

NEW BOOKS

A CENTURY OF ANGLO-CATHOLICISM. By Herbert Leslie Stewart, Professor of Philosophy, Dalhousie University. London and Toronto. J. M. Dent and Sons, Ltd. 1929.

This book is the work of "a Presbyterian born and bred, one content with the Church in which he was brought up, and conscious of no tendency whatever to change it for either the Roman or the Anglican Communion". To many persons it will seem vain to expect from such an author that degree of knowledge and understanding necessary for an adequate account of Anglo-Catholicism. One can think of Anglo-Catholics who will be annoyed at the claim of a Presbyterian to know so much about them.

Paradoxical as it may seem to be, this writer, who is not an Anglo-Catholic at all, but professes quite a different faith, has been able to offer a more convincing defence for Anglo-Catholicism than is to be found in most of the works by professed believers in the system. Professor Stewart reserves his commendation for the best in Anglo-Catholicism, and he rightly insists that this and every other form of belief should be considered and judged in its best and finest form. Disgusted with the ravages of secularism in the Protestantism especially of America, Professor Stewart looks with admiration to the genuine religious spirit manifested by Anglo and Roman Catholics. They are resolute champions of the common faith, which should belong to all Churches alike, but which some have allowed themselves to compromise or forsake. In Anglo-Catholic churches, religion is still the one matter of interest and concern. One cannot but be grateful to men who have, against very great odds, maintained their allegiance to the full faith of the ages, and made no kind of compromise with the hostile spirit of the time. Considerations of this kind have moved Professor Stewart to write a defence of a system of belief and practice which he believes to contain a number of grave inconsistencies and even absurdities.

Our author has apparently been influenced to write this work by another consideration not so well grounded in fact. He regards the Anglo-Catholics as a persecuted party. They are being subjected at present, he says, to a fierce and even scornful criticism. His sense of fair play compels him to come to their assistance, and to remind their opponents that they are themselves at least as much open to attack as those whom they criticize. It is not easy to take Professor Stewart very seriously in this part of his argument. He is quite aware that Anglo-Catholics are now far too strongly entrenched, in England at least, to suffer seriously from such criticism. It is only the Protestant underworld, and that in England is insignificant, which would wish to see the Anglo-Catholics driven over into the Roman Communion. There is little to justify Professor Stewart's view of them as a much persecuted and

seriously threatened sect in the Church of England, unless it is to be found in the fulminations of the former Home Secretary, or the occasional demand of some exasperated writer that his Episcopal brethren shall suppress the Bishop of Birmingham.

Professor Stewart is at his best in his account of the Oxford Movement. His intimate knowledge of the English Literature of the nineteenth century is here a most important asset. It is not too much to say that his volume deserves its place beside Dean Church's great history of the Movement, and the very important work of Dr. Brilioth published a few years ago. Dean Church carried his story to the year 1845. Professor Stewart gives an account of the Movement to the present time, and seeks to show that the same principles to which the Tractarians sought to give expression are still dominant in the minds of Bishop Gore and other leaders of the Anglo-Catholics of to-day,—and that in spite of very great changes of outlook upon Holy Scripture and other matters of high importance.

The essence of Anglo-Catholicism is to be found in the conception of a Church—an Ecclesiastical Order founded by Our Saviour Himself, which His followers must retain, not because they think it convenient or find it edifying, but because it was appointed by Him and to it He promised His Presence. Such authority and spiritual independence of the Church is the corner-stone of Catholicism. The Oxford Movement and the Anglo-Catholic Movement ever since have been, perhaps more than anything else, anti-Erastian. "In the creed she is to hold, in the forms of her worship, in the spiritual guidance she is to give to her members, the Church shall never be subject to any earthly authority." That is what Keble and Newman declared nearly a hundred years ago, and that is what Anglo-Catholics are praying that the bishops will declare to-day. Professor Stewart has skilfully disentangled and convincingly stated the really distinctive features of Anglo-Catholicism, the dominant principles in the teaching of both the Tractarians and the most distinguished and representative Anglo-Catholics of to-day. This needed to be done, for there are all kinds of misunderstandings abroad among both friends and foes of the Movement.

