

without, the redoubtable Hollander was glad of a respite.

"Still," as Penn said afterwards, remembering those three days, "a Dutchman is never so dangerous as when he is desperate." On Sunday morning, the 21st, the mother-bird was seen as before with her chickens folded by her wings, but now sadly plucked and lamed. For a third time there was the fiercest grappling, this day where the strait is narrowest. How, as the cannon boomed off Dover, the people must have flocked to the cliffs, peering at the distant battle through the wintry air! Penn at last broke through Van Tromp's encircling guard and captured fifty merchantmen. The battered *Triumph*, with Blake on the quarter-deck, in spite of his wound, dashed on after the main body, crashing against craft which, reckless of themselves, tried to block his path. His fleet streamed after him, the cannon never silent, while the crippled masts cracked under the press of canvas. More than half the Dutch men-of-war became prizes, and Blake thought he had grasped the entire fleet. But as pursuers and pursued swept out into the North Sea, a night of storm set in. When morning dawned, Van Tromp had vanished as if he were the Flying Dutchman himself. In their flat-bottomed craft, made for shallow seas, knowing now every inlet and current of the home waters, his ships had fled over and through the dangerous bars, close in shore, where the English dared not follow. The clutch of Blake had been eluded after all. The greater part of the convoy flocked past the Texel towards Amsterdam, bark and cargo safe; while the fighting craft, diminished but defiant, backed now by dangerous shore batteries, offered to the foe their still unconquered broadsides.

Already, it must be remembered, the war had raged for nine months, when Blake and Van Tromp sighted one another off Portland Bill; nor did the indecisive action which has just been described end it. Van Tromp was in the Downs again early in June, with one hundred ships, this time unencumbered by a convoy. Blake's wound kept him inactive, but Lawson broke the Dutch line after the fashion of Rodney against De Grasse, and Nelson at Trafalgar. Poor Dean, the hero of the torn breeches, that day was cut in two by a chain-shot, and Monk showed himself a capital commander. The *Brederode* herself was boarded and on the brink of capture. At the critical moment a match was thrown, it is said by Van Tromp himself, into the magazine. The decks roared into the air with all the English intruders and a great part of the Dutch defenders. Van Tromp, it was supposed, was lost; but coming either out of the air, or the sea, or from some fragment of the ship that had escaped destruction, he was seen, invulnerable as a phantom, on the deck of a fresh, fast-sailing frigate, careered along his shattered and yielding line, trying to rally them to a new encounter. The day, however, clearly went against him; nor was fortune kinder in July. In a conflict fiercer than ever, a musket-ball stretched Van Tromp dead upon his post, and the cause of Holland was lost. That day alone 5,000 men were slain, and in the whole war the Dutch admitted a loss of 1,100 ships.

After the contest with the magnificent Dutch, to encounter other Powers was for the Commonwealth mere child's play, though Blake fought that remarkable battle with a Spanish fleet under the Peak of Teneriffe. Referring the reader to Mr. Hannay's book, we can only mention that Blake's heroic period was comprised within six years. When he was fifty-six years old, decrepit through wounds, worn out with weary tossing, winter and summer, upon desolate seas, he yearned for his native Somersetshire, and with the early summer of 1656 his battered flag-ship, the *George*, crossing the Bay of Biscay, saw before her at

length the loom of the Lizard. Home was at hand, but the Admiral was dying. The ship spread all her canvas, that at least he might die ashore. Her progress, however, was slow, crippled as she was, like the commander, by much service; and off the Start, two hours before they could cast anchor in Plymouth Roads, his spirit fled. Heroic Ironside that he was, he prayed as he fought, whether in the saddle or on the deck, and his rugged followers lifted up their voices in company. Nor was he without fine and gentle traits. He loved his old neighbors and his home, and, like Hampden, Sidney, and Vane, while combatant in the fiercest conflicts, had the graces of a scholar and a gentleman.

PRICE'S LONDON GUILDHALL.—I.

A Descriptive Account of the Guildhall of the City of London: its History and Associations. Compiled from Original Documents, with Facsimile Charters, Maps, and other Illustrations, by John Edward Price. Prepared by authority of the Corporation of the City of London under the Superintendence of the Library Committee. Pp. iii, 298. London, 1886.

ANY one who has seen the Report of the Library Committee, delivered to the Common Council of the City of London on Thursday, December 16, 1886, and who has read Mr. Price's Preface, will turn with the highest expectations to the body of the work.

"A mere architectural description of the building," says the author, "could have been dismissed in a few pages. . . . The true history of the Guildhall is rather to be traced in the numerous traditions and interesting associations by which it is connected with the most important corporation in the world. . . . Associated it has been in one way or another with almost every occurrence of importance belonging to the history of this country, whether such be related to royalty, politics, law, commerce, or public ceremonial. . . . The edifice is one which with the citizens of London must ever command an interest unsurpassed by any other of their public buildings" (pp. ii, 3-4).

