority. Nothing in Dr Gigot's lucid summing up is affirmed *ex cathedra* save that which the Church has taught. His work, therefore, will stand, whatever be the fate of much modern criticism, for its aim is to instruct, and the information it gives cannot be neglected. W. B.

MR BODLEY is not yet within sight of his long-expected work on the Church in France, which is to form a "second series" of his well-known book entitled *France.* We learn with regret that his bad health is responsible for the delay. He gives us, meanwhile, a reprint of his two lectures on the subject at the Royal Institution (*The Church in France.* By J. E. C. Bodley. London: Constable), adding in appendices the texts of the Concordat, of the Organic Articles, of the Associations Law of 1901, and of the Separation Law of 1905.

The lectures themselves present a useful and interesting, although necessarily condensed, exposition of the Concordat of 1801—a "brief sketch of the material, social and administrative position of the Church under the Concordat"—and some account of the provisions of the Separation Law. Controversial questions are tabooed by the rules of the Royal Institution; and Mr Bodley tells us that his own "cross-bench mind" was well content with the restriction thus imposed.

It is, however, to be doubted whether any writer in such circumstances could avoid trenching, at least indirectly, on the forbidden field. And when this is done, impartiality becomes almost impossible. Despite Mr Bodley's "cross-bench mind," and his extraordinarily wide acquaintance with French ecclesiastical life, one feels that his note is that of one school—the school of the "governmental" ecclesiastics such as (to name two prelates with many points of difference) Mgr Mignot and Mgr Fuzet. Their views will be familiar to readers of some of our leading English newspapers, and they are reflected faithfully and clearly in the book before us. But they are not the views of the majority of French ecclesiastics; and the writer's personal friendship for the late Cardinal Perraud might have led us to expect that more prominence would be given to the other estimate of the situation.

In one or two instances, moreover, controversial topics are touched upon even directly. Thus (p. 43), speaking of the attitude of the Church towards the Organic Articles, Mr Bodley says that "when, under the Restoration, the clerical party was in power, the Organic Articles were left practically untouched," implying thereby, it would seem, that they were tacitly accepted. The reason surely was that they were regarded, then and previously, as a dead letter, though protests against them had not been wanting from the beginning. Again, can it be so positively asserted that there was no element of fraud in Napoleon's conduct of these negotiations? As to Napoleon's alleged desire to give no protection to the religious congregations, we know that as a matter of fact he authorized more than thirty of them between the years 1804 and 1807.

But it is in the rôle assigned by Mr Bodley to M. Waldeck-Rousseau that we feel the influence of the ecclesiastical school to which we have referred. No doubt the Associations Law was applied by M. Combes "in a manner not anticipated by its author" (p. 60). Yet it is difficult to acquit M. Waldeck-Rousseau of a desire to destroy all the Religious Orders in France. He clearly declared in the Chamber that any member of a Religious Order was *ipso facto* incapable of a civil status. Here are his words (Jan. 21, 1901):

> A member of a congregation cannot avail himself of the common rights of Frenchmen, since by his three vows of poverty, chastity and obedience he puts himself outside the pale of common rights, of the law, of society.

He may have pleaded for the *suaviter in modo*, but he was certainly committed to the *fortiter in re*. Take, for instance, a sentence from his speech of November 20, 1903, as reported in the *Journal Officiel*. We take the liberty of italicizing a specially significant phrase:

> M. Girard oublie que la loi de 1901 permet, non pas seulement de retirer l'autorisation aux congrégations enseignantes qui l'ont obtenue, mais à plus forte raison de la retirer à chacun de leurs établissements, et que par là elle permet *d'échelonner les solutions* et de ne pas entreprendre plus qu'on ne pourrait accomplir.

Such expressions may, of course, be regarded as a mere sop to Cerberus. But there are many who regard them as a capitulation to the party of disorder. C. P.

THE main theme of *Le Droit d'Enseigner* is the right of the State to educate. That right is examined historically and critically in M. Barry's *Étude Historique, Philosophique et Canonique* (Paris: Lethielleux). We are carried back to Athens, to Imperial Rome; we traverse the Middle Ages, the Renaissance and the Reformation; and, naturally, we are detained longest in France. This historical journey is stimulating though made rather in haste. The rights of the individual, of the family, of the State and of the Church to educate are next discussed; and there is an Appendix on the State monopoly of conferring degrees, a privilege which the writer would wish to see shared by the Church.

The central and chief element of the work is the discussion of the rights of the State in education. The author lays down these propositions:

> Teaching is not an essential and exclusive attribute of the State, but rather accidental and supplementary.
>
> The State has not the right to decree obligatory and gratuitous instruction for all.

The State possesses by its very nature a right, positive, proper and special, though accidental, of opening schools and teaching.

The civil authority possesses also by its very nature the right of taking cognizance of the fitness of masters, and, to that end, of prescribing in a general way to aspirants after the functions of teaching, on the score of guarantees of fitness, certain rules or preventive measures, certificates, etc., according to which it should be able to authorize worthy and capable subjects and remove the unworthy and incapable.

This last principle, it will be observed, goes beyond the axiom, "Public money, public control," if it is to be applied to private schools. *Silent leges inter arma.* Silent too is the philosophy of rights in education in the face of a huge parliamentary majority. But for lovers of the study of rights in the abstract this work will be found to have its interest.

IN *Le Clergé Rural sous l'Ancien Régime*, par Joseph Ageorges; Épilogue par Georges Goyau (Paris: Bloud), we have a little work representing much search among parochial archives, particularly in the author's native province of Berry. The period covered is from the conversion of Gaul to the first French Revolution. We see the parish gradually forming from the *vicus*, or the *oratorium;* the system of popular election; the relation of patron and vassal; the *matricula*, or corporation of the poor of the parish; the parochial guilds; and, finally, the evil arrangement of absentee rectors, taking tithes and having their churches served by half-starved perpetual curates. Even in the days of the most Christian kings the lot of the rural clergy in France must have been a hard one, a prey to poverty and litigation, and surrounded by ignorance, for it is wonderful what ignorance of religion may be found among the peasantry of a Catholic country. The golden age of the village *curé*, according to M. Ageorges, was the seventeenth century, the age of those great Christian territorial families of which Saint Jane Frances de Chantal was a representative. Yet even then, as we read in the Life of M. Olier, for a well-to-do "Abbé" to turn *curé* was a proverb of disgrace.

The Epilogue—nearly half the book—deals with the *curé* of the age immediately preceding the Revolution, and with the ideas of Rousseau, Voltaire, Diderot and Joseph II as to what a priest in the country should be and do. All four strip him of his supernatural character, and leave him the rôle of a humanitarian. Then one asks, Why a priest at all? A very different standard is held up in the person of M. de Sernin, *Modèle des Pasteurs*, a romance by Père de Clorivière.

The book, both in the Epilogue by M. Goyau, and in the historical sketch by M. Ageorges, is opportune for the present crisis in France. Incidentally it throws light on the English rural clergy. J. R.

SANCTITY is as difficult to define to the imagination as genius. In fact it is identical with it so far as it does not transcend it; but it is a great deal more than "an infinite capacity for taking pains." It lies rather in the reason for which pains are taken. From the human point of view it is hard to see anything at all in common, except humanity, between, let us say, a fisherman, a scholar, an artist and a great lady. Yet between four persons of these respective classes there may be a sufficient Least Common Multiple to justify the including of their biographies in a highly specialized series (*Les Saints*. Paris: Lecoffre. 2fr. each). Of the four saints whose lives are under review, the first (*Saint-Pierre*, by L. U. Fillion) was a Syrian of the first century; the second (*Saint-Théodore*, by Abbé Marin) a Byzantine of the ninth; the third (*Le B. Fra Giovanni Angelico de Fiesole*, by Henry Cochin) an Italian of the fifteenth; and the fourth (*La B. Varani*, *Princesse de Camerino*, by Comtesse de Rambuteau) also an Italian, of the sixteenth century. Yet the Least Common Multiple is there, and it is a quality not merely of objective creed but of subjective attitude. Perhaps we cannot better define it than as Saint Paul defines it when he tells men to live as pilgrims on earth. Saint Peter dropped his net and went to catch men; Saint Theodore died in exile; Fra Angelico painted unearthly pictures; the Princess became a Poor Clare—they all took various and definite pains and all for exactly the same reason, namely, that they recognized their divine birthright and tried to live up to it. This, after all, is the only difference between saints and other people; but it is a very considerable difference, and will continue to be so even beyond the end of time. The Countess de Rambuteau must be congratulated on the way she has done her work; but as for M. Joly and his colleagues, they must be long ago tired of congratulations. B.

PAULINE Marie Jaricot lived a wonderful life through two-thirds of the last century. She founded the "Association for the Propagation of the Faith" as well as the "Living Rosary," and suffered the usual misrepresentations and suspicions that appear always to accompany pioneer work of every description. There is a very touching picture, at the beginning of M. Maurin's Life (translated by E. Sheppard. Art and Book Company. 5s. net), of the devout old lady's old age; and the book is prefaced by a congratulatory letter to the author from Leo XIII. This is a very French book, and the heroine shares the same character. But the little speeches, gestures and cries make the Life none the less interesting. B.

FATHER Magnier's *Life, Virtues and Miracles of St Gerard Majella* (Second edition. St Louis: B. Herder) is a nicely composed biography of the extraordinary Redemptorist lay-brother lately canonized by Pius X. The simplicity of the story is an excellent setting for the simplicity of the hero who took miracles as a matter of course, tapped upon the Tabernacle door with a message to the "Prisoner of Love," and let down an image of the Holy Child into a well to recover a key which he had dropped into the water. It is hard in modern England, where the Law is better recognized than the Lawgiver, to represent this kind of action as anything but exotic, but perhaps the action is none the worse for that; the blue gentian is a creature of God, even though it does not flourish in English lanes. Curiously enough, however, the United States of America seem to contain many clients of St Gerard Majella at the present day, in spite of the fact that the wonderful child—for he was no more, or no less, than a child even when he died in his thirtieth year—had all the characteristic Neapolitan fervour and simplicity, and went to his reward a hundred and fifty years ago. It is also strange—and at the same time not at all strange—that one who was not a priest like the Curé d'Ars should possess the power, which that great spiritual physician also possessed, of reading the hearts of those who had made bad confessions and of encouraging them to repair their sacrilege. One other charming incident may also be quoted here. A great lady sent her servant to the monastery to ask for Brother Gerard, and the porter who opened the door, when he heard the message, exclaimed that he could not understand how people always wanted to see such a thick-headed fool. The great lady, of course, at once guessed rightly that the porter must be none other than Brother Gerard himself. B.