In the first place, it is worth emphasizing that the Oxford Movement had originally nothing at all to do with ritualism. "My name," writes Pusey in 1860, "is made a byword for that with which I never had any sympathy, that which the writers of the *Tracts*, with whom in early days I was associated, always deprecated—any innovations in the way of conducting the service, anything of ritualism, or especially any revival of disused vestments." There are many clergy that call themselves "Catholic", and deny that title to their neighbours, who have yet to learn what was recently described by *The Church Times* as a truism,—that the Catholic parish is the parish whose people confess their sins and make their Communions, not the parish where the vestments are elaborate and the ritual advanced.

It is also worth restating the fact that the Oxford Movement was an anti-Roman Movement. "The Movement of 1833," says Dean Church, "started out of the anti-Roman feelings of the Emancipation time. It was anti-Roman as much as it was anti-sectarian and anti-Erastian. It was to avert the danger of people becoming

Romanists from ignorance of Church principles." The leaders of the Movement a century ago were anti-Roman in the very same sense in which Bishop Gore and the more intellectual of the Anglo-Catholics are anti-Roman to-day. They were not at all prepared to admit the claims of the Roman Church. They sought to express and to practise a genuine Catholicism, in which much of the Roman system had no place at all. The Anglo-Catholic priest of to-day, who in the most uncritical spirit is appropriating the whole creed and *cultus* of Rome, is doing so in defiance of the early leaders of this Movement, and of the intellectuals among Anglo-Catholics at the present time. By such actions he proclaims that the Anglo-Catholic compromise has failed, as Newman felt in 1845 that it had failed. This sort of Anglo-Catholicism is sure to suffer defeat in the conflict with Roman Catholicism. Men will not long be satisfied with an imitation when they can have the real thing. We are grateful to Professor Stewart for his clear demonstration that the true heirs of the Tractarians are Bishop Gore and men like the writers of *Essays Catholic and Critical*, and not the mere ritualists and Romanizers. It is these latter who give point to the remark of Dean Inge that the goodwill of the Tractarian firm has now been acquired by men with very different aims and methods.

Anglo-Catholic clergy of the more violent sort (the phrase is Professor Stewart's) have, moreover, to answer to the charge of sheer bad faith. An ordination vow runs thus: "In public prayer and the administration of the Sacraments I will use the form in the said book prescribed, and none other, except as far as shall be ordered by lawful authority." Public respect for the Anglican priesthood can hardly survive the spectacle of hundreds of clergy treating that undertaking as a scrap of paper. These men may retort that members of other schools are dishonest in other ways, but they do not thereby justify themselves.

There is no possibility of denying that the extravagances of extreme Anglo-Catholics and ultra-Modernists in the Anglican Church constitute a serious scandal. It is not surprising that the whole Anglican position is regarded by so many as an illogical compromise. But surely there is much to set over against this. No Church in Christendom has come nearer to the ideal of "sects without schism." The Church of England stands to-day as one of the great rallying points in the Christian world, just because she has not allowed her Anglo-Catholics to be driven to Rome or her Protestant wing to Non-conformity, and because a large liberty has been given to her children in the interpretation of her formulae. Had she pursued this policy more fully in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, she would to-day be more truly national than she is.

In the last chapters of his book Professor Stewart deals with the Prayer Book Revisions of 1927 and 1928, and with the crisis created by their rejection by the House of Commons. It is to be hoped that his argument will receive the attention it deserves. The Protestant controversialist, who hailed the action of the House of Commons as a triumph for his cause, should think again. Does he really desire, in the first place, that the Church of England shall be dependent upon parliament as now constituted for instructions as to how it shall profess its faith and direct its worship? The Anglo-Catholic may be wrong

about many things, but surely he is right when he declares that such a submission would be an intolerable humiliation. The Bride of Christ would be made the concubine of Caesar.

The impossibility of enforcing the Prayer Book of 1662 as the standard of worship throughout the Church of England should now be obvious to all but the blindest partizans. Not hundreds but thousands of priests, with a large lay support, declare that it is quite inadequate as a devotional manual by which to conduct the Church's worship. By the alternative Book a place was to be made for a host of devoted men and women. There was no other alternative, except to tell them that they had no place in the Church of their fathers, and bid them go elsewhere. Is that what our Protestant friends desire? Are they so strong that they can view without dismay the expulsion from the Church of England of so many distinguished for piety and learning, and by whom the Church is so largely represented in the crowded cities of England?