The present work originated in the desire of the Corporation to preserve plans and drawings of such portions of the Guildhall as were to be removed for the erection of the new Council Chamber. According to the Report of the Library Committee, it cost £1,596 8s., and three years were devoted to its compilation, a delay of two months being caused by the fire at the printing-house of Messrs. Blades, East & Blades. Mr. Price begins with a consideration of "the origin and development of that municipal life which has made the city what it is" (pp. 4-32); he then traces the architectural history of the Guildhall as a whole (pp. 33-63) and that of its particular parts—the Kitchen, Hall, Crypts, Library, Blackwell Hall, the Aldermen's Court, Council Chamber, and the Offices, including a description of their contents (pp. 63-185), and a brief account of the development of the Mayoralty, the Court of Aldermen, the Common Council, and the offices of Chamberlain, Comptroller, and Town Clerk (pp. 156-185). Then follows a discussion of the subjoined topics: receptions, Lord Mayor's show, trials, the great fire of 1666, lotteries, the Orphan's Court, the new Library, the Museum, and the excavations for the new Council Chamber (pp. 185-256). The work concludes with an Appendix of original documents (pp. 257-296) and an Index (pp. 267-298). The volume contains 7 maps, 38 chromo-lithographs, and 112 woodcuts, most of which are admirably executed.

The portions of the work dealing with the history of the City of London are of most interest to the general public, but are least worthy of commendation. The attempt, on pages 3-9 and elsewhere, to glorify the Corporation of the City of London by showing its Roman origin is far from

successful. The crude analogies traced between its civic functionaries and those of the Roman "municipia" are just as applicable to all civilized nations in all ages—to New York, for example, as well as to London. The fact that some French towns are of Roman derivation, which the author emphasizes as corroborative testimony, proves nothing at all as regards English towns. On page 7 we are asked to accept as further evidence a passage from the mawkish chronicler, Jocelin de Brakelond, namely, the allegation of the Londoners that they had been free of toll everywhere in England from the time of the foundation of Rome, with which that of London was contemporary—"a tempore quo Roma primo fundata fuit, et civitatem Londoniæ eodem tempore fundatam." This evidence is about as reliable as the old inscription on the tablet at Winchester, to the effect that the latter city was built by Ludor Rouse Hudibras, 892 B. C., or as the assertion of the chronicler Fitzstephen ('Vita Sancti Thomæ,' Prologus) that London is much older than Rome—"Urbe Roma; secundum chronicorum fidem, satis antiquior est." Here is some more of the author's profound reasoning on the same subject (p. 14): "They (the London wards) were local divisions, resembling the *curiales* and *regiones* of a classic city. On this there is the emphatic testimony of Fitzstephen, who, after his reference to the use of laws and institutions common to Rome, remarks, 'London is in like manner to Rome distributed into regions.' The wards of New York resemble the *regiones* of Rome about as much as those of London did in the twelfth century, when Fitzstephen wrote his panegyric. The argument in favor of the Roman origin of English towns, so plausibly advanced by Wright and Coote, is impotent and, at times, almost ridiculous in the hands of Mr. Price, who does not in the least shake Loftie's conclusion, that "not a single fact of any kind has yet been adduced that will go even a little way towards proving this romantic theory" ('Historic Towns—London,' p. 14).

In his discussion of English guilds (pp. 24-30) the author displays much irrelevant learning concerning the Roman "collegia opificum," "collegia dendrophorum," etc., but does not present the shadow of a proof in support of his assumption that the former emanated from the latter. Some of this space might have been more advantageously devoted to an inquiry into the history and functions of the "cnichtengild," or gild of knights, which Mr. Price does not even mention in this connection, although some eminent authorities regard it as the quondam governing body of London, from which the Guildhall derived its name. The author next enters into a consideration of the gild merchant, which he would have discussed more intelligently had he been acquainted with the results of recent investigation. If, as he maintains, there really was such a general or dominant gild merchant of London in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, we should certainly meet with some trace of it in the 'Liber Custumarum,' the 'Letter Books,' and other muniments of London. The author's "internal evidence" in support of his position is the fact that the burgesses of Oxford, who had a gild merchant, received a charter from Henry III. granting them all the liberties of London. But it does not necessarily follow that London had every institution of Oxford. A town receiving such a charter was not completely remodelled after its exemplar, but simply grafted upon its own individual polity such of its prototype's liberties as it deemed advisable. The subject is fully investigated in the *Antiquary*, vol. xi, pp. 142-147, 199-203. Norton's statement ('Commentaries,' 3d ed., p. 25) that there is no trace of London ever having had a general mercantile gild, is certainly correct. The historical account of

the various elements of the Corporation—namely, the Mayor, Court of Aldermen, Common Council, Chamberlain, Comptroller, and Town Clerk (pp. 156-185)—is meagre, fragmentary, and inaccurate. Some of these inaccuracies will be pointed out hereafter. Such important topics as the history of the Sheriffs and the growth of the Livery Companies are passed over in silence. A far better account of the constitutional development of the City could easily be compiled from the works of Loffie and Norton.