IT would be a great pleasure to watch the expression of a certain kind of Englishman engaged in reading these two volumes of sermons delivered to the Stonyhurst boys (*At the Parting of the Ways. In the Morning of Life.* Second edition. By Herbert Lucas, S.J. Sands and Co. 3s. 6d. net). Anything less " Jesuitical " cannot be imagined. They are extremely like the best kind of sermons preached in the English public schools, and a great deal better, since, among other advantages, they have the Catholic faith behind them. They are instructive, not didactic; inspiring, not hysterical; skilful, not ingenious; and, above all, they are humorous and human. The boy who said of life generally, " Father, I don't know how it is, but I'm sick of the whole show " (to whom, by the way, it was pointed out that he was only looking at a side-show); and the boy who had as much vocation for the priesthood as an average man for " playing a galop on the xylophone "—these are most human. But there is much more than human nature in these books; there is a ladder whose head is riveted in heaven, and whose foot is equally secure on earth; and that, after all, is the ideal of school-sermons. Boys are neither saints nor devils, but boys, with a passion for climbing. B.

THE many who read *The Dream and the Business* (T. Fisher Unwin. 6s.) will necessarily have at this moment more consciousness of the author's personality, more of the haunting sense of mortality and loss, than is suitable for a calm literary survey. It is almost a shock to be caught at once in the current of a brilliant conversation about life and men and women, when the author's voice, with its many varied tones, light, mocking and tender, has only just been hushed.

Although it deepens the pathos, it is a real satisfaction to the admirers of John Oliver Hobbes that this book should be undoubtedly one of her best, if not the best, she ever wrote. It not only gives conversation at its very best, such talk as betrays yet conceals the thoughts of the heart, but it is also less elusive and far deeper than most of Mrs Craigie's works. It is less afraid of the simplicity that can never be attained by the dweller in the city of modern social life. It strikes often as far down as the bed-rock of human nature. In the Nonconformists of *The Dream and the Business* John Oliver Hobbes has penetrated more deeply than before into a vein of vigorous, stubborn national life, and in so doing she has found it possible to draw her characters more clearly, more squarely. Strangely enough from the background of the Nonconformist Firmaldens and their surroundings there stands out a little figure vibrating with delicate life, a much more convincing personality than the heroine of *The School for Saints* and of *Robert Orange.* Tessa is a member of an old Catholic family and the wife of Lord Marlesford, whom she has converted to the faith. Both Sophy Firmalden, the stern Minister's beautiful and intellectual daughter, and the ethereal, wilful Lady Marlesford, fall under the spell of Lessard, the triumphant and curiously handsome tenor. He is described as "a rebel from the beginning," whose "egoism was his supreme failing and also his main charm." He was "a man to whom the very notion of control was abhorrent; who hated feasts no less than fasts, if they were of command; who had but to hear of a law to challenge it; who had but to bow to a superior to detest his rule."

> "Why is it my fate [asked Lessard] to love fanatical religious women? First a strong Puritan, now this wayward Catholic; and both of them mad on the subject of virtue in its maddest form."

To them both Lessard offered the *Dream* of love, and both rejected it; but to one of them the victory was fatal.

With all its vigour, its vitality, its occasional artificiality, its too brilliant, too easy epigram, its cosmopolitan temper, its exquisite tenderness, its slightly metallic laughter, there is a deep note of world-weariness underlying *The Dream and the Business.*

"Women of my type [writes the dying woman in the Epilogue] who are not strong enough physically to bear the strain of moral suffering, very soon, and gladly, flicker out. . . . Although we may have the courage to face hard things and the faith that can accept hard sayings, God mercifully allows us to die early in the fight. Do not you doubt that I have made a good little fight."

Finally, the book concludes with words that seem to come straight from John Oliver Hobbes herself as a fitting farewell after the "good little fight" of a brave life had been concluded:

"For the rest [wrote Jim Firmalden to Lessard], you know my creed:

> Poor vaunt of life indeed
> Were man but formed to feed
> On joy, to solely seek and find and feast;
> Such feasting ended, then
> As sure an end to men.

Suffering can never be suppressed by statute. It is a law of nature, but, as all other laws of nature, since it must be obeyed, let us at least submit as sons of God and co-heirs with Christ—not as beasts of burden and as those who believe that all labour is in vain."

S.

NOT least among the services rendered to literature by Father Robert Hugh Benson are his contributions to the historical romance of the sixteenth century. The historical sense is not greatly developed in the English people; and, if they must assimilate some portion of the records of their past, they generally prefer to swallow it in the form of a gilded pill. Poets and novelists therefore have chances of acceptance which are denied to chroniclers of the dry bones of history, who are moreover often obliged to stop short in the midst of a thrilling episode, baulked of authoritative material for carrying on a story to its completion, while the weaver of romance may draw upon his imagination, and tell a fascinating tale that beguiles the reader and captures his judgement. If he has a rich and flowing vein of fancy, he may repeople for us with amazing elaboration a long vanished world, but it behoves him not to violate the truth of history in its largest sense. Father Benson has an eye for minute detail; his descriptions remind us of old Flemish pictures, and when he paints a street crowd or a court ceremony we not only see the fashion and colour of the clothes worn, but we almost hear the voices, strident or subdued, weak or incisive. He has given us a Henry VIII whom we know, since the portrait agrees in its main outline with what history deponeth of him; and there is nothing in his presentment of Elizabeth that does not awaken some echo of her known life and conduct. For when he has said all, there is still a mass of material behind to corroborate and even to surpass what he has shown us of her cleverness, her brilliancy, her subtlety, her absence of all moral sense, her duplicity, her shiftiness.

In *The Queen's Tragedy* he had a magnificent opportunity of telling the story of Mary Tudor, who has suffered from misrepresentation more than any other historical personage. It was the policy of all those who wished to curry favour with her successor to malign Mary, and the effect of the calumnies they heaped upon her memory has not passed with the passing ages. Again and again her character has been vindicated, but to the multitude to-day she is still "Bloody Mary," and with disappointment we are compelled to admit that in this his latest romance Father Benson has done little to make her better known.

Let us see how his imaginary being agrees with what contemporary writers of unquestionable veracity have put on record. For instance, the author of *The Queen's Tragedy* represents her as being "no scholar," as needing a guide in reading the Breviary. In another place he says, "It was Latin, but she understood here and there." All the children of Henry VIII were not only well educated but what in these days we should call learned. Of Mary it is recorded by Ludovicus Vivès that she delighted at a very early age in the Epistles of St Jerome, in the Dialogues of Plato, in the works of Seneca, Cicero, Plutarch, St Ambrose, St Augustine. When she was twelve years old, Lord Morley declared that she was "so rype in the Laten tongue that rathe doth happen to the women sex"; that she not only perfectly read, wrote and construed Latin, but could translate any hard thing out of Latin into English. Savagnano, who came to England when Mary was about fifteen, reports her as being "well grounded in Greek," to have spoken Spanish, French and Latin "besides her own mother English tongue," to have sung excellently, and to have played on several instruments. Her translation of the Paraphrases of Erasmus at a much later date was praised by Udal. Giovanni Michiel, towards the end of her life, speaks of "the facility and quickness of her understanding," adding that her replies in Latin and her very intelligent remarks in that tongue surprised every one. "She displays," he says, "a wonderful grandeur and dignity." John Heywood, the wit and epigrammatist, mentions her "highly cultivated intelligence" and her love of innocent fun. His pleasantries amused her even when she was on her death-bed.

As for her ill-fated marriage, Father Benson allows it to pass for "a ludicrous affair enough" in the eyes of her enemies.

> Jane had watched from her side a passion that grew day by day hotter and more fierce, as imagination and hope and religious fervour and desire for love wrought their effect on a lonely soul. She had seen a woman cut off from the world by ramparts, first of suffering, then of high rank, and, lastly, of unlovability, stretching out thin hands more passionately every day as the hot fire raged within her, crying out to the fancy that her own mind had wrought on the clouds, to come down and be incarnated and take her to himself, and compensate her for the long years of isolation.

Although we do not mean to imply that this view which Father Benson has put into the mouth of one of his *dramatis personæ*, who represents the element at her court unfavourable to Mary, is his own, let us ask, what are the facts? Mary herself, in her noble speech to the citizens of London at the Guildhall, given by her arch-enemy Foxe "as near out of her own mouth as it could be penned," said:

> As concerning the marriage, ye shall understand that I enterprised not the doing thereof without advice, and that by the advice of all our Privy Council, who so considered and weighed the great commodities that might ensue thereof, that they not only thought it very honourable, but also expedient both for the wealth of the realm, and also of you our subjects. And as touching myself, I assure you, I am not so bent to my will, neither so precise nor affectionate, that either for mine own pleasure I would choose [a husband] where I lust, or that I am so desirous as needs I would have one. For God, I thank Him, to Whom be the praise therefor, I have hitherto lived a virgin, and doubt nothing but with God's grace I am able so to live still. But if, as my progenitors have done before me, it may please God that I might leave some fruit of my body behind me to be your governor, I trust you would not only rejoice thereat, but also I know it would be to your great comfort. And certainly, if I either did think or know that this marriage were to the hurt of any of you, my Commons, or to the impeachment of any part or parcel of the royal state of this realm of England, I would never consent thereunto, neither would I ever marry while I lived. And on the word of a queen I promise you that if it shall not probably appear to all the Nobility and Commons in the high court of Parliament, that this marriage shall be for the high benefit and commodity of the whole realm, then will I abstain from marriage while I live.

Mary's assertion that she had resolved to contract a marriage with Philip of Spain for the good of the realm was no idle pretence. Spain was the richest and most powerful nation in Europe, not so much by reason of the political importance of the mother-country, although its close connexion with the empire added not a little to its prestige, but on account of its extensive colonies and the almost fabulous wealth which they represented. England on the other hand was little; the day of her greatness had not yet dawned, and the country, with the exception of London, was poor. An alliance, moreover, between a Tudor sovereign and a reigning member of the House of Hapsburg could not but add in itself to the aggrandizement of England. If in the event the marriage was disastrous to the land she loved so well and formed but another thorn in Mary's crown of sorrows, it should not be forgotten that it was in a great measure contracted in the forlorn hope of saving the country from the further effects of heresy and schism.

It must not, however, be supposed that *The Queen's Tragedy* is all unfavourable to Mary. As the end approaches, the truth will out concerning her earnest, right intentions, her resignation, her childlike, humble faith. The tenderness with which Father Benson depicts the gentle wanderings of her mind and her struggle to collect her thoughts for the last solemn moment only falls short of the real scene described for us by an eyewitness, in which it is evident that she held her soul strongly in her own grasp until she delivered it up to Him who had ever been in spite of human weakness the beginning and end of all her desires.

J. M. S.

M. L'ABBÉ TURMEL has contributed much of late years towards a better acquaintance on the part of French readers with patristic and medieval theology. It is a good sign that his book *Saint-Jérôme* (Paris: Bloud) has reached a second edition. The series to which it belongs is called "La Pensée Chrétienne—Textes et Études"; and its purport is to give by means of quotation, with interwoven commentary, the actual words employed by our great early teachers. To this end St Jerome is well adapted and easy to follow. The sketch of his life occupies no more than thirty pages, but is accurate and sufficient. His views on Scripture, its translation, exegesis and inspired character will be found by no means antiquated. Other points of importance meet us in the letters to St Augustine, the disputes about Origen, the attitude of St Jerome towards the Papacy, the clergy and the monks. His eschatology deserves particular notice. But M. Turmel does not set himself to examine the literary or critical value of the Saint's writings; he is concerned with him only as a director of souls, an exponent of the Bible and a theologian. Under these aspects we are given a volume which laymen as well as priests may study with advantage. W. B.