It is much to be desired that the criticisms of this sympathetic observer will be heard and heeded by all parties. Then Anglo-Catholics will see themselves as serious onlookers, by no means their uncompromising opponents, see them, and their adversaries may learn to appreciate the wealth of devotion and seriousness of purpose represented in the Anglo-Catholic group.

F. H. COSGRAVE.

Trinity College,
Toronto.

IT NEEDS TO BE SAID. By Frederick Grove. The Macmillan Company of Canada, Toronto. 1929.

It would be unfortunate if the unexplanatory and rather affected title of this book should deter those interested in Canadian literature from becoming acquainted with it. Intended originally for lectures, it is in fact a series of essays on literary problems—more especially as they affect Canadian authors. Their central thought is the need for a higher standard both of motive and of workmanship for the writer, and a more adequate training and a broader outlook for the critics of our literature. Mr. Grove sees Canadian authors as open to two diverse influences, the one that of the great Anglo-Saxon tradition, itself the offspring of the Graeco-Roman and Hebrew classics, which in the main represents the spirit of idealism—the other being the current of materialism and worship of a vulgar success which he considers to be characteristic of the American, or more strictly the United States, literature at the present time. If the writers of our Dominion are to create anything of permanent worth, they must resolutely struggle against this latter stream of tendency, and ally themselves to the great tradition of European writers, while yet seeking to give adequate expression to whatever is vital and individual in the life of their own country. The critic, moreover, if he is to be worthy of the name, must be sufficiently familiar with all the great work of the past to be able to apply the highest standards in his judgment of the writings of his own day. Of real criticism Mr. Grove holds we have now little

or none. Publishers, as well as authors and critics, are subjected to his severe castigation. Their demand that stories shall have "a happy ending" especially excites his anger. And no doubt such a demand is often a stumbling-block in the way of intelligent writers. Yet in revolt from it our author goes to an extreme that cannot be justified, since he maintains that all great work is necessarily expressive of the tragic character of human life, and the happy ending is therefore a sign of weakness. Here our author himself ignores much of what is greatest in the literature of the past. *King Lear*, *Wuthering Heights*, and *Jude the Obscure* deal with tragic issues; but who would demand anything but a "happy ending" for *Tom Jones*, *Pride and Prejudice*, or *Pickwick*? What the writer should claim is complete freedom to work out his theme to what is to him its natural, and therefore its artistically perfect, conclusion. But while one may dissent from some of Mr. Grove's opinions, it is none the less true that there is much in his book that has real value. We certainly feel in Canada the need for a higher standard in literature and criticism, and in these essays is not a little that is fresh, stimulating and thought-provoking.

E. R.

THUCYDIDES AND THE SCIENCE OF HISTORY. By Professor C. N. Cochrane. Oxford University Press. 10s.

This very scholarly book is the work of the present Professor of Ancient History in University College, Toronto. Professor Cochrane is a Canadian, a graduate of Toronto and Oxford. The work is dedicated to the Professor Emeritus of the same chair, W. S. Milner, also a Canadian; and the dedication is very fitting, as many graduates of the Classics Department of Toronto will recognise. It is good to know that somewhere in this country Ancient History, and especially Greek History, is receiving the serious attention it will always deserve.

Professor Cochrane has this for his thesis: that Thucydides received his inspiration and bent from Hippocrates, the Greek medical writer of the fifth century B. C.; that because of this inspiration, and because of the fortunate fact that medicine is concerned with *men as they are*, Thucydides is a *scientific* historian beyond all others. He begins by setting forth the position of medical science in his day (it would have been better had he said "medical science" instead of "biological and medical science"), and by tracing certain resemblances of vocabulary and style, and more particularly resemblances of thought, between Hippocrates and Thucydides. He remarks that Thucydides's account of the Plague in Athens "constitutes the most intimate link between Thucydides and Hippocrates, and seems indeed to be the bridge between the two." Coming to grips with Thucydides's method, he attempts to show that it is purely scientific, and furthermore that it is uniquely scientific among writers of ancient times at least. He devotes separate chapters to Thucydides's conceptions of the State, Inter-State Relations, the Problem of Government, and to his analysis of War and Revolution in the years 431-404 B. C. A subsequent chapter, on the Scientific Tradition after Thucydides, contains some interesting remarks on Polybius.