The author devotes several pages to the determination of the ancient site of the Guildhall (pp. 34-38). Though some of his evidence is of a dubious character, he is probably correct in concluding that the building formerly stood in Aldermanbury, not far from the west end of the present edifice. On pages 44-48 early references to the Guildhall are considered. The earliest given are *circa* 1212 and 1252. In this connection Mr. Price should not have failed to emphasize a passage in the 'Vita Galfridi' of Giraldus Cambrensis (Lib. ii, cap. 8). The latter, in describing the deposition of William Longchamp in 1191, thus pregnantly alludes to the Guildhall: "Convocata vero civium multitudo in aula publica, quæ a pоторum conventu nomen accepit." Again, in the 'Liber de antiquis legibus,' under the year 1244, there is a passage which mentions the Guildhall ("convenientibus Civibus apud Gildhall," etc.), and at the same time elucidates the constitutional history of London. We feel confident that if Mr. Price had searched the records of the city and the old chroniclers more assiduously, he would have found other earlier and more valuable passages than those which he has printed. The year 1410 marks an important epoch in the history of the Guildhall. "In this year also," says Fabyan, "was ye Guyde halle of London begon to be newe edified, and of an olde and lytell cotage, made into a fayre and goodly house as it now appereth." On page 51 Mr. Price gives an English abstract of a valuable document bearing on the subject. The same record is printed more fully in Riley's 'Memorials of London,' pp. 589-591. Mr. Price might well have given us the Latin *in extenso*; it would be far more pertinent than most of the Latin originals printed in his book. This document, which belongs to the year 1413, is evidently the earliest reference to the subject that the author could find in the city archives. Here, too, we entertain strong doubts as to the completeness of his quest.

Throughout the whole work poor judgment is exhibited in the selection and coördination of materials, more space being frequently devoted to accessories than to essentials; some important topics seem to be utilized merely as pegs on which to hang genealogies and other matters either wholly irrelevant or remotely connected with the subject of discussion. On pages 30, 31, for example, we find a long Latin document relating to Oxford which has no connection at all with the point at issue. Pages 39-42, together with a full-page facsimile, belong to the same category. The fact that the greater part of the Guildhall stands in the Parish of St. Laurence, here occasions the author to give a long Latin grant of the Church of St. Laurence made by the Abbot of St. Sauve de Montreuil (pp. 40, 41); this leads him into several incoherent references to the monastery of St. Sauve. Continuing to dilate upon the Parish of St. Laurence, he prints an abstract of a document which only incidentally mentions the Guildhall in 1273 (pp. 42, 43), far more space being occupied with allusions to the witnesses than with the body of the record. On pages 45, 46, where early references to the Guildhall are considered, two-thirds of the matter consists of rambling excursions. The comparison of the size of the main hall with "other buildings

ancient and modern" (pp. 76, 77), and the verbose inscriptions from the monuments in the building (pp. 81-84) might also have been omitted. One of these long inscriptions, containing some 250 words, is printed on page 81, though very legible on a plate facing that page. Pages 49, 115-117, 131, 161, 181, 202, 203, are in great part made up of genealogical digressions concerning persons casually referred to in the text. Of dubious relevancy is the amount of space assigned to Gog and Magog (pp. 89-95), the Lord Mayor's Show (pp. 196-205), and a description of the objects in the Museum (pp. 234-256). On the other hand, in some places we feel the need of more fulness. Some examples of this have already been given. The record on page 164 concerning the election of Aldermen is important, and should have been printed *in extenso*. On pages 168-170 there is a list of what Mr. Price calls the "first recognized Court of Common Council" (A. D. 1247). Why has he not printed it just as it is in the original? And why has he not indicated that the list has already been given to the world by Riley ('Memorials,' pp. liii-lv), with whose version Price's coincides verbatim? Doubtless, too, the city archives contain earlier lists still more worthy of publication. A list of *circa* 1320, with which the author is evidently unacquainted, may be seen in the British Museum—Lansdowne MSS. 558, fol. 204.