Some Recent Books

THE remarkable series of philosophical works, commencing with the publication of the *Philosophia Naturalis* by T. Pesch in 1883, and ending with the second part of Meyer's *Institutiones Juris Naturalis* in 1900, is a monument of labour and learning of which the Society of Jesus may justly be proud. The *Institutiones Juris Naturalis* (*Pars* 1. *Jus Naturæ generale continens Ethicam generalem et jus sociale in genere.* Freiburg: Herder. 12.50 fr.), is the first to reach a second edition. The volume was briefly noticed in the DUBLIN of April, 1886, on the appearance of the first edition. The present edition is described as *emendata*, which means that in addition to the removal of a few clerical errors we have now better paper, better type, a more advanced typography (shown particularly in the sparing use of capitals in the text and of stops in the references), a more approved spelling of certain words (such as *condicio*, *cotidie*, *intellego*), a slight increase of references in the foot-notes, a few historical enlargements in the body of the work—among which may be mentioned two prominent paragraphs, 241b, 567a—on the importance of the "lex æterna," and on the deficiencies of the school of jurists who impugn the existence of what is called natural law, their contention being that all right and obligation is derived from the positive enactments of States and legislators. No thoughtful person will blame the writer for not increasing the bulk of his volume by discussions of the various ethical eccentricities or varieties which have made their appearance during the course of the last twenty years. Nothing is to be gained by such repetitions in a doctrinal treatise. The book as published in 1885 covered the ground of general ethics up to that date. With true sagacity Father Meyer had made a capital point of the existence of the eternal law above and behind the positive laws of God and man; he had insisted on this in its various connexions; he had written at length and with care on the new historical school of jurisprudence, which since the time of writing has still further extended; he had laid down firmly the highest principles which should govern the action of the State with regard to its individual members; he had sufficiently discussed hedonism, utilitarianism and above all the theory of independent morality. These deep and far-reaching inquiries are still the problems of the hour, and in no other of our recent writings are they treated with such fullness, accuracy, insight and historical alertness as in the volume here noticed.

The only point of criticism here offered is that, seeing the progress which has been made of late in ethnological studies, one could have wished that some more distinct reference had been made to them at certain stages in the treatment.

H. P.

AT a time when the scholastic handbook has fallen under the obloquy of the critic, it may be advisable to inform the reader that the title *Abrégé* must not be allowed to divert his attention from the latest contribution to the literature of philosophy (*Abrégé de Métaphysique: Étude historique et critique des Doctrines de la Métaphysique Scolastique d'après les Enseignements des principaux Docteurs*. Vol. i, pp. 301; ii, pp. 235. Paris: Lethielleux. 1906) by M. le Comte Domet de Vorges, one of the best known of Catholic laymen on the orthodox side of philosophy. The two volumes may fairly be styled an abridgement when compared with the two thick quartos of Suarez whose order is adopted; but they can scarcely be classed as a manual if compared with the ordinary textbooks on the same subject. The work was first written some twenty years ago as a study in philosophy under the guidance of Suarez. The student in course of time has become refractory. The *Eximius Doctor* is mentioned on almost every page, but not unfrequently as the object of friendly criticism.

The style is clear, and the writer moves with perfect freedom among the sometimes bewildering complexity of metaphysical opinions. He is master of the art of seizing what is really pertinent to his inquiry amid a maze of ideas and problems, and of arranging the different or diverging views in due perspective. The historical aspect of each question is considered, and familiar problems assume a new character under the light thus shed upon them. Possibly no reader will be prepared to endorse all the views adopted by M. le Comte; he himself would be the last to expect or even desire such agreement. This, however, will remain outside the possibility of discussion, that the book points out impressively though implicitly the direction in which our methods and choice of materials may be improved. We are content to go on year after year with a confessedly unsatisfactory classification of the Categories. Then there is the celebrated fourfold division of Quality, with its surprises and its quite unnecessary mysteries. This ancient and troublesome division receives short shrift at the hands of our author. He discards the impertinent *immobilis* in the definition of Place; he reconstructs and rebaptizes that unfortunate derelict Habit, the tenth Predicament. In fact, the boldness with which some of these time-honoured lay-figures are handled is truly exhilarating. The Categories of Quantity and Quality are especially well treated. The exposition of Matter is attractive. Certain views are held which one rarely meets with in the same mind, such as the real distinction between essence and existence, the real distinction between relation and its foundation, the impossibility of a vacuum, the negation of potential parts in the continuum. But these apparent peculiarities will but serve to quicken the interest of the reader.

The tendency of the book is towards reality, as against the introduction into metaphysics of merely logical devices; it is an appeal to the natural reason of the thoughtful man, as against the harassing misinterpretation of Aristotle. The book is one to set people thinking. H. P.

THE six "Westminster Lectures" of the second series (edited by the Rev. F. Aveling, D.D. Sands and Co. 6d. each) maintain, if they do not surpass, the high standard of excellence and utility reached by the former series, both with regard to the choice of subjects to be dealt with, and the selection of lecturers to deal with them.

However much irreligious tyros in biology and the cognate sciences may scoff and jeer, it is consoling to find that eminent professors not merely see nothing adverse to our religious convictions of "soul" or "principle of life" in these branches of science, but even postulate that principle as the only possible explanation of the phenomena of life. Among these eminent professors Dr Windle claims a high place, and his lecture, *The Secret of the Cell*, will stiffen the back of the religious-minded student, and check the effrontery of his irreligious opponent.

Dr Aveling's lecture, *Science and Faith*, deals with the method rather than with the subject-matter of scientist and theologian. He establishes three important points, namely, that science, which professedly treats of phenomena that fall under the observation of the senses, is utterly incompetent to reach the underlying reality; that the scientist, inured to this practice of sense-observation, is peculiarly unfitted for the task of building up a system of philosophy; and, finally, that consequences disastrous not only to faith but to all knowledge have ever attended the scientist when he has attempted to extend his empirical conclusions beyond their purely empirical sphere.

A layman and a physician, Dr G. W. Marsh, delivered the lecture on *Miracles*. The lecturer is deserving of the highest praise for his able defence of the Catholic attitude towards that important subject. An unbiased perusal of the pamphlet will convince anyone. It consists of a clear unfolding and vindication of St Thomas Aquinas's definition of a miracle, and of a division of miracles into three classes, with apt illustrations of each class, namely, those universally impossible to nature; those impossible in a particular case; and those impossible to nature in the manner in which they occurred. Next follows a disquisition on the character of the evidence required to establish a miracle; and finally, an interesting narrative of two modern miracles which are well able to bear the test of the canons of authenticity laid down in the foregoing part of the lecture.

A very complex, difficult and burning problem is treated in clear and masterly fashion by Father A. B. Sharpe in another "Westminster Lecture," *Evil, its Nature and Cause*. Father Sharpe aims at showing not only how inadequate are all non-theistic hypotheses in this great question, but how impossible those very hypotheses are seen to be in the light of it. On the other hand, assuming the existence of God and human free will, he is able, after a true exposition of the nature of evil, to give a sufficiently complete answer to the two root questions: How can God, being infinitely good, permit evil? Why has He done so? Those who heard this lecture, and those who shall hereafter read it, will be grateful to the lecturer for the removal of many of the anxious soul-searchings that have been occasioned by the contemplation of the mental suffering, of the moral wrong-doing and injustice, which abound in this world.

So clearly does Father J. Rickaby, S.J., define his position—allowing full scope for the moderate Biblical critic, taking his stand behind the shield of "the living witness borne by the universal Church at this hour to Christ as God"—that he is able to compel undivided attention to the intrinsic value of the scriptural and patristic arguments which he adduces in his "Westminster Lecture," *The Divinity of Christ*. "It amazes me," he urges, "to be told in the name of criticism that in the Synoptics there is no evidence for the Divinity of Christ." The lecturer undoubtedly justifies his amazement by the evidence for this truth that he brings forward from the Synoptics, confirmed as it is by the testimony of St John and by the interpretations of the Fathers of the Church.

There are many statements in *The Higher Criticism* ("Westminster Lecture," by the Rev. William Barry, D.D.) which will astonish equally the Catholic reader, hitherto untutored in modern advanced Biblical studies, and the non-Catholic with his preconceived ideas of Catholic narrowness and rigid conservatism. The fears of the former will be speedily succeeded by a deep sense of religious joy when he realizes, as the lecturer proceeds, how securely the Church is passing through yet another conflict; while the latter, beginning in wonder, will

> In wonder end and admiration fill
> The interspace,

when he, too, realizes that the "Church of Rome" stands invincible still in the face of a foe that gravely menaces the very foundations of the different sections of Protestantism.

E. G.

New Testament Greek

"THE most interesting dictionary I have ever perused," is an expression attributed to H. T. Buckle. A less omnivorous reader may say that the most amusing and lively grammar he has ever perused is Dr J. H. Moulton's *Grammar of N. T. Greek*. (Vol. I. *Prolegomena*. T. and T. Clark. 1906.) Dr Moulton shares with Dr J. R. Harris among New Testament scholars a certain irrepressible gaiety which from time to time relieves the dreariness of optatives and aorists, or stichometries and Syriac fragments, as the case may be. Dr Moulton's *Prolegomena* are not only amusing, but, to anyone who cares for the New Testament text, extremely interesting reading. The second volume is to contain the actual grammar, based upon Winer, as re-written by Dr Moulton's father. This first instalment gives an introduction to the "Common" Greek, a few notes on accidence and orthography, and then six chapters on syntax. The excellent quality of the writer's work leads us to expect high things of the next volume, which is to supersede not merely Winer-Moulton but also Winer-Schmiedel and Blass. To the latter a high tribute is more than once paid. "Blass comes as near to an Athenian *revenant* as any modern could hope to be." The words about Schmiedel shall be quoted, because they are so characteristic:

> Professor Schmiedel has unfortunately been called away from Grammar by the *b'ne Jerahmeel* to perform a post-mortem examination upon the Gospel history. The unrivalled ability of his dissection is beyond question. But as there is reason to believe that the Gospels may still be studied for some time to come, we will venture to express an earnest hope that the learned and painstaking grammarian may soon resume his place among the interpreters, and conclude the monumental work which keeps Winer's memory green in the country of his birth (p. xii).

Needless to explain that the novelty in this Grammar is that it is based upon the study of the papyri rather than of the classics. The groundwork of it all is naturally found in Deissmann's *Bible Studies*, but Dr Moulton has searched the papyri on his own account, and has utilized other works and articles and papers and transactions, and has systematized the whole with great clearness. The inscriptions have been to some extent utilized. Professor Thumb of Marbury has assisted. Survivals in modern Greek have been brought to bear on the history of the spoken language. Possibly yet more will be done in this line some day. Patristic Greek might be further studied. The result of modern studies of papyrus Greek has wholly revolutionized our ideas of the history of the "common" language, but it may be questioned whether it has revolutionized the actual interpretation of the New Testament. Many, indeed most, of the so-called Semitisms, Hebraisms, Aramaisms, have disappeared, though some still remain. But the translations remain the same, and the new light from the rubbish heaps of Oxyrhynchus rarely suggests a new meaning, though it often strengthens one of two alternative renderings.

