

generally improves on that of Trumpp (where it follows the same text), besides adding a noteworthy body of material expressly ignored by Trumpp, because he did not think it worth translating. As an official in the Punjab, the author had an exceptional opportunity to make the preliminary studies necessary to the undertaking here happily completed and he has done well what he set out to do. It is a pity, however, that the latter sects were not treated more fully. Here there is a lack still to be adequately supplied. It is also to be regretted that Mr. Macauliffe has not shown a more just, as well as more generous, appreciation of what others have done.

*The Cambridge History of English Literature.* Edited by A. W. Ward and A. R. Waller. Vol. IV: Prose and Poetry; Sir Thomas North to Michael Drayton. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. \$2.50 net.

The interest of such a work as this history of English literature is bound to fluctuate with the nature of the material which is dealt with in the successive volumes, and, as it happens, the material which the present volume embraces is, taken as a whole, not of the most interesting character. There are some notable exceptions, of course—Raleigh, Bacon, Donne, Burton, and the Authorized Version of the Bible—but the great names, for the most part, belong to other volumes. Sidney and Spenser are behind us, Shakespeare and the whole starry host of the Elizabethan dramatists are still to come. The best poetry included in the present volume, being lyrical, is the most difficult to make interesting in a critical exposition. In addition, it must be confessed that, with the exception of Mr. Whibley's treatment of the Elizabethan translations, there is singularly little distinction of style in the various chapters. This accords with the paucity of eminent names among the contributors; but, after all, we fear that it is the fault of our generation rather than of the editors that, despite the competence in scholarship which they may justly claim for their collaborators, there should be so little of the *vis viva* of literary criticism in most of the chapters that deal with literature, pure and simple. One feels that the generation which produced the first series of Morley's "Men of Letters" would have made a better showing in this respect, if indeed it is conceivable that so distinguished a band of critics (of whom, to be sure, a few are still active) would have submitted themselves to the yoke of science in the form of an enterprise like the present one. In any event, some of the best chapters in the volume before us—for example, Archdeacon Cunningham's on Early Writings on Poli-

tics and Economics, H. G. Aldis's on The Book-Trade, 1557-1625, and J. Bass Mullinger's on The Foundation of Libraries—deal with matters which, though of great importance, are merely subsidiary to literature, properly speaking.

Of the four authors to whom separate chapters are devoted, viz., Raleigh, Campion, Drayton, and Donne, the last-named has been the most fortunate in his critic, Prof. H. J. C. Grierson of the University of Aberdeen. Mr. Grierson has given us an adequate picture of this original and complex personality, and he has indicated very justly the influences which entered into his genius. We miss, however, any comment (except in the case of the satires) on the peculiar rhythms of Donne's verse which have been so subtly characterized of recent years on this side of the ocean by Prof. H. M. Belden. Neither can we share in the author's apparent admiration for Donne's letters, which strike us as among the most unreadable compositions that ever came from the pen of a great author. On the other hand, the letters of his friend, Sir Henry Wotton, the earliest in our language, as it seems to us, that possess literary charm, are passed over in silence in this history.

Prof. Albert S. Cook, the only American contributor to the present volume, has written interestingly of the early translations of the Bible, and especially of the Authorized Version and its influence. It seems an indiscriminate criticism, however, which in a characterization of the Bible makes no distinction between the Old and the New Testament. There is surely an enormous difference between the two. Vast, moreover, as the influence of the Bible has been in the sphere of morals, it is an exaggeration from the purely literary point of view to speak of it as "possessing a universality which has placed it at the foundation, or the head, or both, of all modern literatures." This might much more truly be said of the literature of Greece. Professor Cook discusses satisfactorily the nature of the influence which the Authorized Version has exercised on subsequent English literature, but his conclusion from the limited vocabulary of the Bible as compared with Shakespeare's abundance, viz., that "the capacities of words, especially of the simpler words, are much greater than is believed by those who use a large and heterogeneous vocabulary" seems beside the mark. The greater complexity of the civilization which Shakespeare's plays reflect and the immense variety of subjects which he wrote about, of human facts and relations that he touched upon, as Professor Jespersen has reminded us, will account for the difference. It strikes us, too, as hardly fair to Shakespeare when Professor Cook contrasts to his disad-

vantage the praise of man in "Hamlet," Act ii, Scene 2—"What a piece of work is a man!" etc.—with the famous passage in the Eighth Psalm, "What is man that thou art mindful of him," etc. In the first place, the latter is hardly genuine prose. The Hebrew original is a lyric and the lyrical rhythm in the English translation is unmistakable and an important element in its beauty. Furthermore, the prevailing quality of the passage from the Psalm is sublimity, for which there is no place in Hamlet's speech. Indeed, it is the adoration of God's omnipotence even more than the exaltation of man that finds its expression in the words of the Hebrew poet. And in addition to all this we must take into account, as Professor Cook himself acknowledges, the dramatic fitness of the passage in "Hamlet."