Another criticism, equally general, is this, that the author is very negligent in indicating the sources of his information. On page 46 we find the substance of a document which he prides himself on printing for the first time, but he furnishes us no clue to the repository of the original. The same is true of the record containing his "earliest reference" to the Guildhall (p. 44). Pages 52 and 140 are marred by similar omissions. He sometimes cites works without denoting the volume and page (see p. 3, note 1; p. 65, note 2; p. 134, note 1; or without giving the edition (for example, Stow, on pp. 21, 54, 121). Here are some examples of his heedlessness in this direction: "Kemble, Cod. Dip. p. 304" (there are six volumes); "Tacit. 15, Annal."; "Antiquarian Magazine, March, pp. 116 and seq." (pp. 45, 217, 224). The following references are wrong: p. 11, note 1; p. 12, note 3; p. 15, note 2; p. 21, note 1; p. 28, note 1; p. 220, note 2; p. 221, note 1. Doubtless a careful examination of those relating to the 'Letter Books' and other muniments of the City of London would yield a rich harvest of blunders.

SCHERER'S ESSAYS ON GOETHE.

Aufsätze über Goethe. Von Wilhelm Scherer. Berlin: Weidmann. 1886.

THE pervading quality of these essays is well indicated by the first title, "Goethe Philology." Scherer himself had the training of a philologist in the now current sense of the word. With one exception, his most important work was a brilliant contribution to the history of the German language. In his earlier years he was known as a promising Germanist, and such he continued to be to the end, save that his patriotic interest turned more and more from the language to the literature of the fatherland. Being called to Strassburg after the reopening of the University in 1872, he soon began to interest himself as a philologist in the youth of Goethe. In this line of study he was by no means a pioneer. Other scholars, notably Düntzer, had long been engaged in it, but there was just at this time a general *accès* of interest in Goethe's text and in the historical interpretation of it. To study the works, and even the words, of the poet just as he wrote them; to take less counsel of general ratiocination and more of history and philology; above all, to study the works of the poet genetical-

ly, endeavoring to follow him, so far as possible, in every detail of the creative process—this was the essence of the doctrine which began to be extensively preached and practised some fifteen or twenty years ago.

Among the ablest and the most enthusiastic votaries of this doctrine was Scherer. The first fruits of his work in this field are to be seen in the little volume, 'Aus Goethe's Frühzeit,' which appeared in 1879. From that time to the date of his death Goethe seems to have been his favorite study. He contributed to the *Jahrbuch* and to various periodicals a long series of special studies, the most important of which are here published under the editorial supervision of Erich Schmidt, formerly Director of the Goethe Archives at Weimar and now Scherer's successor at the University of Berlin. The book deserves a warm welcome both for its subject's and for its author's sake. It opens many a new vista for the student of Goethe, and it is the work of a highly gifted and inspiring writer.

The first of the essays, already alluded to, is an interesting review, written in 1877, of recent Goethe literature. The second, entitled "Gretchen," is an attempt to get at the facts which underlay Goethe's account of his first love, the Frankfort Gretchen, through whom he was brought into such unpleasant proximity to the criminal courts of his native city. This story, as recounted in 'Dichtung und Wahrheit,' has by some been thought to be a pure invention, and Goethe himself seems on one occasion to have intimated that such was the case. But Scherer finds reason for thinking that the account has a strong basis of fact, and that—which is, however, by no means a new idea—the play "Die Mitschuldigen," with its atmosphere of rascality, was a direct precipitate of this early experience of human depravity. A third study, upon "Goethe as a Lawyer," endeavors to show, contrary to the opinion of a German jurist, that Goethe's briefs were quite different from those of other lawyers of his day. Following this we have a chapter on "Goethe as a Journalist." Concerning the reviews written by Goethe and Merck in 1772, Scherer says that he does not hesitate to rank them with the best that German criticism has produced; he even finds them "brighter, bolder, and less monotonous" than the *Literaturbriefe* of Lessing. A passage in this essay will, for two or three reasons, bear quoting:

"I oppose," says Scherer, "whenever I can the coarse doctrine that reviews are written for the day only, and have no further use than to tell the public in the briefest and clearest manner whether it ought to regard some new book as nice or as abominable. Especially have I no liking for reviews which are intended to annoy or to disparage people, or to vex some third person who has nothing to do with the affair. Even reviews may be works of art. Even reviews may reflect a human soul. Even reviews may essay to become a permanent and valuable possession of the national literature; if only they spring from a pure intent, are written in the service of truth and justice, and reveal the honest thoughts of their authors."

Essays follow upon various incomplete or unwritten works of Goethe—the "Nausikaa," of which we have an outline sketch by scenes, and about a hundred and fifty lines of more or less fragmentary text; the "Iphigenia in Delphi," of which we have nothing save some allusions in Goethe's letters; and the "Pandora," of which we have a large fragment, with a "scheme" for its continuation. Each of these studies is an attempt to describe in some detail the drama that would probably have resulted if Goethe had worked out his theme. Tastes will differ as to the value of such speculations upon what might have been; those who have a fancy for them will doubtless call these essays brilliant specimens of "divinatory criticism." Scherer's ardor does not appear to be at all dampened by the reflection