Dr Moulton seems rather inclined to exaggerate certain peculiarities in the use of tenses, and one is sorry to notice the survival of some Cambridge heresies as to the rendering of aorists. The defence (p. 136, note) of the Revisers' translation of John xvij is saddening, for it is a translation which is bad English and does not represent the Greek. Anyone who relates his day's experiences in English, and then repeats them in French, if he is at home in both languages, will know that there is no shade of difference in meaning, not even any change of point of view, when he alters the aorist tenses, which our language demands, into *passé indéfini* (= perfect), which is unavoidable in French. The genius of the Greek language obliged St John to use aorists in his seventeenth chapter; and the genius of the English language obliges us to translate them by perfects. But that the perfect is really nearer to the sense intended by the writer is apparent from the καὶ νῦν in verse 5.

It is possible that the effects of this study of the new finds may be greater in textual criticism than in exegesis. It has already confirmed the orthography of the great uncials against the Byzantine tradition. It will be especially important to study *Codex Bezæ* and the Western witnesses from the new standpoint.

But the Higher Criticism may also gain some arguments. For instance, on p. 40, the fact that St John uses ἐμός where the other New Testament writers use μου is used to connect the Fourth Gospel with Asia Minor, since ἐμός and the like still survive in modern Cappadocian-Pontic Greek; whereas St Luke, who hardly ever uses ἐμός, should come from Macedonia (as Ramsay thinks) or from some other country outside Asia Minor. On the other hand, on p. 211 we are told that St John's fondness for ἵνα is an anticipation of Modern Greek, *except* in Cappadocian-Pontic Greek! So here we have conflicting evidence. But Dr Moulton is a pioneer, and a very able and conscientious one; and final results are anyhow not to be looked for in a volume of *Prolegomena*.

C.

WE are glad to welcome the third and fourth volumes of Father Horace Mann's learned and useful *Lives of the Popes in the Early Middle Ages* (Kegan Paul. 1906). The third volume begins with the accession of Leo III (795), and ends with the death of Benedict III (858). The subject is roughly the relations of the Carolingian Empire with the Papacy. Under Leo III, Father Mann carefully and convincingly defines the relations of the Papal Monarchy with the overlordship of the new Empire, and his deduction from the full evidence he supplies is of great importance. The later phases of the iconoclastic controversies also come within the limits of this volume, including the Western difficulties (such as the Carolingian books and the anti-papal decision of the Paris doctors), and the Eastern crisis in which the monks, led by St Theodore the Studite, were the protagonists. The fourth volume deals with a yet more interesting period, and gives the lives of three really great Popes, Nicholas I, Hadrian II and John VIII. The history of Photius, with its plain proofs of the full admission by Byzantines of Roman prerogatives, is well given. Hincmar of Rheims is another notable figure. On John VIII, Father Mann mainly follows the brilliant and fascinating study by Père Lapôtre, and vindicates the good character of that remarkable Pontiff. The volume closes with Stephen VI (*d.* 891); and the next instalment will bring Pope Formosus on the scene, and carry us into the dismal tragedies of the tenth century. It must be admitted that the writer's style is sometimes tedious; but this mainly arises from his virtues of carefulness and moderation. The period is one which has been much neglected, and we hope Father Mann's solid and valuable labours will lead many to plunge into its intricate mazes, for it is a time of first-rate importance for the understanding of the later Middle Ages. C.

WHEN the late Father Heinrich Denifle, O.P., was cut off by death last summer on his way to Cambridge, where he was to have received a well deserved honour, his monumental work on Luther was still unfinished. He had already published a second and revised edition of the first part of the first volume. And in addition to this he had issued a pamphlet in reply to his two foremost critics, Harnack and Seeberg, and had moreover completed the valuable supplementary volume on the medieval interpretations of Romans i, 17. On Denifle's death the task of carrying on the work was entrusted to his brother in religion, Father Albert Maria Weiss, O.P., the well-known apologist, who has just issued the concluding portion of the revised first volume, *Luther und Luthertum in der ersten Entwickelung* (Von P. Heinrich Denifle, O.P. Zweite Auflage, ergänzt von P. Albert Maria Weiss, O.P. Erster Band. Mainz: Kirchheim). In addition to this, Father Weiss has published as a second supplementary volume a critical study of Denifle's work under the title, *Lutherpsychologie als Schlüssel zur Lutherlegende* (Ergänzungsband II zu Denifles Luther und Luthertum. Mainz: Kirchheim). As Father Weiss says very truly, the task laid upon him was one of peculiar difficulty. Even in the most favourable circumstances the editor and continuator has a somewhat thankless office. But in the present case there was much that added to the difficulties of the situation. Denifle's vigorous attack on Luther had naturally aroused the resentment of zealous Protestant theologians; and the author, as we have seen, had already been compelled to cross swords with some of the leading critical scholars of modern Germany. At the same time the book, in spite of its undoubted merit, was regarded with some misgiving by certain Catholic critics.

Father Denifle's Luther

To some, maybe, it seemed that learned labour would be better bestowed in meeting the difficulties of our own day than in rekindling the fires of this old controversy. Others, again, while recognizing the real importance of Denifle's book, were disposed to think that he had given a somewhat one-sided picture of the Saxon Reformer and that the criticism would have gained in persuasive power if the writer could have been induced to temper justice with mercy and moderate the singular severity of his censure. It is a satisfaction to find that this view of the matter is to some extent corroborated by the judgement of Denifle's new editor. At any rate it is clear that Father Weiss is sensible of the difficulty felt by many of Denifle's readers, and it may be hoped that the modifications he has been able to make in the text, as well as the explanations given in his critical dissertation, will do something to lessen if they do not wholly remove these objections.

It is no disparagement to the great powers of the original author if we say that his last work is likely to gain by the fate which has submitted it to the impartial revision of a judicious editor. It must not be thought that in this process of amendment Father Weiss makes any concessions to the disadvantage of his author. It is true that on some points he endeavours to moderate the vigour of his language, and in more than one place he is able to suggest a more favourable interpretation of Luther's conduct: for instance, where he points out that it is not necessary to suppose that the misrepresentation of Catholic doctrine is the result of conscious dishonesty and wilful falsification. Yet in the main he fully maintains Dr Denifle's damaging indictment of Luther and his system; and in some pages which strike an interesting personal note he gives us the true key to the exceeding severity of Denifle's censure. It seems that this was partly due to the impetuosity of his native Tyrolese spirit, partly to the fact that he was comparatively new to the field of polemical theology, and Luther's misrepresentation of the Catholic system fired him with a generous indignation. We are disposed to think that Denifle's estimate of Luther and

Lutheranism is a matter of comparatively minor interest. If all that he has to say on this subject were eliminated from his pages, his book would still remain one of the most remarkable recent contributions to historical and theological literature. Whatever may be our judgement on Luther's character, there can be no question that, whether through malice or ignorance, he gravely misrepresented Catholic doctrine and medieval theology, and his mistaken views on these matters have been widely accepted by later generations. The real merit of Denifle's work lies in his masterly presentment of the true facts. His estimate of Luther may be too one-sided; but his vindication of medieval Catholicism is unassailable. W. H. K.

OBJECTION might be urged on literary grounds against the addition, even to the weakest books, of prefaces by distinguished men of letters, and on national grounds when the distinguished men of letters are also responsible Ministers of State. Yet it is sufficiently appropriate that *Science in Public Affairs* (Edited by the Rev. J. E. Hand. George Allen. 5s. net) should have a preface by Mr R. B. Haldane, though his immediate business be war and the science of war. In his short preface the Secretary for War makes one welcome allusion to his own task, for he speaks of "the separation of command and organization in war from supply and administrative details, and the resulting establishment of the general staff" as one illustration of "the great lesson of the new era on which we are entering."

Welcome, too, is Mr Haldane's recognition that "'Educate, educate, educate' is the cry on all sides"; and, in view of Mr M. E. Sadler's very remarkable contribution on "Science in National Education," his avowal is "wholly in accord with the spirit which pervades the book, and with the ideas which it seeks to set forth." Yet when we turn to Mr Sadler's essay, with its powerful plea that in a national system of education there should be given free scope to individual conviction, we perforce remember "the Bill of the Session" of 1906. The English attitude towards State education is wittily described as "hesitancy hampered by an inheritance of half-measures." Of elementary schools the writer holds that

The success of the best schools in encouraging corporate spirit could be reproduced in all. The old idea that the public elementary schools are for the poor only has lost much of its power but still works mischief to the unity of our social life. The quickest way to eradicate it is to make the public elementary schools so good that parents who have their children's welfare at heart will want to send them there.

Among the things which Mr Sadler considers most necessary for English education are, besides free scope for individual conviction, good teachers (to be secured at all costs), more attention to physical training and well-being, more cultivation of the mother tongue and the love of letters, more effort to induce the habit of exact thinking, the encouragement of experiments in teaching methods, and, in all schools, public and private, the fostering of the national spirit.

Of the other essays the most helpful seem to us to be Mrs S. A. Barnett's on "Science and City Suburbs" and Mr C. M. Douglas's on "Science and Administration." If none of the other essays quite reaches the standard of distinction which Mr Sadler's maintains throughout, none fall conspicuously below it. It is a good practical book. R. B.

THE *Funeral Sermon on Sir John Thompson* (Halifax: Meagher. 25 cents) is a good example of the dignified eloquence of the recently deceased Archbishop of Halifax. The subject of this panegyric was received into the Catholic Church as a young man; his career as a lawyer and as a statesman was exceptionally brilliant, and his sudden death during a visit to his sovereign at Windsor Castle in 1895 came as a shock to the whole empire.

> How faithful he was [writes the Archbishop] to the practices of devotion which he deemed profitable to his soul can be gathered in an unmistakable manner from what was found on him after death. Amongst other things were a small picture of his Saviour, a crucifix and a set of rosary beads. . . He had gone to Windsor Castle at the command of his earthly sovereign; whilst bending his knee to her and swearing fealty to her throne with a heart filled with the spirit of true loyalty, he wore pressed to that same heart the image of the heavenly King, both as a reminder of the homage which he owed Him and as a consecration of the service of his soul to the eternal King.

BOOKS RECEIVED

¶ *Notice under this heading does not preclude fuller treatment in the next number of the* REVIEW.

¶ *The Editor intends in future to apply to Publishers for a copy of any book which he proposes to have reviewed.*

Questions d'Histoire et d'Archéologie Chrétienne. Par M. Jean Victor Guiraud, Professeur à l'Université de Besançon. Paris: Lecoffre. 3.50fr.