Some of the more important authors find competent treatment in chapters which deal with various branches of literature—Burton in a chapter by Edward Bensly, which also includes the Latin writers, Barclay and Owen; Bacon in the chapter on the Beginnings of English Philosophy, by W. R. Sorley; Nash, Greene, and Dekker (as prose-writers) in one on Popular Literature by H. V. Routh. There are, besides, chapters which add greatly to the usefulness of the work as a book of reference, viz., The English Pulpit, by F. E. Hutchinson, Writers on Country Pursuits and Pastimes by H. G. Aldis, and Literature of the Sea and Seafaring and Travel by C. N. Robinson, R.N., and John Leyland. The very ample bibliography at the end of the volume is not the least valuable part of it.

The editors announce that Vols. V and VI will deal with the English Drama down to 1642, and Vol. VII with non-dramatic literature, mainly of the period between 1625 and 1660. The last-named volume is to appear before the end of the year.

*The Decay of the Church of Rome.* By Joseph McCabe. New York: E. P. Dutton & Co. \$2.50.

Dr. McCabe, a former Catholic and member of the Franciscan Order, is known already for more than one sharp attack on the church of his youth. The present volume is an elaborate statistical study in demonstration of the thesis that "instead of showing signs of increase the Church of Rome is rapidly decaying, and only a dramatic change of its whole character can save it from ruin." The author claims to be entirely unprejudiced in his treatment of the matter, but neither his past relations with the Catholic Church nor the book itself inspires confidence in his freedom from bias. Such statements as the following reveal his general attitude:

Catholic countries are disappearing from the map of the world (p. 13).

A day will come when historians will wonder how the Vatican ever acquired a reputation for statesmanship. In the small momentary ruses of diplomacy it has usually been able to command the services of skilful men, but its whole management of the Latin races has been devoid of any large statesmanship (p. 12).

Contrary to a widespread conviction, there has been no progress made by the Roman Church during the nineteenth century in any normally educated portion of the English-speaking world (p. 194).

This rapid survey will show the reader at once that the terrible figure of 120,000,000 illiterates in a total of 190,000,000—a figure that, of course, I have obtained by careful analysis—is in reality a very moderate one. It means, in plain English, that the majority of the Roman Catholics of the world to-day consist of American Indians, half-castes, negroes, and mulattoes; Italian, Spanish, Russian, and Slavonic peasants of the most backward character; and Indian, Indo-Chinese, and African natives. These make up much more than half of the whole. Further, the great bulk of the remainder are the peasants and poor workers of Germany, Austria, France, Belgium, and Ireland. . . . When we note the extraordinary impotence of Catholicism in the great cities of Europe; when we learn in country after country, that the middle class forsook it a generation ago, and the artisans are abandoning it to-day; when we find its authority rejected almost in proportion as a nation is touched with culture; and when we see that its larger tracts of unchallenged authority so constantly correspond with the darker areas in the cultural map of the world—we see that its power rests largely on a basis that is directly and triumphantly challenged by the modern spirit—a basis of ignorance (p. 305).

That the figures of the book differ so widely from those ordinarily given by statisticians both Catholic and Protestant is explained by such a passage as the following, which shows how the author ventures to go behind the official returns:

But I decline to regard as a Catholic one who never goes to mass or Easter communion, or who habitually supports political parties that are sternly condemned by, and openly hostile to, the Church. Where there is obviously neither belief nor obedience to commands that, on the most familiar Catholic principles, bind under pain of eternal damnation, I do not see how a census declaration that one is a Roman Catholic can be taken seriously (p. 301).

