

the home's peculiar functions. To guide and inspire the children in memory work is something the home can do better than can any other agency, and better, perhaps, than it can do many other things. The home deals with individuals; it has them regularly, steadily, every day, seven days in the week. The time is indeed short, but this defect in quantity is made up by the unique element of quality. The time which the children naturally devote to their parents, and when they claim their parents for themselves, is the sweetest, most impressionable, of all the times of day. I mean bed time and prayer time. Then the interests and distractions of the active day fade. Then the child turns with intense eagerness, all the greater for this absence and absorption in school and at play, to his mother—and to his father, if his father be parent and not merely progenitor—for companionship, for confidences, for story-telling, for

reading of literature, and for worship. And it is reasonable to hold that, in the pressure of the week's engagements, which bears not less heavily nowadays upon the children than upon the adults of the household, there can be one other stated time for worship and for instruction—the quiet hour on Sunday. May I not, then, seriously and earnestly propose—and to clear myself of cant I may confess that I am trying to bolster up my own resolution by this public announcement of personal intention—that we as parents sacredly devote some stated time to guiding, helping, and inspiring our children at home to learn by heart precious portions of Scripture and such-like language, in the belief that thereby, in a unique and indispensable way, we shall be filling their minds, forming their characters, feeding their souls, and giving them, as it were in fee simple, the very essence of a priceless heritage?

Five Years of Robert E. Lee's Life¹

By Edwin Mims

Professor of English Literature, Trinity College, North Carolina

THE most recent account of General Lee's life lays special emphasis on the period from 1865 to 1870. It offers little light on his early life, or on his military career; it is Lee the husband and father, the peaceful citizen, the college president, who stands out vividly in the reader's mind. And well is it so, for the record of these years is the most precious legacy committed to the Southerners of the present generation. Lee's magnanimity in defeat, his ready acceptance of the new order of things, his moderation and restraint under most trying circumstances, his steadfast hope in the future of his section, and his noteworthy effort towards the building up of an institution of learning, constitute the most glorious chapter in a very noble life. A typical product of the old South, inheriting the best blood of several generations of Vir-

ginia gentlemen and gentlewomen, he was a leader in the development of the new South.

General Lee's spirit and his work should be to the South a constant protest against passion and prejudice and provincialism. Not less significant should be the revelation to Northern readers of a man who was to a notable degree an embodiment of the best spirit of Virginia. Just as his decision to go into the Confederate army has caused some Americans to think more sympathetically of the Southern cause, so his life after the war should enable the people of other sections to understand the conditions that confronted a brave and unfortunate people after the war. For Lee was not an isolated figure; he was in a very real sense the product of his section—the leader of many men who after the war worked in his spirit. To the entire nation, now in danger of a revival of sectionalism, the record of these five eventful years should be a

¹ *Recollections and Letters of General Lee.* By Captain Robert E. Lee. Doubleday, Page & Co., New York.

lesson in the direction of genuine Americanism.

Mr. Rhodes has drawn with singular dramatic power the struggle that went on in Lee's mind in April, 1861, as he "paced the broad pillared veranda of his noble Arlington house, his eyes glancing across the river at the flag of his country waving above the dome of the capitol and then resting on the soil of his native Virginia." "We should be willing," he says, "to recognize in him one of the finest products of American life." Another son of Massachusetts, Mr. Charles Francis Adams, has drawn with like power and insight the scene at Appomattox—"the most creditable episode in all American history—an episode without a blemish—imposing, dignified, simple, heroic." He adds: "A people has good right to be proud of the past and self-confident of the future when on so great an occasion it naturally develops at the front men who meet each other as those two met each other then. Of the two, I know not which to award the palm. Instinctively, unconsciously, they vied, not unsuccessfully, each with the other, in dignity, magnanimity, simplicity." Impressive as are both of these scenes in Lee's life, more impressive perhaps is that drawn by Colonel William Preston Johnston of September 28, 1870, when, after a morning occupied with the correspondence and other tasks incident to his office as President of Washington College, General Lee attended a vestry meeting of his church in Lexington. Returning late in the evening from this meeting, in which he had displayed unusual interest, "he took his place at the family table, standing to say grace. The effort was vain; the lips could not utter the prayer of the heart." Upon his face was "a look of sublime resignation, as if he knew the hour had come when all the cares and anxieties of his crowded life were at an end." Between the scene at Appomattox and this closing scene of his life is the story of a singularly heroic life, lived not in the silent and stoical mood which people generally attribute to him, but in the full consciousness of the performance of a duty that God had committed to him.