[Two of this author's previous works were "crowned" by the French Academy, one on the origins of the Renaissance and the other on St Dominic. The essays in this volume deal with the repression of heresy in medieval times, the morality of the Albigenses, the *consolamentum* or initiation of the Cathari, the arrival of St Peter at Rome, the question of St Dominic's alleged imitation of St Francis in the matter of poverty, and the life of Jean-Baptiste de Rossi.]

Geschichte der Deutschen National Kirche in Rom: S. Maria dell' Anima. Von Dr Theol. et Hist. Joseph Schmidlin. With 30 illustrations. Freiburg: Herder.

The Church and the Barbarians: Being an Outline of the History of the Church from A.D. 461 to A.D. 1003. By the Rev. William Holden Hutton, B.D. Rivingtons.

In Quest of Truth. Glimpses of Roman Scenes during the Reign of the Emperor Domitian. By Robert Muenchgesang. Freiburg: Herder.

Wayside Sketches in Ecclesiastical History. Nine Lectures, with Notes and Preface. By Charles Bigg, D.D. Longmans. 7s. 6d. net.

The Life of Christ. By Mgr É. le Camus, Bishop of La Rochelle, France. Translated by William A. Hickey, Priest of the Diocese of Springfield. Vol. I. New York: The Cathedral Library Association. 1.50$.

Justins des Märtyrers Lehre von Jesus Christus dem Messias und dem Menschengewordenen Sohne Gottes. Eine Dogmengeschichtliche Monographie. Von Alfred Leonhard Feder, S.J. Freiburg: Herder. 8m.

Books Received

Die Reise des Cardinals Luigi D'Aragona, 1517-1578. Beschrieben von Antonio de Beatis. Erläutet von Ludwig Pastor. Freiburg: Herder. 3.50m.

Tacitus and other Roman Studies. By Gaston Boissier. Translated by W. G. Hutchison. Constable. 6s. net.

Some Literary Eccentrics. By John Fyvie. With ten illustrations. Constable. 12s. 6d. net.

La Mère de Belloy et la Visitation de Rouen, 1746-1807. Une Page d'Histoire Religieuse pendant la Révolution. Par René de Chauvigny. Avec une Introduction par Son Éminence le Cardinal Perraud, Évêque d'Autun, de l'Académie Française. Paris: Plon. 3.50fr.

Shakespeare and the Supernatural. A Brief Study of Folklore, Superstition and Witchcraft in "Macbeth," "Midsummer Night's Dream" and "The Tempest." By Margaret Lucy. With a Bibliography of the Subject by William Jaggard. Liverpool: Jaggard and Co. 2s. net.

Mon Ambassade en Allemagne, 1872-1873. Vicomte de Gontaut-Biron. Paris: Plon. 7.50fr.

Empires and Emperors of Russia, China, Korea and Japan. Notes and Recollections by Monsignor Count Vay de Vaya and Luskod. With illustrations. John Murray. 15s. net.

Western Culture in Eastern Lands. A Comparison of the Methods adopted by England and Russia in the Middle East. By Arminius Vambéry, C.V.O. John Murray. 12s. net.

Vie du Vénérable Justin de Jacobis, premier Vicaire Apostolique de l'Abyssinie. 2^{me} édition. Paris: Ch. Douniol. 5.10fr.

[Mgr de Jacobis died in 1860, and his cause was introduced at Rome by a decree of July 13, 1905. This Life records his apostolic adventures, including imprisonment (twice) and banishment, and the final scene when Mussulmans contended with the schismatic Christians for the honour of carrying his body. Mgr Demimuid has led up to the biography proper with a chapter on the ecclesiastical history of Abyssinia.]

Books Received

Outlines of British History for Catholic Schools. By E. Wyatt-Davies, M.A. With illustrations. Longmans. 2s. 6d.

The Philosophy of the Upani Shads. By Paul Deussen. Authorized English translation by Rev. A. S. Geden, M.A. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark. 10s. 6d.

La Cosmogonia Mosaica en sus relaciones con la Ciencia y los Descubrimientos historicos modernos. Per el P. Juan de Abadal, S.J. Barcelona: Gustavo Gili. 1.50pts.

Dictionnaire de Philosophie Ancienne, Moderne et Contemporaine. Complété par deux tables méthodiques. Par l'Abbé Élie Blanc. Paris: Lethielleux. 12fr.

Compendium of the Summa Theologica of St Thomas Aquinas, Pars Prima. By Bernardus Bonjoannes, A.D. 1560. Translated into English. Revised by Father Wilfrid Lescher, O.P., with Introduction and an Appendix explanatory of Scholastic Terms by R. P. Carlo Falcini. Thomas Baker.

Special Introduction to the Study of the Old Testament. By Rev. Francis E. Gigot, D.D. Part II. Didactic Books and Prophetical Writings. New York: Benziger Bros. 8s. net.

The Genuineness and Authorship of the Pastoral Epistles. By Rev. J. D. James, B.D. Longmans. 3s. 6d. net.

De Evangeliorum Inspiratione, de Dogmatis Evolutione, de Arcani Disciplina. P. Reginaldus M. Fei, O.P. Paris: Beauchesne. 2.50fr.

A Manual of Bible History. I. The Old Testament. By Charles Hart, B.A. Washbourne. 3s. 6d. net.

Religions Ancient and Modern. Constable. 1s. per volume.
- Celtic Religion in pre-Christian Times. By Edward Anwyl, M.A.
- Hinduism. By L. D. Barnett.
- The Religion of Babylonia and Assyria. By Theophilus G. Pinches, LL.D.

Books Received

La Théologie de Saint-Hippolyte. Par Adhémar d'Alès. Paris: Beauchesne. 6fr.

The Great Fundamental Truths. A Simple and Popular Course of Higher Religious Instruction for the Educated Laity. Book I. The Church an Infallible Guide. By the Rev. R. C. Bodkin, C.M. Dublin: Browne and Nolan.

Principles of Religious Life. By the Very Rev. Francis Cuthbert Doyle, O.S.B. Third edition. Washbourne.

Attitude of Catholics towards Darwinism and Evolution. By A. Mackermann, S.J. St Louis and Freiburg: Herder. 3s. 6d.

Larger Catechism. Second Part of the Abridgement of Christian Doctrine for Higher Classes, prescribed by His Holiness Pope Pius X. Translated by the Right Rev. Thomas Sebastian Byrne, D.D., Bishop of Nashville. New York: Fr. Pustet. 35c.

An Abridgement of Christian Doctrine, prescribed by Pope Pius X for all the Dioceses of the Province of Rome. Translated by the Right Rev. Thomas Sebastian Byrne, D.D., Bishop of Nashville. New York: Fr. Pustet and Co. 15c.

A Manual of Theology for the Laity: being a Practical Guide Book for all of Good Will. By Rev. P. Geierman, C.SS.R. With an Introduction by the Most Rev. John J. Glennon, D.D., Archbishop of St Louis. New York: Benziger.

Lectures on the Method of Science. Edited by T. B. Strong, Dean of Christchurch. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 7s. 6d. net.

Refectio Spiritualis alumno clerico meditanti proposita. H. Parkinson, S.T.D. 2 vols. Bruges: Beyaert. 2s.

Memoriale Vitæ Sacerdotalis. Auctore Claudio Arvisenet. De Sacrificio Missæ. Tractatus Asceticus continens Praxim attente, devote et reverenter Celebrandi. Auctore Joanne Cardinali Bona, Ord. Cist. Freiburg: Herder. 3m.

Books Received

Thoughts and Affections on the Passion of Jesus Christ for Every Day of the Year. Taken from Holy Scripture and the Writings of the Fathers of the Church. By Fra Gaetano M. da Bergamo, Capuchin. Translated from the Italian. New York: Benziger. 8s.

Anglican Ordinations: Theology of Rome and of Canterbury in a Nutshell. By Rev. H. C. Temple, S.J. New York: Benziger Bros.

For Faith and Science. By F. H. Woods, B.D. Longmans. 3s. 6d. net.

The Eye for Spiritual Things and other Sermons. By Henry Melville Gwatkin, M.A. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. 4s. 6d. net.

Outlines of Sermons for Young Men and Young Women. By the Rev. Joseph Schuen. Edited by the Rev. Edmund T. Wirth, Ph.D. New York: Benziger Bros. 8s. net.

The Religion of the Plain Man. By Father Robert Hugh Benson. Burns & Oates. 2s. 6d. net.

[This little book, embodying the lectures recently delivered with great effect by the author at Cambridge, seems excellent both in conception and execution. The plain man, John, is remarkable only for his power of avoiding side-issues and for the rapidity with which he learnt the Scriptures. He deals only with central questions, and deals with them trenchantly, because he is a practical man who has got to live. We like John because he does not try to be original but only to be real, although the author has not been at pains to fill in his portrait with petty verisimilitudes.]

The Gospel of the Rejection: A Study in the Relation of the Fourth Gospel to the Three. By Wilfrid Richmond. John Murray. 5s.

The New Reformation: Recent Evangelical Movements in the Roman Catholic Church. By John A. Bain, M.A. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. 4s. 6d. net.

Primitive Christian Education. By Geraldine Hodgson. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. 4s. 6d. net.

Divine Authority. By J. F. Scholfield. Longmans. 2s. 6d. net.

Books Received

On the Doctrine of Personal Identity, considered with reference to a Future Life. By C. Comyns Tucker. Longmans. 1s. 6d. net.

A Dream of Realms Beyond Us. By Adair Welcker. Ninth American edition. San Francisco: Adair Welcker. 40c.

John of Damascus. By Douglas Ainslie. Constable and Co. 3s. 6d. net.

The Blessed Virgin and all the Company of Heaven: Some Words of Peace. By A. Theodore Wirgman, D.D., D.C.L. With a Preface by the Rev. W. J. Knox Little, M.A. Oxford: A. P. Mowbray. 5s. net.

The People's Prayers: being some Considerations on the use of the Litany in Public Worship. By E. G. Cuthbert F. Atchley. Longmans. 6d. net.

The Dream of Gerontius. By Cardinal Newman. With Introduction and Notes. By Maurice Francis Egan, A.M., LL.D. Longmans. 1s. 6d.

Miriam of Magdala. A Study. By Katherine F. Mullany. New York: Magdala Co. 1.00$.

The Life of Count Moore. Compiled from materials supplied by his Family. By Albert Barry, C.SS.R. Dublin: M. H. Gill. 3s. 6d. net.

The Lover of Souls. Short Conferences on the Sacred Heart of Jesus. By Rev. Henry Brinkmeyer. New York: Benziger. 4s.

La Devotion au Sacré Cœur de Jésus: Doctrine; Histoire. Paris: Beauchesne. 3.50fr.

Jesus Crucified. Readings and Meditations on the Passion and Death of our Redeemer. By Rev. Walter Elliott, of the Paulist Fathers. New York: Columbus Press. 1.00$.

The Mother of Jesus in the First Age and After. By J. Herbert Williams. Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co. 6s.

The Madonna of the Poets. Burns and Oates. 2s. 6d. net.

Books Received

Mary the Queen. A Life of the Blessed Mother for her Little Ones. By a Religious of the Society of the Holy Child Jesus. New York: Benziger Brothers.

