

conferred upon him. He is made to look upon what is passing around him not in a natural and even casual way, but with the intensity of an impending disaster. The story is told sympathetically, and with a detail that proves the industry of the writer. The entries from the British orderly-books and from the logs of the British vessels near New York enable Mr. Johnston to correct the current story of Hale's capture, and this may be considered the most important contribution made to history by the present volume. Hale's diary while in service is given in full, and the many admirable illustrations and the beauty of print make the volume a worthy tribute to the memory of the man.

*Robespierre: A Study.* By Hilaire Belloc. B.A. Charles Scribner's Sons. 1901.

Beside Mr. Belloc's volume on Danton may now be placed a study of Robespierre which is conceived in much the same spirit and executed in much the same style. The spirit is that of reverence for the Revolution; the style is that of one who is endeavoring to reconcile poetry with prose, and the demands of historical accuracy with an aspiration to interpret the hidden truths of character and motive. Here are deep problems, or rather they would seem such did not Mr. Belloc attack them so lightly. Whatever the shortcomings of this book may be deemed to be by those who admire the National Convention less than Mr. Belloc does, it is instinct with energy. However closely it may seem to identify original power with the love of strange words and unusual phrases, we cannot truly say that the author, in his search for picturesqueness, has merely discovered mannerisms. Striking language will be found in every chapter and on every page. Whether or not it gives pleasure must depend largely upon individual taste. Those who like a copious and fervid diction may be greatly impressed—those who do not may be inclined to close the book at the end of the preface. For ourselves, we have found that Mr. Belloc's strain, as it rushes on from paragraph to paragraph at a sustained pitch of declamation, is somewhat exhausting, but we would not deny him for a moment the merits of good scholarship, ingenuity, and rhetorical skill. Though good taste may be at times overshadowed by assertiveness, this volume pays homage to an idea which now if ever we need to emphasize—the idea, namely, that if historical research is a science, historical composition is an art.

For the average man the name of Robespierre connotes the Terror, and particularly the Great Terror. But here Mr. Belloc intervenes to distinguish between creating and using. "It is a grave historical error to confuse Robespierre with the Terror—indeed, it is an error no longer committed save by historians whose ignorance of the French language and of recent research preserves them in a traditional net." In our opinion the test point is Robespierre's responsibility for the law of 22 Prairial, An II., which "deprived the accused of defenders, dispensed with witnesses, and substituted moral for material proofs [Aulard]." Concerning the fact of his connection with this measure there can be no dispute. He drafted it himself, although Cou-

thon was the agent who presented it. What happened during those ghastly forty-nine days, when 1,376 victims were hurried to the guillotine, is, in one sense, but too well known; yet as to Robespierre's direct part in the carnage some misapprehension still exists. During the last weeks of his life he seldom attended the meetings of the Committee, and no list save that of 2 Thermidor bears his name. Mr. Belloc's hypothesis is, that in the early summer of 1794 he wished to stop the Terror and come forward as the saviour of France. In support of this view, which he admits is not capable of definite proof, the author appeals to some words of Barère: "Robespierre perished because he would have stopped the great career of the Revolution." It seems a risk to lay much stress upon one of Barère's phrases, but Mr. Belloc's point is that the Committee, before waiting to be destroyed, anticipated Robespierre and used the power which was given it in a way he did not approve. Where he had thought himself the master, he found Carnot, Barère, and Prieur, with different aims and considerable determination, in control of the machine. He quarrelled with them and he fell.

Mr. Belloc bases his book chiefly upon the material which was collected by Ernest Hamel, but he does not go nearly so far as Hamel did in vindication of Robespierre. We quote one passage which shows this, and which also shows Mr. Belloc's style when it is not quite at its best:

"The hopeless oneness of structure that is for living things a negation of life, the single outlook and exiguous homogeneity of his mind, made him in the first troubling hopes of the Revolution a shaft or guide, in its dangers and betrayals, an anchor, in its high last and vain attempt to outstrip our human boundaries, a symbol, and in its ebb of return to common living a tedium and a menace. For when men of human complexity reposed at last in victory, and had leisure to balance things again, he was seen to have neither instructive human foreknowledge nor the sad human laughter, and there was no exile in his eyes."

It would be a capital omission in giving an account of this book to neglect Mr. Belloc's personality. Where the writer keeps himself in the background, the reviewer has no excuse for dragging him upon the stage, but where, as in the present case, a large number of confidences are frankly offered, there can be no reason why one should not take notice of the fact. In a word, Mr. Belloc shows signs of possessing a certain quality which he shares with Cicero, Rousseau, and Charles Sumner. He is neither reticent about expressing his own sentiments nor weakened by any distrust in the value of his own judgments. Thus, a good deal of his eloquence suggests the college debating society, while the marks of youthfulness may be seen from the first sentence, in which he sits "alone at evening before a fire of logs in a room near the Rue St. Honoré," to the last in which he refers to himself as one who hopes for better things. Were Mr. Belloc devoid of talent, it would not be worth while to notice a fault of manner which threatens to become serious. We only criticize this aspect of the book because we have a sincere belief that, if the author is willing to use a little more repression, he can write considerably better than he has done as yet. Of course, every man must develop his own style, and no one should demand that individuality be unduly

checked; but, in this instance, the danger does not lie on the side of self-effacement.