What is it that makes Lee's life after the war so noteworthy to a man of the present generation and such a precious legacy to all men who are working in the South to-day? In the first place, Lee accepted the overthrow of the Southern Confederacy as a fact. He never apologized for what he had done, he never ceased to think that he and his soldiers had pursued the right course in fighting against invasion. But he submitted to the inevitable. "The war having been decided against us," he said, "it is the part of wisdom to acquiesce in the result and of candor to recognize the fact." He believed that in the good providence of God apparent failure often proves a blessing. "I have, in my own conduct, and in my recommendations to others, labored to conform to existing circumstances. I consider this the part of wisdom as well as of duty." At the time when many leading Southerners were still fighting over the battles of the late war, and were lamenting the overthrow of all their hopes, at a time when some of the bravest men, unable to see any hope for their section, were emigrating to Mexico and England, he wrote to Captain Tattall: "The questions at issue between them [the Southern States] and the Northern States having been decided, I believe it to be the duty of every one to unite in the restoration of the country and the re-establishment of peace and harmony." He believed that true patriotism sometimes required of men to act exactly contrary at one period to that which it does at another. "The circumstances which govern their actions change, and their conduct must conform to the new order of things." In accordance with this principle, he promptly applied for a citizen's rights, and was obedient to the law of the land.

A striking illustration of this point of view is seen in his comment to one of his friends after having visited some of the estates of once prosperous Virginians, who still attempted to live as in the days before the war. "Thomas," he said, "there was enough dinner to-day for twenty people. All this will now have to be changed; you cannot afford it; we shall have to practice economy."

To his daughter Mildred, visiting in Baltimore, he wrote: "Preserve your simple tastes and manners. Plainness and simplicity of dress, early hours, and rational amusements, I wish you to practice. You must bear in mind that it will not be becoming in a Virginia girl now to be fine and fashionable, and that gentility as well as self-respect requires moderation in dress and gayety. While her people are suffering she should practice self-denial and show her sympathy in their affliction." He did not seem to look upon it as a hardship at all—he who had been accustomed to all the luxuries of ante-bellum days—to confine himself strictly to the necessities of life. Accustomed to life in the brilliant social circles of Virginia planters, he found himself after the war living the simpler life of Presbyterian Lexington.

Nor was this steadfast acceptance of new conditions accompanied by the least spirit of bitterness or stolid stoicism. He had suffered as much as any Southerner by reason of the war; his home at Arlington had been "fouly polluted," his delicate wife and children had had to flee from point to point for refuge, his own health had become impaired, his grief for his soldiers at the time of the surrender was great beyond measure, he was deprived of the rights of citizenship in a country to which he was more than willing to give his allegiance. In spite of all these facts, he was never known to show the slightest evidence of bitterness. Going as he frequently did among the families who had suffered most from the war, he steadfastly declined to discuss their common sufferings. To those who spoke bitterly he "would at one time pass the subject by with some pleasantry, and at another would seek to allay the irritation in their hearts by reminding them that, in the existing conditions of the country, such things were perhaps unavoidable, and that it was the duty of all to submit patiently to evils for which time was the only cure." He urged all to help in "the allayment of passion, the dissipation of prejudice, and the restoration of reason." Writing to General Early, who was preparing an account of his campaign, he said: "I would recommend, however, that, while

giving facts which you think necessary for your own vindication, you omit all epithets or remarks calculated to excite bitterness or animosity between different sections of the country." To Governor Letcher he wrote: "All should unite in honest effort to obliterate the effects of war and to restore the blessings of peace." He rebuked a college student because in an oration he tried to excite the passions of his audience by appealing to the bitter memories of the Civil War. To a preacher who had in conversation denounced the North in terms of excessive bitterness, he said: "I have fought against the people of the North because I believed they were seeking to wrest from the South her dearest rights, but I have never cherished toward them bitter or vindictive feelings, and have never seen the day when I did not pray for them." The assassination of Lincoln, which was received with suppressed joy by some Southerners, was to him a most dastardly crime, greatly to be deplored. He maintained the policy of expelling any students who might take part in any attempt to punish negroes.

At a time when many Southerners were in despair as to the future, Lee taught by precept and example that human virtue is superior to calamity. He believed that "silence and hope and fortitude" would heal the afflictions of the South. In 1870, when reconstruction governments were in full sway, he wrote: "We must hope for the best, speak as little and act as discreetly as possible. We have nothing to do but to attend to our material interests and to await events. The dominant party cannot reign forever, and truth and justice will at last prevail." Under the most trying ordeal he wrote to his son: "I am confident that, if we all do our duty, and earnestly work to extract what good we can out of the evil that now hangs over our dear land, the time is not distant when the angry clouds will be lifted from our horizon, and the sun in his pristine brightness again shine forth." In 1869 he said: "Political affairs will be better, I think, and people will be more sanguine and hopeful." He was always on the lookout for conservative opinion in the North, trusting implicitly