Meditations on the Mysteries of Faith and the Epistles and Gospels for each Day. By a Monk of Sept Fonts. Translated from the French by a Religious of the Visitation of Wilmington, Del. Revised and edited by Rev. Ferreol Girardey, C.SS.R. First and second volumes. Freiburg: Herder.

Science et Religion. Paris: Bloud. 0.60fr. a volume:—Épicure et l'Épicurisme. Henri Lengrand.—L'Inquisition Protestante: (1) Les Saint-Barthélemy Calvinistes. (2) Les Victimes de Calvin. J. Rouquette.—Le Concile de Trente et la Réforme du Clergé au XVIme Siècle. Paul Deslandres.—(1) Organisation Religieuse de la Hongrie; (2) Le Christianisme en Hongrie. Emile Hom.—(1) La Catéchèse Apostolique; (2) L'Enseignement de Saint-Paul. Henri Couget.—Ce que fut la "Cabale de Dévots" (1630-1660). Yves de la Brière.—Comment rénover l'Art Chrétien. Alphonse Germain.

The Ascent of Mount Carmel. By St John of the Cross. Translated by David Lewis. With Corrections and a Prefatory Essay on the Development of Mysticism in the Carmelite Order. By Benedict Zimmerman, O.C.D. Thomas Baker.

Sister Mary of the Divine Heart (Droste zu Vischering), Religious of the Good Shepherd, 1863-1899. By the Abbé Louis Chasle. Translated from the second French edition by a Member of the Order. Burns and Oates. 6s.

Lenten Readings from the Writings of the Fathers and Doctors of the Church as found in the Roman Breviary. Done into English by John Patrick, Marquess of Bute, and arranged by Father John Mary, Friar Minor Capuchin. Burns and Oates.

La Loi d'Amour: II. Miséricorde. By L. A. Gaffre. Paris: Victor Lecoffre.

Books Received

Das Freiburger Münster. Ein Führer für Einheimische und Fremde. Von Friedrich Kempf und Karl Schuster. With 93 illustrations. Freiburg: Herder. 3m.

[The little guide to the Cathedral of Freiburg written by J. Marmon in 1871 has long since been out of date. This new guidebook gives the history of the Minster from its first beginnings to our day, describing the building and its notable features from an historical and artistic, and occasionally also from a technical, standpoint.]

The Annual Retreat. Meditations and Spiritual Conferences for the use of Religious who make the Annual Retreat privately. By the Rev. Gabriel Bouffier, S.J. Translated from the French by Madame Cecilia. Kegan Paul. 3s. 6d. net.

Consolamini: Meditations. By the Reverend P. M. Northcote, O.S.M. Art and Book Co. 3s. 6d. net.

The Mystic Treasures of the Holy Mass. By the Rev. Charles Coppens, S.J. St Louis, Mo.: Herder.

Lectures on the Holy Eucharist. By Charles Coupe, S.J., M.A. London. Edited with Notes and References by Hatherley More. R. and T. Washbourne, Ltd. 3s. 6d.

Saint Columba. By Samuel Keyworth. Burns and Oates. 2s. 6d. net.

Saint Benedict Joseph Labre, Votary of Holy Poverty and Pilgrim. By C. L. White. Burns and Oates. 2s. 6d.

Patron Saints for Catholic Youth. By Mary E. Mannix. New York: Benziger Bros. 2s.

The Lessons of the King made Plain for His Little Ones. By a Religious of the Society of the Holy Child Jesus. New York: Benziger Bros. 2s. 6d. net.

Lives of the Saints for Children. By Lady Amabel Kerr. Second Series. Catholic Truth Society.

God's Birds. By the Rev. John Fitzpatrick, O.M.I. (John Priestman). Burns and Oates.

Books Received

A Garland of Everlasting Flowers. By Mrs Innes Browne. Washbourne. 3s. 6d.

Pearl; or, A Passing Brightness. By Olive Katherine Parr. Sands. 3s. 6d. net.

Sanctity's Romance: Stories of the Bright Ages. By David Bearne, S.J. Wimbledon: "Messenger" Office. 1s. 6d. net.

Short Spiritual Readings for Mary's Children. By Madame Cecilia, Religious of St Andrew's Convent, Streatham. London: Washbourne.

Our Lady of the Pillar. By Eça de Queiroz. Done into English by Edgar Prestage, of the Lisbon Royal Academy of Science, Chevalier of the Order of S. Thiago. Constable. 2s. 6d. net.

Jack. By a Religious of the Society of the Holy Child. Benziger. 2s. 6d.

The Arena. By Harold Spender. Constable. 6s.

[A novel dealing with the inner life of modern British politics, with a strong romantic accompaniment. The theme throughout is the part played by women in politics, and the plot hinges on the relations between Lord Alfred Markham and his young wife.]

More Five o'Clock Stories in Prose and Verse. By a Religious of the Society of the Holy Child Jesus. New York: Benziger. 2s. 6d.

Tom Losely: Boy. By the Rev. J. E. Capus, S.J. (Cuthbert). New York: Benziger Bros. 3s. 6d.

The Mystery of Homby Hall. By Anna T. Sadlier. New York: Benziger Bros. 3s. 6d.

The Shipwreck: A Story for the Young. By the Rev. Joseph Spillmann, S.J. Translated from the German by Mary Richards Gray. St Louis: Herder. 2s.

The Chiquitan Festival of Corpus Christi. A Tale of the Old Missions of South America. By the Rev. Joseph Spillmann, S.J. Translated from the German by Mary Richards Gray. Freiburg: Herder.

Books Received

An Imperial Love Story. By Henry Curties. Washbourne. 3s. 6d.

The Lady in Crimson and other Tales. By Ymal Oswin. Art and Book Co.

The Boy and the Outlaw: A Tale of John Brown's Raid on Harper's Ferry. By Thomas J. L. McManus. New York: Grafton Press. 1.50$.

Not a Judgement. By Grace Keon. New York: Benziger Bros. 5s.

Les Cousins de Matutinaud. 2^e Série des "Idées de Matutinaud." Par E. Duplessy. Paris: Charles Douniol. 2.50f.

A Treatise on Strict Counterpoint. By Francis Edward Gladstone. Part I. Counterpoint in Two and Three Parts. Novello and Co. 2s.; in paper boards, 2s. 6d.

Erinnerung an Leo XIII. Gedanken über die Weltgeschichtliche Bedeutung seines Pontifikates. Von Stanislaus von Smolka. Freiburg: Herder. 1m.

La Mentalité Laïque et l'École. Par L. Lescoeur. Avec une Préface de M. Keller. Paris: Charles Douniol.

La Société Contemporaine et les Leçons du Calvaire. Conférences prêchées à Notre-Dame des Champs, à Paris, pendant le Carême de 1906. Par Abbé P. Magaud. Paris: Charles Douniol. 2fr.

[These conferences deserve to be widely read in France. They were given in the Lent of 1906, at Notre-Dame des Champs, in Paris. The author drew from the Cross of Christ the lessons which it has for the unbeliever and the uninstructed, for the lax and the apostates, for men of pleasure and men of substance, for indifferentists and egoists, for the lukewarm and the confessors of the faith in France to-day.]

Disestablishment in France. By Paul Sabatier. With a Preface by the Translator, Robert Dell, and the French-English Text of the Separation Law, with Notes. Fisher Unwin. 3s. 6d. net.

Books Received

Divorce. A Domestic Tragedy of Modern France. By Paul Bourget. Translated from the French by G. L. Charlwood. Fisher Unwin. 6s.

La Renaissance Catholique en Angleterre au XIX^{me} Siècle. III^{me} Partie. 1865-1892. Par Paul Thureau-Dangin, de l'Académie Française. Paris: Plon-Nourrit. 7.50fr.

[This third part is fully equal to its predecessors in point of accuracy and excellence of workmanship. It falls into two divisions. The first, dealing with the careers of Cardinals Manning and Newman from 1865 until their death, will especially interest Catholic readers. It is marked by impartiality, thoroughness and exactness of information. The second division deals with the Ritualistic and High Church movement in the same period. We hope for an early opportunity of dealing with this work at length.]

THE INDEX TO VOL. 139

The Titles of Articles are printed in Italics

A MODERN Pilgrim's Progress, *reviewed*, 213-214.
A Soul's Wayfaring, by "Z," *reviewed*, 214.
Abrégé de Métaphysique, Comte Domet de Vorges, *reviewed*, 427-428.
Action Libérale, 102.
Action Populaire, 100-101.
Æneas Sylvius, 267 seqq.
Æneas Sylvius, Commentaries, 269.
Æneas Sylvius and Nicholas de Cusa, 267-276.
Ageorges, Joseph, Le Clergé Rural sous l'Ancien Régime, *reviewed*, 416-7.
Aguisseau, M. d', 301.
Aidan, St, 263.
Ainger, Alfred, Life and Letters of, by Edith Sichel, *reviewed*, 225-228.
Albigenses, 325.
Almanach du Congo, 381.
Anabaptists, 325.
Angelico, Le B. Giovanni, by Henri Cochin, 417.
Anthologia Græca Epigrammatum, Pal. cum Plan., 74.
Apôtres, L'Œuvre des, by Mgr. Le Camus, *reviewed*, 204-206.
Aristotle, 249.
Arius, 234.
Arnold, Matthew, on Translating Homer, 7.
Association Catholique, 104.
Athanasian Creed, 264.
Athanasius, St, 234.
Augouard, Mgr., Vingt-huit Années au Congo, 364-365.
Augustine, St, of Canterbury, 263.
Augustine, St, De Civitate Dei, 3.
Austin, Alfred, The Door of Humility, *reviewed*, 219-221.
Aveling, Rev. F., Science and Faith, *reviewed*, 429.
Avesta, the Second Gatha of the, Bishop Casartelli, 123-128.
Awesta, Die Gatha's des, 123.

BARNES, Mgr. A. S., *Winchester, Mother of Schools*, 383-399; The Witness of the Gospels, *reviewed*, 206.
Barnett, Mrs. S. A., Science and City Suburbs, *reviewed*, 437.
Barrès, Maurice, Voyage de Sparte, *reviewed*, 221-222.
Barry, M., Le Droit d'Enseigner, *reviewed*, 415-416.
Barry, Rev. W., D.D., The Higher Criticism, *reviewed*, 430.
Barry, Rev. W., D.D., *Our Latin Bible*, 1-23. vid. 104.
Batiffol, Mgr, 87-88.
Baur, 241.
Beare, John I., Greek Theories of Elementary Cognition, *reviewed*, 224-225.
Beaumont, M. de, 306, 307, 320.
Beauvilliers, Duc de, 306, 311, 312.
Bebel, A., Die Frau und der Socialismus, 321-322
Belloc, H., *The Fiscal Question*, 227-229.
Benson, Rev. R. H., The Queen's Tragdey, *reviewed*, 421-425; Richard Raynal: Solitary, *reviewed*, 197, vid. 232.
Berger, Samuel, Histoire de la Vulgate, 1-22.
Bible, Our Latin, by Dr William Barry, 1-23.
Biétry, M., 408.
Bill, Denominationalism and the Education, 155-180.
Blunt, Wilfrid Scawen, *The Dance of Death*, poem, 359-361.
Bodley, J. E. C., The Church in France, reviewed, 413-415.
Boothroyd, History of Pontefract, 356.
Bossuet, 307.
Bowden, Life and Pontificate of Gregory VII, 28.
Briand, M., 406.