Professor Cochrane has been a close and attentive reader of the Greek historians and philosophers; he has had a long experience of teaching Ancient History; and he performs, as few could, a valuable service in causing modern readers to traverse once again the notable events of the latter part of the fifth century B. C., and in asking, in the light of all development since: What was it that made Thucydides the great historian he was? He ventures "to suggest an hypothesis better calculated to explain characteristic features of his work than any which has come to the attention of the writer." "The truth is that Thucydides had the assured faith of a scientist because he was a scientist, because in fact he was inspired by contact with a department of positive science which in his day had succeeded in extricating itself from the coils of cosmology, and which, by means of a method adequate to the most rigid modern demands, was already advancing to conclusions which were recognised as valid and immediately significant to human life. From the remarks of Plato it may be inferred that mathematics had in his day reached this point. . . . but mathematics has at best a remote connection with life. On the other hand, biological and medical science deals directly with humanity in its normal and pathological conditions. And in the second half of the fifth century biology and medicine were already established as fruitful sciences in the Hippocratic school. The intellectual and spiritual affiliations of Thucydides were with this school."

This is interesting; but whether Professor Cochrane has established his theory, is another matter. He cites others who have pointed to resemblances between Hippocrates and Thucydides, but complains that they have not pushed the resemblances far enough. Our author pushes them to great lengths. He goes to great lengths also in maintaining that Thucydides is a scientist, and nothing but a scientist, whereas other writers, notably Herodotus, were "religious", "metaphysical", or "philosophical". But there are likenesses between Thucydides and other writers—even Herodotus. The most striking influence, so far as language is concerned, would seem to be the sophists. Another, and very powerful, influence in the direction of realism was the fact that Thucydides was himself actively engaged in the affairs he describes. As Niebuhr said:

"He who has not been an administrator can never write a history; in the study no great historian can develop; a real historical writer must have seen the world."

To be sure, the likeness between the language and ideas of the Hippocratic writings and Thucydides's account of the Plague is very striking; the likeness of the language was noted at least as early as the *Thesaurus* of Stephanus. Aside from this, the similarity can perhaps most easily be seen in his "diagnosis" of War and Stasis, about which Professor Cochrane writes so well in his chapter on War and Revolution, already mentioned. (This chapter might well be read by all students of politics and affairs, whether they have any special interest in Greek historians or not. If space permitted, I should like to amplify this. As it is I wish, with emphasis, to call attention to it.) From the point of view of his own thesis, this is the best chapter in Professor Cochrane's book. Elsewhere I am not sure whether he would not have done better to state the likeness less strongly. For example, pp. 18-23

contain some really thoughtful writing on Thucydides's psychology, and on his postulate of the uniformity of human nature. But in at least one or two passages here he presses the obligation to Hippocrates too hard.

Then again, as to Thucydides being a scientist pure and simple, in contradistinction to all other writers: would not a statement less strong have been better? The author in many places does qualify his statement. He points out the scientific explanation Herodotus gives of the mouth of the river Peneus, etc. He is quite justified in saying that Herodotus often falls back on supernatural explanations. But in other places he is harder to follow. On p. 14 he complains that Herodotus comes to an impasse with the ultimate questions. On p. 23, however, in dealing with Thucydides's method, he says that human nature is ultimate and inexplicable, and must for the science of history be a postulate. Again, our author says that "science cannot know of any cause" of the Plague at Athens, at a critical moment of her history. . . . "For history this is a co-incidence". But surely history could say that the Plague was caused by the overcrowding of the city, and it is extraordinary that Thucydides did not say this, when he was so much under the influence of the Hippocratic "Airs, Waters and Places" —which Professor Cochrane says is "well described as the first exposition of the fundamental principles of public health". He says: "If we praise Thucydides and decry Herodotus at the present day, it is because our spiritual affiliations are with science rather than with philosophy; for Thucydides is the most scientific, as Herodotus is the most philosophic, of historians". Now, aside from the fact that in several respects Herodotus is more modern than Thucydides, several false antitheses are lurking here. Philosophy and science are not the precise negations of each other. Consider Aristotle. Herodotus, according to our author himself, is scientific in part; and I think he would admit that Thucydides is philosophic in part. He speaks of him elsewhere as "moved by a deep confidence in the constitution of man and nature." This is philosophic. There is an even worse confusion of this kind on pp. 104-5, in distinguishing Thucydides, Plato and Aristotle. I do not mean, of course, that the author is confused in his own mind; but, out of brevity, or for some reason, his language is very confused.

