

criticism of his brother's literary work he speaks out plainly and strongly, thus lending greater weight to his account of it.

Much of the value of this *Life* of Sir J. F. Stephen is in showing that while he failed to secure the measure of success which his own honest ambition and the just estimate of his friends anticipated, yet he influenced other men in such a way as to make them strong and useful. His whole life was one of hard work, and he thoroughly enjoyed it for its own sake and not for any reward or honor that it might bring. His was a manly independence, of perhaps a little too rough a nature to commend him either to the people who had votes to give to a popular candidate for Parliament, or to the men in high office who had the power to give great places to those who served them with strong fidelity to party and unquestioning obedience. It was not in Stephen's nature to do this, — he thoughtfully reasoned out his own course in law, in politics, in theology, in metaphysics, and he was slow to change his views, but ready to confess his errors when he finally was convinced. Naturally such a man did not win university honors or gain a seat in Parliament or achieve great success at the Bar or popularity on the Bench, — indeed, he had for his personal comfort too little respect or regard for these or any conventional standards, — but he had a strong and manly nature, an intellectual superiority, an ambition to do good work, that made him a man of mark in his lifetime and that give his biography a special value of its own. Mr. Leslie Stephen's best qualities as a man of letters are shown in the capital way in which he has subordinated his own opinions and views of life, especially of intellectual life, in order to give to the world a clear and strong portrait of his brother, and we may be sure that his picture of Sir J. F. Stephen will be the one dearest to those who knew and loved the man, and to that larger circle of those who knew his work and respected its excellence.

J. G. ROSENGARTEN.

*Wolfe.* By A. G. BRADLEY. [*English Men of Action.*] (London and New York: Macmillan and Co. 1895. Pp. viii, 314.)

MR. BRADLEY has written an eminently readable book. The material for a biography of Wolfe is scanty, and already pretty well known through Wright's admirable *Life*. If we have now little that is new, the old story is retold with vigor and grace.

Wolfe's glory is the glory of one brilliant success, but he had the staying qualities of genius. Without money or powerful friends, he yet, even in Walpole's corrupt days, secured rapid promotion in the army by his own conspicuous merits. At twenty-two he was entrusted with the pacification of a whole district in Scotland. His genius was of the kind that takes infinite pains. His captains furnish him with an estimate of the characters of each of their men. Ill and worn-out at Quebec, he yet finds time and strength to visit two young subalterns lying ill on a transport.

On his last field he found opportunity in the hurry of battle to seek out a wounded officer and promise promotion. With these qualities, which won the love of others, he was unwearied in self-improvement. At Glasgow he employs tutors from the University and is deep in mathematics and classics. He is an enthusiastic student of the art of war. His despatches are masterpieces. So good were they that it was whispered that Townshend, his highly educated brigadier, must have written them; but in time Townshend wrote poor despatches for himself. "If your brother," said George Selwyn to Charles Townshend, Pitt's successor at the War Office, "wrote Wolfe's despatches, who the devil wrote your brother's?" Wellington's despatches are masterpieces too, but Wolfe surpasses Wellington in scholarly tastes and dignity of character. Flip-pant oaths would have sounded incongruous on Wolfe's lips. We do not know what he could have done in strategy or tactics on a great European field. Dettingen was the only battle between disciplined forces that he saw, and he was then but sixteen. He fought at Culloden against wild Highlanders, and on the Plains of Abraham against regulars mingled with militia troops and Indians.

Mr. Bradley slips sometimes. It was not Horace, but Sir Robert, Walpole, who said, "They may ring their bells: they will soon be wringing their hands" (p. 9). The governor of Virginia was not always "titled" (p. 94). Canada in 1759 consisted of something more than scattered settlements stretching down the St. Lawrence from Montreal (p. 98). There were not "a mill, a mansion, and a church" on each seignior (p. 99). The churches were built as convenience prompted, and were generally less numerous than the seigniories. Louisbourg scarcely "commanded the mouth of the St. Lawrence" (p. 103). "The Canadas" did not exist until Upper Canada was established after the British Conquest (p. 141). On the other hand, one feels grateful to him for calling attention to an English archaism that the unwary would now call a new and vulgar Americanism. The sport was "elegant," says Wolfe of some grouse-shooting in Scotland.

The monument at Quebec which commemorates Wolfe and Montcalm with equal eulogy is probably unique. Recently, when a project was on foot in Canada to erect a memorial to some of the British who fell in the war with the United States in 1812-1815, Mr. Goldwin Smith offered to devote to the purpose the profits of his History of the United States, if an inscription in terms of international reconciliation were placed upon the monument.

This volume, like the others of the series, is crippled for want of an index.

GEORGE M. WRONG.

*A History of the Presbyterian Churches in the United States.* By ROBERT ELLIS THOMPSON, D.D. ["American Church History" Series.] (New York: The Christian Literature Co. 1895. Pp. xxxi, 424.)

THE Rev. Robert Ellis Thompson, D.D., of Philadelphia, was selected by the Editorial Committee of the American Society of Church History, to write the history of the Presbyterian churches in the United States, for the series on "American Church History" which the Society planned, in the confidence that he could be trusted to present the facts in an impartial, scholarly, and interesting way. This confidence he has in the main justified.

The book opens with an excellent bibliography of fully 20 pages, distributed under periods. Similar bibliographies are given in each volume of the series, and constitute one of its most useful features. Then comes a single chapter on the historic antecedents, in the Old World, of the Presbyterian churches of the United States. To Calvin and John à Lasco Presbyterian polity is properly traced. From them it became the polity of the Reformed churches of the continent, and of the Scottish Church. But American Presbyterianism is really derived from Ulster, whither Scottish Presbyterians had emigrated in large numbers, in the early part of the seventeenth century, and whence they were driven to this country by prelatical oppression and troublesome landlords. The founder of American Presbyterianism is the Rev. Francis Makemie, who landed in 1683, and in Philadelphia was moderator of the first presbytery in 1705. Immigration from Ulster to America began in the closing decades of the seventeenth century, and set in on a great scale in the eighteenth century. As there were several species of Presbyterianism in the old country, it is not to be wondered at that the imported at once showed these varieties. Presbyterians were fond of argumentation upon small points, and so they divided among themselves on the old lines, and later on new ones. To-day, although much consolidation has taken place, and there has been a marked falling off of polemical zeal, there are still four distinct varieties of Presbyterianism among us, viz. the Presbyterian Church, *par excellence*, North and South, the Cumberland Presbyterians, the United Presbyterians, and the Reformed Presbyterians. They stand in this order in influence, numbers, wealth, and prospects, and there are few signs that these bodies will unite. Dr. Thompson tells the story of the growth of these species, giving much the larger space, properly, to the great Presbyterian Church, North and South. But in trying to follow several lines of development, he occasionally gets the skeins a little tangled and the reader's attention is distracted.

How modern the book is, is seen by the chapters on the Briggs and Smith cases, and that on the proposed Theological Seminary control. Probably many will turn to see what the author has to say upon the Briggs matter, and some will be surprised at his strictures upon the General