The Index

Broglie, Prince Emmanuel de, 300, 320.
Browning, Robert, Translation of the Agamemnon, 7.
Buls, Charles, Croquis Congolais, 376.
Burgundy, Duke of, 306, 311, 315.
Burke, John Butler, The Origin of Life, *reviewed*, 187-191.
Burke, Edmund, Appeal from the Old to the New Whigs, 327.
Burnett, History of the Reformation, 122.
CALENDAR of Domestic State Papers, 340.
Camus, Mgr. Le, L'Œuvre des Apôtres, *reviewed*, 204-206.
Capart, La Propriété Individuelle et le Collectivisme, 326.
Casartelli, Bishop, *The Plaint of the Kine,* 123-128.
Catholic Social Effort in France, 87-104.
Catholic Reviews, Home and Foreign, 228-232.
Catholic Missions in the Congo Free State, by J. de C. MacDonnell, 362-382.
Cattier, Félicien, Étude sur la Situation du Congo, 362.
Chamberlain, Right Hon. J., 163.
Chanterac, M. de, 306-308.
Chapman, Dom John, O.S.B., *The Condemnation of Pope Honorius,* 129.
Chevreuse, M. de E., 310, 318.
Chirac, 320.
Church of France, by J. E. C. Bodley, *reviewed,* 413-415.
Church of France, The, and The French People, 400-411.
Clarendon, History of the Rebellion, 339, 349, 552.
Clemenceau, M., 322, 408.
Clergé Rural sous l'Ancien Régime, Joseph Ageorges, *reviewed,* 416-417.
Clorivière, Père de, Modèle des Pasteurs, 417.
Cobbett's State Trials, 339, 348, 357.
Cochin, Henri, Le B. Fra Giov. Angelico, *reviewed,* 417.
Combes, M., 406, 414.
Common Prayer, The Book of, 257.
Concordantia Catholica, De, by Nicholas Khrypffs, 271.
Condemnation of Pope Honorius, by Dom John Chapman, O.S.B., 129-234.
Confessions of Saint Augustine, 19.
Congo Free State, Catholic Missions in the, by J. de C. MacDonnell, 362-382
Contemporary Review, June, 1905, 284.
Cornhill Magazine, July, 1905, 358.
Cowper-Temple Clause, The, 163.
Craigie, Mrs, The Dream and the Business, 419-421.
Crinagoræ Mitylenæi Epigrammata, ed. M. Rubensohn, 74.
Crinagoras of Mitylene, by Prof. J. S. Phillimore, 74-86.
Croquis Congolais, by Charles Buls, 376.
Cunningham, Dr W., Western Civilization, 334.
Cyprian, St, 3.
Cyril, St, 135.
Cyrus of Alexandria, 137.
DANCE *of Death, The,* poem by Wilfrid S. Blunt, 359-361.
Dangers of Spiritualism, The, by J. Godfrey Raupert, *reviewed,* 196.
Dearmer, Rev. Percy, 324.
Delcassé, M., 407.
Denifle, Heinrich, O.P., Luther und Lutherthum, *reviewed,* 434-436.
Denominationalism and the Education Bill, 155-180.
Deroulède, M., 406.
Desjacques, R.P., in Études Religieuses, 478.
Devas, C.S., *Is Socialism Right after all?* 321-339.
Dicey, Law and Public Opinion, 337.
Dieu, Abbé le, 304.
Dillon, Mr John, 170.
Dimnet, Abbé, 232.
Disraeli, 287.
Donizo, Vita Matildæ, 38.

The Index

Douai Diaries, 398.
Douglas, C. M., Science and Administration, *reviewed*, 437.
Doumer, M., 407.
Dream and the Business, The, John Oliver Hobbes, 419-421.
Droit d'Enseigner, Le, *reviewed*, 415-416.
Dubois, Father, O.S.M., Saint Francis as Social Reformer, *reviewed*, 207-208.
Duchesne, Mgr, Histoire Ancienne de L'Église, *reviewed*, 181.
Dugdale, Visitation of Yorkshire, 349.
EDMUNDS, Dom Columba, O.S.B., The Early Scottish Church, *reviewed*, 217-218.
Ellis, Professor R., 75.
Encyclicals of Pius X, Vehementer nos, 401 ; Gravissimo, 401, 403.
England's Black Tribunal, 339, 358.
English Mystics, Studies of the, by W. R. Inge, *reviewed*, 211-212.
Erasmus, 271.
Eurialus et Laurentia, by Æneas Sylvius, 269.
Existence of GOD, The, by Mgr Moyes, *reviewed*, 207.
FAWCETT, 36-37.
Fawcett, Mrs, Political Economy, 278.
Fénelon a Cambrai, 1697-1715, Emmanuel de Broglie, 300.
Fénelon in Exile, by the Hon. Mrs. Maxwell Scott, 300-320.
Fénelon's Spiritual Letters, Abbé Gosselin, 300.
Fénelon, Case of Conscience, Dialogues of the Dead, Fables, 317.
Fénelon, Les Maximes des Saints, 301-302.
Fénelon, Infallibility of the Church, 317.
Fénelon, Letters on Religion, 317.
Fénelon, Lettres de Direction, ed. Moïse Cagnac, 300.
Fenwick's Career, by Mrs Humphry Ward, *reviewed*, 198-200.
Fichte, 274.
Fillion, L.U., Saint-Pierre, *reviewed*, 417.
Fioretti, 35.
For Truth or for Life, 233-251.
Foster, County Families of Yorkshire, 344.
France, Catholic Social Effort in, 87-104.
France, The Church of, and the French People, 400-411.
France, The Church in, by J. C. Bodley, *reviewed*, 413-415.
Francis of Assisi, Social Reformer, by Father Dubois, O.S.M., *reviewed*, 207-208.
Francis, M. E., Simple Annals, *reviewed*, 218.
Fraticelli, 325.
Fuzet, Mgr, 414.
GAMA, Vasco da, 111.
G.W., *In a Library*, poem, 72-73.
Garrod, H. W., The Religion of all Good Men, *reviewed*, 216.
Geddes, History of the Church in Malabar, 122.
Gigot, Dr F. E., Special Introduction to the Study of the Old Testament, Part II, *reviewed*, 412-413.
Gilbert, J. T., Contemporary History of Affairs in Ireland, 1641-1652, 339.
Gilbert, J. T., An Aphoristical Discovery of Treasonable Factions, 348.
Glossner, M., Nicholas von Cusa, 267.
Gore, Bishop, Roman Catholic Claims, 129.
Goschen, Lord, Essays and Addresses on Economic Questions, 329.
Gospels, The Witness of the, by Mgr Barnes, *reviewed*, 206.
Gouvea, 122.
Goyau, Georges, 99, 101, 416-417.
Greek Theories of Elementary Cognition, by J. I. Beare, *reviewed*, 224-225.
Greenidge, History of Rome, 328.
Guesde, Jules, 406.
Guide Social, 101.
Guyon, Mme, 301.

The Index

HALDANE, Right Hon. R. B., 434.
Halifax, Archbishop of, Funeral Sermon on Sir J. Thompson, *reviewed,* 437.
Handbuch zur Vulgata, Dr Fr. Kaulen, 1.
Harmel, 334.
Hastings, Dictionary of the Bible, 10, 15.
Head, F. W., 103.
Hedley, Bishop, 300, 302, 309.
Hefele, C. J., Bishop of Rottenburg, History of the Councils of the Church, 129.
Hegel, 273, 336.
Heinz, 334.
Hervé, Gabriel, 407.
Histoire Ancienne de l'Église, by Mgr Duchesne, *reviewed*, 181–182.
Histoire de la Théologie Positive, by Abbé Turmel, *reviewed,* 211–212.
Hitze, Die Arbeiterfrage, 335.
Hollond, Discourses on the Navy, 341.
Hobbes, John Oliver, The Dream and the Business, *reviewed,* 419–421.
Holmes, Richard, Collections towards the History of Pontefract, 349.
Honorius, The Condemnation of Pope, by Dom John Chapman, O.S.B., 129–154.
Hort, Dr F. A., 241, 242, 243, 248, 249; The Way, the Truth, and the Life, 233.
Huddy, Mrs, Matilda of Tuscany, 38.
Hügel, Baron Anatole von, 28.
Hugo, Victor, Fantômes, poem adapted from, by W. S. Blumt, 359–361.
IN *a Library,* poem, by G.W., 72, 73.
India, The Syrian Christians in, 105–122.
India and the Apostle Thomas, by Bishop Medlycott, 105.
Inge, W. R., Studies of the English Mystics, *reviewed,* 218–219.
Inquiry Commission, Congo, Report of, 363, 365, 368, 369, 371, 373 seq.
Institutiones Juris Naturalis, by Rev. T. Pesch, S.J., *reviewed*, 426–427.
Is Socialism Right after all? by C. S. Devas, 321–338.
JARICOT, Pauline Marie, Life of, by M. Maurin, *reviewed,* 418.
Jaurès, M., 322, 406.
Jérôme, Saint, by Abbé Turmel, *reviewed*, 425.
Joachim, Harold H., The Nature of Truth, 336.
Joly, M., Les Saints, *reviewed*, 417–418.
Jordan, Friar, Mirabilia, 110.
Joseph the Indian, Travels of, 110–111.
Jowett, Benjamin, 26, 34, 75.
KANT, Critique of Pure Reason, 272–273.
Kaulen, Dr Fr., Geschichte der Vulgata, 1, 4, 5.
Kempis, Thomas à, 271.
Kine, The Plaint of the, by Bishop Casartelli, 123–128.
LAGRANGE, Père, 232.
Langeron, M. de, 306, 307.
Le Brun, Explication de la Messe, 117.
Lefébure, Léon, Portraits de Croyants, *reviewed,* 214–216.
L'Eglise Byzantine de 527 à 847, Père Pargoire, *reviewed,* 216–217.
Leo XIII, 92, 100, 322.
Leonis XIII Acta, 321.
Lépicier, Rev. Alexius M., O.S.M., The Unseen World, *reviewed*, 194–195.
Lex Credendi, by Rev. George Tyrrell, *reviewed,* 182–187.
Liddon, Dr, 264.
Life, For Truth or for, 233–251.
Lightfoot, Bishop, 241.
Llandaff, Viscount, *Matilda of Tuscany,* 38–71.
Louis, St, 313.
Lucas, Rev. Herbert, S.J., At the Parting of the Ways, *reviewed,* 419
In the Morning of Life, *reviewed,* 419.