All these things have to do with manner of statement, and the statement can be improved when the book goes to a second edition. A change of statement is inherent in the author's own qualifications of his main thesis.

There remains the more fundamental question: whether history is, or ever can be, a science as our author conceives it. Some doubts of his own may perhaps be detected. I do not mean that history cannot be scientific. I do not mean that Thucydides was not partly influenced by Hippocrates. I think both are true. But is not history also an art? It is an old question, on which Hegel and others have had much to say. Ranke boasted: "Ich will bloss sagen wie es eigentlich gewesen". But did he? Could he? Thucydides himself gives the answer in the negative (I. 22), and though blue-books, newspapers, the camera and other things have been invented since his time, an historian can never say just what happened. For reasons of brevity,

for one thing—and Thucydides is the curtest of historians, not even excepting Tacitus. An historian must select, in other words; and in the selection lies his art, in large measure, and his greatness. True, a scientist selects too, but his selection is mere abstraction, whereas in his selection the historian remains concrete. Otherwise history would be mere statistics.

As soon as one hears it said that Thucydides is purely scientific, one thinks of his Speeches. These are artistic inventions. Thucydides himself admits that he put into the mouths of certain persons such speeches as he thought proper to them. Professor Cochrane refers to them as a literary convention taken over from Herodotus. But he goes on to say that just as Hippocrates made *logoi*, or formulations of the truths of medicine, so Thucydides wrote *logoi* or speeches, as an analysis of situations. "But", the inattentive reader might exclaim—or even the critic of this passage, taken by itself—"this is a pun on the word *logos*"; and though the author works out his comparison in a suggestive way, it is only a metaphor after all. Some of his writing in this place is self-contradictory. "Scientific history, as Thucydides argues, has nothing to do with imaginative literature." In that case, the writer of the Speeches is not scientific at all. Scientific indeed he is; but being an historian, he cannot be a scientist merely. He is also an artist, and as such, in spite of all his detachment, reveals himself—a grave Athenian patriot in the generation which saw the decline of Athens and the suicide of Greek civilisation.

Some of what I have said is in disagreement. But Thucydides is one of the very greatest of writers, and men have always disagreed in their interpretations of him, as they have in their interpretations of Shakespeare. He is not a shallow pool, to be explored at a glance. Professor Cochrane has brought to his task not only fine scholarship and hard thinking, but a lifelong interest in politics, which makes many of his *obiter dicta* very penetrating. His work is an honour to himself, and to his two universities.

CARLETON STANLEY.

WHITE NARCISSUS. A Novel, by Raymond Knister, Toronto.
The Macmillan Co. of Canada. 1929.

For some little time past there has been a tendency among Canadian writers of fiction to abandon both the sentimental love-story, with its sickly-sweet atmosphere and conventional morality, and the "stirring" tale of adventure, with its appropriate local colour supplied by Rocky Mountains, mining camps, blizzards and log cabins—all affording a background to the necessary brave hero, fascinating heroine, and scheming villain, and to substitute for this well-worn material realistic, and sometimes even a pessimistic, portrayal of everyday Canadian life in some of its many aspects. Such novels as *Our Daily Bread* by Graves, or *Rockbound* by Ray, and the plays of Merrill Denison, belong to this movement,—on the whole one of promise for our literature. To its influence we may ascribe the present volume. *White Narcissus*, however, is not a wholly successful novel. The style,

though not careless, is sometimes involved; the story moves too slowly, and the characters of the man and woman who are the two principal figures remain throughout shadowy and ill-defined. On the other hand, some of the less prominent persons in the story are interesting, and have vitality. The representation of the life of the farmers and their families in rural Ontario is sympathetic without sentimentality. It will not be surprising if Mr. Knister follows up this book with others of far greater value. He has as yet hardly acquired full mastery over his tools.