in its final triumph over radical views. He was remarkably patient under all the attempts that were made to darken his fame and to blight his character, assured in his own mind that the future would vindicate him. "The accusations against myself," he said, "I have not thought proper to notice, or even to correct misrepresentations of my words and acts. We shall have to be patient and suffer for a while at least; and all controversy, I think, will only serve to prolong angry and bitter feelings and postpone the time when reason and charity may resume their sway. At present the public mind is not prepared to receive the truth." In a letter to Mrs. Jefferson Davis, who had called attention to certain attacks made upon him with regard to Northern prisoners, he says: "*Controversy of all kinds* will, in my opinion, only serve to continue excitement and passion, and will prevent the public mind from the acknowledgment and acceptance of the truth." Lee's confidence in the final vindication of his character has been more than realized within the last twenty years. Taking part in none of the bitter controversies of the time, leaving no querulous memoirs behind him, he has found stout defenders of his character among men who once opposed him in battle. Charles Sumner, who placed him "in the catalogue with those who had imbrued their hands with their country's blood," and handed him over to "the avenging pen of history," has been succeeded by men in his own State who have urged the building of a monument to the memory of one of the greatest benefactors of the American Nation. He is a striking illustration of the truth of Milton's words: "They also serve who only stand and wait."

But Lee did not lead a merely passive life during this period. He grew in richness and fullness of character. There is a striking parallel in Wordsworth's life in the way in which he found refuge in the primary sources of life. The comparison must not be pushed too far, but readers of the "Prelude" will recall the account given by the poet of his restoration to joy and peace after the temporary doubt and despair through

which he passed subsequent to the Reign of Terror in France. Under those conditions, Wordsworth, under the tutelage of his sister, "sought for present good in life's familiar face and built thereon his hopes of good to come." He fell back upon the hiding-places of man's power—"human kindnesses and simple joys." So Robert E. Lee, after a "long-lived storm of great events," found peace—if not joy—in the simple pleasures of life. "What a glorious world Almighty God has given us!" he said. His favorite seat in his house at Lexington was in a deep window in his dining-room, "from which his eyes could rest on rolling fields of grass and grain bounded by the ever-changing mountains." He took delight in his garden and in the campus of the college. His long rides on Traveler through the mountains about Lexington were at once a source of recreation and of silent peace. "He and I," he says, "whenever practicable, wander out into the mountains and enjoy sweet confidence." One such journey to the Peaks of Otter is vividly described by his daughter Mildred, who accompanied him. While Lee avoided all publicity—never allowing himself to be made a hero of—he took much delight in his visits to the old homesteads famous in the history of Virginia—mansions along the James and Potomac Rivers, many of which were associated with the most precious memories of the various branches of his family. He manifested a genuine interest in children and in the love affairs of a large number of friends and relatives. "I think we should enjoy all the amenities of life that are within our reach and which have been provided for us by our Heavenly Father." He found pleasure in friends he met at summer watering-places and in Baltimore, notably George Peabody and W. W. Corcoran, who in turn became much interested in Washington College.

It was in his family, however, that Lee found his greatest joy. His son, by means of his recollections and a large number of family letters, has developed his father's home life far more fully than it has ever been presented. Lee wrote a great many letters, and they

are good ones, too. Those to his two sons, who after the war became planters, show an intelligent and loving interest in all the details of their work. One of the greatest pleasures he had in his later life was the marriage of his son Fitz-Hugh to Miss Bolling, of Petersburg. He was rejoiced to see many of his old friends and to take part in the festivities of that occasion. "The cheerfulness with which the people were working to restore their conditions removed a load of sorrow which had been preying upon him for years." The letters to his daughters are characterized by an almost childlike affection and a playful humor that lights up the somewhat serious tone of parts of the book. After the old Virginia fashion, they often visited for months at a time their relatives and friends, in whose welfare their father took the keenest possible interest. He wrote them full accounts of happenings in Lexington—"cadet hops," literary clubs, church fairs and suppers, informal receptions held for the college students by himself and Mrs. Lee. His chivalric temperament is nowhere more in evidence than in his devotion to his invalid wife. When all the family were at home, he was apt to be even "cheerful and gay," even with the impaired health and growing seriousness of his last days. One of the most vivid recollections cherished by the son is of the winter evenings when the father read aloud to the family from Sir Philip Worsley's translation of the Iliad, which had been dedicated by the author to "the noble Virginia soldier whose talents and virtues place him by the side of the best and wisest man who sat on the throne of the imperial Cæsars."