The Index

MABILLON, 234.
Mackail, J. W., 75.
MacDonnell, J. de Courcy, Catholic Missions in the Congo Free State, 362-382.
Macdonald, Ramsey, Socialism and Society, 321.
Macnamara, Dr, 175.
Magnier, Father, Life of Saint Gerard Majella, *reviewed*, 418-419.
Mallock, W. H., Labour and Popular Welfare, 323.
Malthusianism, 331.
Manning, Cardinal, 164.
Mann, Rev. Horace, Lives of the Popes in the Early Middle Ages, vols III and IV *reviewed*, 433-434.
Mansi, J. B., Amplissima Collectio Conciliorum, 129.
Marsh, Dr G. W., Miracles, *reviewed*, 419.
Marshall, Prof. Alfred, 32.
Martens, W., Gregorius VII, Sein Leben und Wirken, 38.
Marx, Karl, 322, 323, 336.
Mary Adelaide of Savoy, 313.
Matilda of Tuscany, by Viscount Llandaff, 38-71.
Majella, Life of Saint Gerard, by Father Magnier, *reviewed*, 418-419.
Maxwell-Scott, Hon. Mrs, *Fénelon in Exile*, 300-320.
Meakin, Budgett, Model Factories and Villages, 334.
Meister, Dom Placide de, O.S.B., 230.
Medlycott, A. E., Bishop of Tricomia, India and the Apostle Thomas, *reviewed*, 105.
Menger, Dr, 323.
Meredith, George, 92, 266.
Métaphysique des Causes, La, by Th. de Régnon, S.J., *reviewed*, 193-194.
Meung, Jean de, 325.
Mignot, Mgr, 95, 414.
Mill, J. S., Autobiography, 30, 237, 293,
Millerand, M., 407.
Milton, 108.
Ministère Pastoral de Jean-Jacques Olier, *reviewed*, 209-211.
Missions Belges, June, 1906, 371.
Missions en Chine et au Congo, Father Vervaeke, 378.
Moberley, Bishop, 384.
Möhler, Symbolism, *reviewed*, 233-234.
Moyes, Mgr, The Existence of God, *reviewed*, 207.
Montbiron, M. de, 308, 309.
Moulton, Dr G. H., Grammar of N.T. Greek, Prolegomena, *reviewed*, 431-433.
Muratori, Rerum Italianarum Scriptores, 38.
NEALE, Dr J. M., Primitive Liturgies, 109.
Newman, J. H., 17, 30, 36; Apologia pro Vita sua, 233; Via Media, 233, 249; The Arians of the IVth Century, 233; Development of Religious Error, 242.
New Testament, Grammar of, Dr J. H. Moulton, *reviewed*, 431-433.
Niccolò di Cusa, G. Rossi, 367.
Nicholas de Cusa, Æneas Sylvius and, 267-276.
Nicholas de Cusa de Beryllo, 274; de Docta Ignorantia, 273-274.
Nikolaus von Cusa, 267.
OLIER, Jean-Jacques, Ministère Pastoral de, *reviewed*, 209-211.
Origin of Life, The, by John Butler Burke, *reviewed*, 187-192.
Our Latin Bible, by Rev. W. Barry, D.D., 1-23.
Out of Due Time, by Mrs Wilfrid Ward, *reviewed*, 200-204.
PARGOIRE, Père, L'Église Byzantine de 572 à 847, *reviewed*, 216-217.
Pastor, Dr L., History of the Popes, 267.
Perraud, Cardinal, 414.
Pesch, Rev. T., S.J., Jus Naturae Generale, *reviewed*, 426-427.
Phillimore, Prof. J. S., Crinagoras of Mitylene, 74-86.

Phillips, Stephen, 35.
Pico della Mirandola, 270.
Pierrepont, Père Ivan de, Au Congo et aux Indes, 374.
Pierre, Saint, by L. U. Fillion, 417.
Piou, M., 102.
Plaint of the Kine, The, by Bishop Casartelli, 123–128.
Popes in the Early Middle Ages, Lives of the, by Rev. Horace Mann, *reviewed,* 433–434.
Portraits de Croyants, Leon Lefébure, *reviewed,* 214–215.
Public Schools Commission, 1857, 383.
QUEEN'S Tragedy, The, by Rev. R. H. Benson, *reviewed,* 421–425.
Querdec, Yves le, Lettres d'un Curé de Campagne, 102.
RAMBUTEAU, Comtesse de, La B. Varani, *reviewed,* 417.
Ramsay, Chevalier de, 316.
Raupert, J. Godfrey, The Dangers of Spiritualism, *reviewed,* 196.
Reinach, Salomon, 89.
René, Amédée, La Grand Italienne, 38.
Report of the Ritual Commission, by Rev. R. H. Benson, 252–266.
Resch, 5.
Rheede, Van, Hortus Malabaricus, 114.
Régnon, Théodore de, S.J., La Métaphysique des causes, *reviewed,* 193–194.
Renaissance, Symbols of the, 267–276.
Richard Raynals: Solitary, by Rev. R. H. Benson, *reviewed,* 191.
Rickaby, Rev. J., S.J., The Divinity of Christ, *reviewed,* 430.
Robinson, Dr Armitage, 5, 6.
Rolin, Henry, in Revue de l'Université de Bruxelles, 366.
Roosevelt, 294.
Rossi, G., Niccolò di Cusa, 257.
Rouvier, M., 407.
Ruinart, Acta Sincera Martyrum, 234.
Rushworth, The Tryal of Thomas, Earl of Stafford, 339, 343.
Ryan, Dr, 229.
SADLER, M. E., Science and National Education, 436–437.
Saint-Simon, 301, 304, 312, 315, 317, 319, 246, 247.
Sales, St Francis of, 309.
Salford, The Bishop of, *The Plaint of the Kine,* 122–128.
Sanday, Dr W., The Oracles of God, 233.
Sagnier, Marc, 96, 101.
Sarrien, M., 407.
Schools, Winchester, Mother of, by Mgr Barnes, 383–399.
Science in Public Affairs, ed. Rev. J. E. Hand, *reviewed,* 436–439.
Scottish Church, The Early, Dom Columba Edmunds, O.S.B., *reviewed,* 217.
Ségur, Mgr, 93.
Seilhac, 101.
Seligman, Prof., Economic Interpretation of History, 327.
Sergius, 134, 138.
Sertillanges, Père, 90.
Sharpe, Rev. A. B., Evil: Its Nature and Cause, *reviewed,* 429–430.
Sichel, Miss Edith, Life and Letters of Alfred Ainger, *reviewed,* 226–228.
Sidgwick, Henry, Some Characteristics of, 24–37.
Sidgwick, Henry, A Memoir by A. S. and E.M. S., 24–37.
Simple Annals, by M. E. Francis, *reviewed,* 218.
Sillon, The, 96, 99.
Smith, Adam, Wealth of Nations, 321.
Smith, Rev. Sidney, S.J., 176.
Spiritualism, The Dangers of, by J. Godfrey Raupert, *reviewed,* 196.
Souben, Père J., Nouvelle Théologie Dogmatique, vols III and IX, *reviewed* 212.
Soul's Wayfaring, A, by "Z," *reviewed,* 214.

Special Introduction to the Study of the O.T., *reviewed,* 412, 414.
Spectator, The, 278.
Stang, Bishop, Socialism and Christianity, 335, 337.
Stations of the Cross, The, by Rev. H. Thurston, S.J., *reviewed,* 208–209.
Stephen, Sir J., Studies in Ecclesiastical Biography, 38.
Studies of the English Mystics, by W. R. Inge, *reviewed,* 218–219.
Susemihl, Geschichte der Griechischen Literatur, 74.
Swetchine, Mme, 319.
Symbolism, by Möhler, *reviewed,* 222–223.
Symonds, J. A., 20.
Syrian Christians in India, The, 105–122.
TENNYSON, Lord, 28, 29, 157.
Théodore, Saint, by Abbé Marin, *reviewed,* 417–418.
The Door of Humility, by Alfred Austin, *reviewed,* 219–221.
The Fiscal Question, by H. Belloc, 227–229.
The Religion of all Good Men, by H. W. Garrod, *reviewed,* 216.
Thompson, Sir John, Funeral Sermon on, by the late Archbishop of Halifax, *reviewed,* 437.
Thurston, Rev. H., S.J., The Stations of the Cross, *reviewed,* 108-109.
Tischendorf, 2.
Tonson, Christopher, 387–388.
Travancore, State Manual of, 235.
Trèsal, 231.
Turin, The Holy Shroud of, 235.
Turmel, Abbé, Histoire de la Théologie Positive, *reviewed,* 211–212; Saint Jérôme, *reviewed,* 425.
Tyrrell, Rev. George, Lex Credendi, *reviewed,* 182–187.
UNSEEN World, The, by Rev. A. M. Lépicier, O.S.M., *reviewed,* 194–195.

VALLARSI, D., Opera Sancti Hieronymi, 1.
Van Renslé, Mgr, 379.
Varani, La B., Princesse de Camerino, by Comtesse de Rambuteau, *reviewed,* 417–18.
Vatican Council, 134.
Vermeersch, 380.
Veronica, St., 236.
Versaeke, Father, Missions en Chine et au Congo, 378–379.
Veyer, Abbé la, 320.
Via Media, J. H. Newman, 233.
Villemain, Histoire de Grégoire VII, 38.
Villeneuve, Guyot de, 407.
Voigt, Hildebrand als Papst Gregorius, 38.
Volkmar, 241.
Vorges, Comte Domet de, Abrégé de Métaphysique, *reviewed,* 427–428.
Voyage de Sparte, Maurice Barrès, *reviewed,* 221–223.
WALDECK-ROUSSEAU, 89, 405, 406, 414, 415.
Walter, Dr Franz, Die Propheten in ihrem Sozialen Beruf, 326.
Ward, Mrs. Humphry, Fenwick's Career, *reviewed,* 198-200.
Ward, Mrs Wilfrid, Out of Due Time, *reviewed,* 200-204.
Weiss, Rev. Albert Maria, O.P., Edition of Denifle's Luther, *reviewed,* 434-436
Wells, H.G., Mankind in the Making, 230.
Westcott, Dr, 241.
Westminster Lectures, Second Series, *reviewed,* 428-430.
Winchester, Mother of Schools, by Mgr A. S. Barnes, 383-399.
Windle, Dr B.C.A,, The Secret of the Cell, *reviewed,* 428.
Wiseman, Cardinal, Essays, 3.
Wordsworth, Dr, 2.
Worship Regulation Act, Public, 255.
Wrixon, Sir Henry, Socialism, 329.
Wykeham, William of, 383 seqq.

The Index

XAVIER, St Francis, 111.
YVES Le Querdec, Lettres d'un Curé de Campagne, 102.
ZAHN, 3.
"Z," A Soul's Wayfaring, *reviewed,* 214.
Zarathustra's Verspredigten, 123.
Zeigler, Latin Bible Versions before Jerome, 3.

Printed at the ARDEN PRESS, Leamington

LIBRARY

Does Not Circulate

AP 4 .D8 SMC

The Dublin review.

AIP-2395 (awab)

ST. MICHAEL'S COLLEGE
LIBRARY