E. R.

PRINCIPLES OF THE ENGLISH LAW OF CONTRACT. By Sir William R. Anson. Seventeenth Edition, by John C. Miles, Kt., and J. L. Brierly, Oxford. At the Clarendon Press. 1929. xl and 461 pp. (\$4.50).

This edition marks the jubilee of a famous book which is generally accepted as a classic in the literature of the law. The necessity for seventeen revised editions in a relatively short time testifies eloquently to its usefulness and popularity, as well as to the fact that "English law is a living and changing thing."

This book was designed by its author, a late distinguished public teacher of English law at Trinity College, Oxford, as an elementary treatise for the use of students. The present editors state in their preface that they "have endeavored to preserve the characteristic features and aims of the book as Sir William Anson set them forth. . ." In this they have succeeded in large measure; they have incorporated changes and developments of varying importance in this branch of the law as effected by recent authoritative judicial decisions. One of the most striking of these is a case with Nova Scotia local colour, (Lord Strathcona Steamship Co. v. Dominion Coal Co.), which extends to chattels the equitable doctrine concerning the binding effect of restrictive covenants on subsequent purchasers who buy with notice of them. It is a judgment of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, delivered in 1926. An excellent discussion of this case is included (p. 277). The only serious fault in this edition is that it continues the tendency of its predecessors toward undue bulk. It is, of course, more difficult to modify the original exposition of legal principles to accord with recent authorities than to discuss new cases more or less clearly and elaborately. For a student's use, however, the value of a book lies in its systematic statement of elementary principles, not in extended annotations, erudite as they may be. The present editors are men of proved legal scholarship. Thus it is unfortunate that they did not adhere strictly to the ideal of the author, and compress the work into about three hundred pages, in this way ensuring it against danger of eventual "fatty degeneration."

As law enters into nearly every relation of the social and civil life of mankind, no man can claim to be completely educated who has not at least a knowledge of its elementary principles. Recognition of this has recently led London University to include "law" as one of

the subjects in the final examination for degrees in Arts and Economics. For both the beginning law student and the lay reader, Anson's *Contracts* must remain one of the best and most useful introductions to the lore of the law.

HORACE E. READ.

A HISTORY OF THE COUNTY OF ANTIGONISH, NOVA SCOTIA. By the Rev. D. J. Rankin, Toronto. The Macmillan Company of Canada. 1929.

This handsome volume bears witness to the energy and historical enthusiasm of its learned author. No effort seems to have been spared to make the record complete and authentic. While much of the work is devoted to the genealogies of families belonging to the county, which have necessarily only a local interest, the story it tells of the courage and perseverance with which the pioneers faced the loneliness, hardships and dangers of life in what at its first settlement was an unbroken wilderness is one well worthy of being preserved. Antigonish was settled mainly by Scottish Highlanders, the race that has contributed so largely to the development and the prosperity of Canada, and it is fitting that the simple yet stirring tale of these early settlers in the county should be handed down to their descendants in this beautiful and permanent form.

E. R.

SWINBURNE. By Samuel C. Chew. Little, Brown and Co. Boston. 1929.

Professor Chew in this book gives us both excellent biography and sound literary criticism. We have had recently so many "Lives" in which reality and fancy have been dexterously woven into a romantically coloured tapestry that it is a relief to find a biographer who presents all essential facts sanely and intelligently, leaving the reader to form his own picture from the material put at his disposal. As a critic of Swinburne's art, Professor Chew is acute and discriminating; his appreciation of the poet's wonderful lyrical gift and mastery of the technique of versification does not blind him to the extravagances and verbosity which too often disfigured both his poetry and his prose.