This is not an ordinary biography, but an interpretation of character, which, as respects the treatment of literature and history, follows canons of its own. If in some ways it is marred by affectation, it cannot be termed commonplace, and from time to time it reaches the pitch of eloquence which it so constantly strives to attain.

*The Georgian Period: Being Measured Drawings of Colonial Work.* By Frank E. Wallis, C. Bertram French, E. P. Morrill, E. Eldon Deane, Theo. H. Skinner, C. M. Bill, and others. Part IX. American Architect & Building News Co. 1902.

In repeated notices in these columns the great excellence of this collection has been pointed out. Sometimes the number is devoted to large plates, mainly copies of line drawings; sometimes it is rather to photographs of the existing house or church that its space is given up; sometimes there is a sheet or two of text with inserted illustrations. The number before us partakes of all of these characteristics. Mr. Paul Waterhouse, an English architect, contributes an article, which is illustrated with photographs by W. Galsworthy Davie—a well-known compiler of important architectural books. The title of it is "The Relation of Georgian Architecture to Carpentry"; and the half-tone prints, nineteen in number, of European origin, though some of the American examples invade the English writer's text, is followed by what appears to be an editorial note on Seventeenth Century Houses, and that by an article on Dutch and German eighteenth-century work, all apparently in America. There is also an article by Theodore H. Skinner on the University of Virginia, and one by James Eastus Price on the Cape Fear district of North Carolina. The illustrations in these papers are partly half-tone prints and partly reproductions of drawings. After we have turned over the five sheets of printed matter (folio size, let it be remembered), we come to the plates, these again partly pictorial views taken by the camera from nature, but in this instance much more frequently reproductions of line drawings made with the T-square and triangle in the orthodox architectural way. Those rigidly drawn details are pretty sure to be accurate—at least it is a point of honor among persons who make *relevés* of this kind to give the exact curve and the right number of flutes or of billets, and so these drawings at least do not belie the character of the original. So much is not to be said of the drawing of the very interesting front door and steps of the Cowles house at Farmington, for here that which is in reality a smooth and smug piece of neo-classic work, with well-levelled and well-pointed brickwork and glossy, white-painted wooden door, columns, entablature, festoons, and fanlight—all as neat as the tool could make it—is turned by the draughtsman's art into something very picturesque indeed, like a fourteenth-century front door in Normandy. Nothing but praise, however, can be given to the drawing of the church tower in Plate 19. There, in despite of the temptations to a false picturesqueness, the hard, square-edged, boxy look of the original tower is preserved, and there can be no higher praise than that when we

are considering, not landscape art, but the facts of existing architecture.

A small prospectus laid within the cover states that there will be only three parts more of the work. The price of publication is not clearly given in this prospectus; but that is indifferent, as information can be obtained by writing to the American Architect & Building News Co.

*What Is Christianity?* Lectures delivered in the University of Berlin during the Winter Term, 1899-1900, by Adolf Harnack. Translated into English by Thomas Bailey Saunders. G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1901.

In his preface to the English edition of this important work, Professor Harnack says that theologians "only half discharge their duties if they think it enough to treat of the gospel in the recondite language of learning, and bury it in scholarly folios." But not all who can use the recondite language can, at the same time, express themselves in such a simple and straightforward manner as does Professor Harnack in these lectures. Many who have followed him through the laborious dullness of his 'History of Dogma,' will wonder at the ease and freshness of his present form. They will wonder more when they read in Mr. Saunders's preface that these lectures were delivered extemporaneously. An enthusiastic hearer took them down in shorthand and presented Professor Harnack with a complete report of what he had said. A few corrections were sufficient to bring the lectures into their present shape. Harnack is not a prophet without honor in his own country. It gives some idea of his vogue that these lectures were attended by 600 students from all departments of the Berlin University.

Perhaps their most interesting aspect is the comment they afford on the pious flurry which, not long ago, was occasioned by Professor Harnack's critical estimate of the chronology of the New Testament books. The more conservative hailed that estimate as reactionary to a remarkable degree, and those who knew least of the details of the criticism were most vociferous in their delight that the learned professor had become as one of them. In fact, the criticism was reactionary only as related to such an extreme throwing forward of New Testament dates as that of F. C. Baur; it remained farther from the traditional standpoints than the radical criticism of Renan, notably with reference to the Fourth Gospel, which Professor Harnack cannot assign to the Apostle John. But what was most significant in the jubilation over Professor Harnack's "reaction" was the inference from his earlier dates that everything in the New Testament must be taken at its face value, with the effect of a complete endorsement of the traditional theology. To read these lectures is to become aware how far any one entertaining such ideas reckoned without his host. For Professor Harnack the New Testament literature is a distorted shadow of things actually said and done—not an exact report of them—while his construction of the nature and character of Jesus is far less conservative than the older Unitarianism in America, or than the English type even.