Of course, any study based upon such a method of computation is liable to large error, and from the same figures many others, even Protestants, would draw vastly different conclusions. Not a few of the facts given and some of the results reached are indisputable, even though surprising to any one who has not already looked somewhat carefully into the matter. That the Roman Catholic Church has been losing ground in other countries as well as in France during recent decades, and that the authorities of the church are themselves

alive to the fact, cannot be doubted. But the situation is by no means so serious as this book represents it. A similar method applied to Protestantism would in many cases lead to similar results. Lukewarmness toward the church, or even open hostility to it on the part of large sections of the population, is no sign of a speedy dissolution, as history has abundantly shown. It is easy to predict imminent disaster, but those who so prophesy know little of the reserve force and recuperative power of Christianity, whether Protestant or Catholic.

*Sir Henry Vane, Jr., Governor of Massachusetts, and Friend of Roger Williams and Rhode Island.* By Henry Melville King. Providence, R. I.: Preston & Rounds Co. \$1.25 net.

The memorable friendship between two great leaders in the cause of political and spiritual freedom finds here a worthy setting forth. Few men of the seventeenth century are better worth remembering, and Dr. King does a service in showing how they helped each other, culling out from the stormy career of each champion the facts bearing upon their mutual relations, and including them in a little book by themselves. He addresses especially Rhode Islanders; speaker and audience being, of course, imbued with the Rhode Island tradition, which has been held most tenaciously in every generation. The calm and tolerant William Bradford of Plymouth characterized Roger Williams as "a man godly and zealous, having many precious parts, but very unsettled in judgment." Your true Rhode Islander, and Dr. King is one, admits no shortcoming in his saint, nor would Dr. King's special audience take kindly to any such suggestion. But outsiders must be pardoned for deferring much to Bradford, who basked under the immediate effluence of the halo; and for believing, while greatly admiring Roger Williams, that his unsettled judgment, combined with his extraordinary force, made him in trying times an uncomfortable, not to say dangerous, neighbor. As the saint was impeccable, so in Dr. King's view was the saint's friend. Dr. King appears to believe that Vane at the outset, in Massachusetts, though scarcely out of boyhood, was yet a character fully formed; that he was an Independent in religion, a republican in politics, an out-and-out champion of freedom of conscience; that he received no impress from the strong men by whom he was surrounded; that in his later career his course was invariably wise. Dr. King seems to adopt Wendell Phillips's conception, that, while for other men we are obliged to walk backward, casting a mantle over their infirmities, and saying "Remember the temptation and the age,"

Vane never fell below the highest standard. We think it would be truer to say that Vane in Massachusetts was quite unformed. Religiously he showed small trace of the fanaticism which in later life carried him to unintelligible lengths; and as regards tolerance, while his utterance in the controversy with Winthrop is indeed noteworthy, it is obscure and hesitating as compared with later declarations. In politics, it cannot be shown that Vane stood on republican ground till after 1648, after the rank and file of the Ironsides had made their stout push for sovereignty of the people.

In Massachusetts he stood for the authority of the King. This appears in his controversy with Winthrop, as well as in his course against the zealots who cut the cross out of the royal ensign. He had the ensign unfurled at the Castle. He accepted knighthood and preferment from the King, sullenly we grant; but "root and branch" man though he soon became, it was long before he dropped allegiance to the ancient triple-pillared polity of England: King, lords, and Commons. With Pym and Hampden, in the first years of the Long Parliament, he stood for a proper balance there against the danger of an overweight in the royal prerogative. The radical programme was some years in the future.

Is Vane's "ermine" quite so "spotless" as has been claimed? Milton calls him skilful

. . . to unfold  
The drift of hollow states hard to be spelled.

He was matchless in unearthing the plots of foreign foes and secret enemies at home, and it is hard to see that he did not sometimes fight the devil with his own fire here. His course in the movement which finally brought Strafford to the block ought, we think, to give pause to those who claim for him the finest sense of honor. The negotiation of the Solemn League and Covenant, which brought the Scots, in 1643, to help the perishing cause of the Houses, was a masterpiece of astuteness; but the Scots loudly declared they had been "cozened," a cry which the Cavaliers reëchoed. They were Vane's enemies, no doubt deserving little sympathy, but will the careful modern reader say that this transaction was thoroughly fair and above board? Does not the subtlety in the engineering of the Self-Denying Ordinance savor overmuch of the wisdom of the serpent? With all due respect for Wendell Phillips, we think we are sometimes obliged, in Vane's case to say: "Remember the temptation and the age." The stress was great, treachery was to be met, the spirit of Machiavelli pervaded the statesmanship of the time. We hold that Vane did not come out of that bat-