Swinburne indeed presents many difficulties to his commentators. In his person, his art, and his life he is an ambiguous figure. His frail undersized body possessed such recuperative power that again and again, after dissipation had brought him to the edge of the grave, a short period of sane living restored him to health. In his face the weak jaw, retreating chin and small sensuous mouth seemed to give the lie to the massive brow and keen bright eyes. In his life there appear equal inconsistencies; the enthusiast for liberty who literally sat at the feet of Mazzini chanting his *Songs Before Sunrise* became, without renouncing his old creed, a Tory and an Imperialist; and the champion of sensual passion developed into the singer of the innocence

and the charm of babyhood. In truth Swinburne, a man of genius and weak in character, was influenced less by reason than by emotion, and so in apostolic phrase was always "as a wave of the sea driven by the winds and tossed."

It is a little difficult for us of the present day to understand the storm of excitement and protest that arose when *Poems and Ballads* was published in 1866. So much literature of an erotic tendency has since that date appeared, and quietly disappeared again, that we are less disposed to pass harsh judgments upon Swinburne's work than were his contemporaries. When we read of a band of Oxford students (among whom was the future Professor Saintsbury) marching through the Oxford streets and quadrangles chanting "Dolores", we are not so much shocked as amused at the ever-recurring foolishness of youth. Yet the Victorian Mrs. Grundy was not without legitimate excuse. Swinburne had a debased and dirty mind—some of his letters to friends are too indecent for publication—and the influence of his poetry upon the young men of his time was very considerable and very unwholesome.

Dr. Chew gives an excellent valuation of Swinburne's work in literary criticism, pointing out, what is often overlooked, that under all his extravagances of praise and blame there is often to be found a solid residuum of sound judgment and acute discrimination. The extravagances, however, are at times extraordinary. When we read in his Essay on Dickens the following diatribe, it is difficult to realize that its object was that least offensive of men of letters, Andrew Lang:—

The publishers of the Gadshill Series favour us with the prefatory importunities of a writer disentitled to express and disqualified to form an opinion on the work of an English humorist. The intrusive condescension or adulation of such a commentator was perhaps somewhat superfluous in front of the reprinted *Waverley Novels*: the offence becomes an outrage, the impertinence becomes impudence, when such rubbish is shot down before the doorstep of Charles Dickens.

Lang was being punished for differing from Swinburne in regard to the character of Mary Queen of Scots!

E. R.

THE FESTIVAL AND OTHER POEMS. By W. H. Williams-Treffgarne.
Selwyn and Blount Ltd., London.

Mr. Williams-Treffgarne offers a charming collection of verse in minor key. Within his range, which is surprisingly extensive, his tone is clear and true. He is at his happiest, perhaps, in a vein of the gentlest whimsicality and pensiveness, as in *Pastime*:

The children upstairs
Are busy at play;
And father and mother
Are off for the day.
Even grandmother
Is given to sport,
She sits at her window
And plays with a thought.

Deftness and lightness of touch are evident in his propounding of the delicate problem raised in *The Two Voices*:

If any so loves bigamy
 As both a maid and muse to wed,
 And hath a double progeny
 Of songs as well as children bred;
 Then each of them a different way
 Will tug and tug the heart of him,
 But which should he the first obey,
 His child's or muse's whim?

The title-piece of the collection, *The Festival*, tells a pretty story, in light legend fashion, of war in the Peloponnesus as seen by an imaginative boy of Eleusis. Some of the imagery is striking, but the narrative is forced. A plaintive note is sounded in the antepenultimate stanza, in the tale of a Thriasian refugee:

On Athens' fair Acropolis,
 The temples gleamed in vain,
 For him who knew his little farm
 Was burning on the plain.

The Cello, Sleeplessness, Daisies, The Alien, all these are delightful. *Epea Pteroenta* is the poet's avowal of his craft. Altogether, it is pleasant to read in the brevity of this little volume the promise of another in its likeness.

M. M. MACODRUM.

THOMAS FULLER. Selections, with Essays by Charles Lamb, Leslie Stephen, etc. With an Introduction and Notes by E. K. Broadus. Oxford. The Clarendon Press.

This little book represents a concession graciously made by scholarship to entertainment. Attractive in format, authoritative in content, with a series of well-chosen excerpts supplemented by the best available essays, Mr. Broadus's contribution deserves an acknowledgment and a welcome. With the exception of a seven-page Introduction and twelve pages of Notes, no attempt at critical evaluation is made. The *Selections* will bring knowledge to some and delight to many.

M. M. MACODRUM.