While Prof. Harnack is commonly re-

garded as an eminent representative of the Ritschlian school, there is little here to identify him with it—beyond his frank distaste for an elaborate Christology. To the doctrine of Christ's double nature he has a particular aversion. After a preliminary chapter, the next following discusses the sources of information and certain prominent aspects of the history. We read of the Fourth Gospel that it "does not emanate or profess to emanate from the Apostle John," and, though "not altogether devoid of a real, if scarcely recognizable traditional element, it can hardly make any claim to be an authority for Jesus's history." Strauss's mythical theory is rejected in set terms, while at the same time immense concessions are made to it. All the birth-stories are frankly brushed aside, and the accounts of miracles are reduced to "the sifted sediment of a residuum." Cures may have been effected by the spiritual force of Jesus, but nearly all the miracle stories arose from misconceptions of one kind or another. Of the traditional evidential miracle—a violation of natural law—no shred is suffered to remain. At the same time, it is contended that the Synoptic Gospels give us a clear account of Jesus's teachings, of "his life's issue in his vocation," and of the impression which he made on his disciples and which they transmitted. Good reasons are given for denying to Jesus any sympathetic relations with the Essenes. Those for the absence of any Greek influence are less satisfactory, and seem to suffer something like contravention from Professor Harnack himself.

The message of Jesus is declared to be one of great simplicity—that the kingdom of God was coming; the infinite value of the human soul; the higher righteousness, and the commandment of love. It is conceded that, over against the kingdom of God, Jesus saw a kingdom of the devil, sharing this idea with his contemporaries. There is something very naïve and pathetic in Professor Harnack's plea for a kindly judgment of this mistaken view. He is quite sure that our modern opinions have their husk as well as kernel, and that we too shall require kindly judgment of our posterity. Surely this is about as far from the identification of Jesus with the infinite God as a genial scholarship can go.

In a succession of interesting chapters we have the teachings of Jesus considered in their relations to asceticism; to the social question, especially as affecting the poor; to questions of law and order; to civilization in general; to Christology; and to matters of doctrine and creed. In several of these chapters, were Tolstoy never mentioned, we should know that Professor Harnack had him vividly in mind. But he refers to him frequently, and it is mainly against him that he endeavors to free Jesus from the implications of asceticism, a drastic view of property, and opposition to all legal requirements and the use of force. Clearly upon this ground Professor Harnack does not fight as one who beats the air. Among his six hundred students, doubtless there were many Tolstoians, socialists, anarchists. One cannot but admire the deftness of his exegesis, while unable to agree with him that the teachings of Jesus are perfectly evident. Where it requires so delicate an instrument as Professor Harnack's exegesis to separate Christ's apparent teachings from the real, it is not strange

that so many have gone quite astray. The general contention is that Christ's concern was entirely with the individual, and that we have no right to go to him for answers to specific social questions or for particular political programmes.

Coming to Christological matters, the simple humanity of Jesus is set forth in terms of unmistakable lucidity: "This feeling, praying, working, struggling, and suffering individual is a man who, in the face of his God, associates himself with other men." "The gospel as Jesus proclaimed it has to do with the Father only, and not with the Son." There is a lack of clearness at one point: we are told that Jesus did not claim to be the Son of God, and elsewhere we are told in what sense he made this claim (pp. 138, 156). The view of his Messiahship is opposed to Wellhausen's, which Martineau adopted, viz., that Jesus did not think of himself as the Messiah. Professor Harnack's view appears to us much more credible than the view to which it is opposed. Of the teaching that to appropriate the gospel a man "must learn to think rightly about Christ," he says, "That is putting the cart before the horse."

The most central interest of a chapter on the Apostolic Age pertains to the resurrection of Jesus. We are assured that faith in immortality is independent of "a foundation unstable and always exposed to fresh doubts." We cannot be so much as certain that Paul knew the story of the empty grave. Paul has a chapter to himself. It denies with equal confidence that Paul founded Christianity and that he corrupted it. He continued it in the spirit of its founder; but his metaphysical treatment of Jesus was the source of many ills. Of these we hear much in the chapters on Greek and Roman Christianity. Especially in the former, Professor Harnack's foot is on his native heath, he has so carefully, in his 'History of Dogma,' elaborated the development of the Catholic Church through its struggle with Gnosticism. The part played by theological fictions in this development is not concealed, nor does Professor Harnack refrain from the damnable heresy that the chief of these was the identification of the Logos with Jesus with which the Fourth Gospel sets out. The indictment of Greek and Roman Christianity is very stern. Both are pronounced foreign to the gospel, which they only accidentally preserve. It is conceivable that a Greek or Roman Christian would have written these chapters differently; the one on Protestantism, also—though Professor Harnack puts his finger, there, on many ailing spots.

*Chine Ancienne et Nouvelle.* Par G. Weulersse. Paris: Armand Colin.

The author of this lively work, who has a good French style, enjoys a travelling fellowship of the University of Paris. He gives here his reflections and impressions of the oldest nation, that may yet be the youngest in the list of the world's surprises. At Hong Kong he was struck with the extreme originality of a modern city which includes two great civilizations, Oriental and Occidental, and was mightily impressed with the grandeur of England in the East—her unnumbered ships and the wonders