Throughout all of Lee's private letters and in all accounts of his relations to his family there is evidence of a vital faith in the Christian religion. One cannot at all understand his character without taking this fact into consideration. Most Virginia families held to the established church in at least a nominal way, but with Lee religion was more than a formal acceptance of church creeds and ceremonies. He was throughout his life a very devout man—as devout as Stonewall Jackson, with an

added note of sweetness and light. Marked as was his reliance upon God throughout the war and in all his relations to his soldiers, it was in the period of his later life that his religious faith was strongest. Every characteristic that has been noted may be explained by this fact. He was one of the most Christlike men who ever lived. He had some of the marvelous patience and magnanimity and consecration of the Master. He took an active interest in the Episcopal church at Lexington, several times representing it in State conventions. In his work as college president he did all in his power to draw every student into active Christian work.

If Lee's life had closed in the summer of 1865, when he was living in a little cottage on the James River, there would still be in it all that has hitherto been noted as characteristic of his later life—his magnanimity in defeat, his lack of bitterness, his hopefulness for the future, his reliance on the primary resources of life, and his abiding faith in the Christian religion. But there came to him in his cottage a call to service as President of a small and at that time insignificant college. To the surprise of his friends, he accepted the offer, and from henceforth gave evidence of his faith in education as the surest road to the restoration and development of the South. "I have led the young men of the South to battle," he said; "I have seen many of them die on the field; I shall devote my remaining energy to training young men to do their duty in life." With a spirit of consecration, he said: "I pray I may be spared to accomplish something for the benefit of mankind and the honor of God." To those who appealed to him to take political positions, or to become associated in business enterprises, he invariably replied in the negative. His words to the Rev. G. W. Leyburn might well serve as the motto of the present educational movement in the South: "So greatly have those interests been disturbed in the South, and so much does its future condition depend upon the rising generation, that I consider the proper education of its youth one of the most important objects now

to be attained, and one from which greatest benefits may be expected. Nothing will compensate us for the depression of the standard of our moral and intellectual culture, and each State should take the most energetic measures to revive the schools and colleges, and, if possible, to increase the facilities for instructions, and to elevate the standard of learning." And, again, to General Gordon: "The thorough education of all classes of people is the most efficacious means, in my opinion, for promoting the prosperity of the South."

In accordance with this faith, he went to a college whose endowment had greatly suffered by reason of the war, whose faculty numbered but four, and whose student body amounted to fifty. Year by year the conception appealed more strongly to him, and year by year the college grew dearer to him. Professor Joynes, then of Washington College, now of the University of South Carolina, indignantly denies that Lee was a figurehead, kept there merely for the attraction of his splendid name. "Never was a college president more laborious than he. He gave all his powers entirely to his work. He had an eye for the supervision of every detail. . . . He was perfectly master of the situation. . . . He found the college practically a bankrupt, disorganized, deserted; he left it rich, strong, crowded with students. He gave it organization, unity, energy, and practical success." Among other contributions to the college, he brought about the establishment of the chair of English, "as a study to receive equal attention and honor with the most favored branches of study," and a School of Commerce to develop the resources and promote the interests of the country. He personally supervised the construction of new buildings, and was committed to the extension of the library and the improvement of laboratories. As a disciplinarian, and as a positive influence in the moral life of students, he has perhaps had no superior among the college presidents of the country. In the words of Mr. Thomas Nelson Page, who was himself a student there, "Here the sons of his old soldiers flocked, to be under the command of the

man who had led their fathers in battle, and to learn from his life the high lesson of devotion to duty."

The real greatness of Lee's character and work herein set forth may be realized more fully after one has read some recent memoirs of Southerners who lived after the war, or has been through the files of contemporary newspapers and magazines. There were many Southerners who manifested a spirit exactly opposite to that of General Lee. Such men as Dr. Dabney, a leader in the Presbyterian Church, Dr. Bledsoe, for a number of years editor of the "Southern Review" in Baltimore, Dr. Claiborne, an eminent surgeon of Petersburg, are typical of a tendency towards sectionalism and a struggle against the inevitable tendency of things which Lee did most to combat. That spirit is manifest in the South to-day among men who are lavish in their praise of Lee and yet miss the true spirit of the man.

On the other hand, there were men in Lee's time and after who had the spirit of the great leader—statesmen like Lamar and Ben Hill and John B. Gordon, who in the seventies gave expression to the new national spirit of the Southern people; preachers like Broadus and McTyiere, who did much to establish their churches upon a new and better basis; editors like Henry Grady, who, reverencing profoundly the past, interpreted and inspired the new forces at work in Southern society; educational leaders like Curry and Haygood, who worked for the development of all classes in accordance with the demands of a democracy; literary men like Sidney Lanier, Joel Chandler Harris, and Thomas Nelson Page, who have written of Southern life and scenery from a truly National point of view. The influence of Lee on all these men and on the men of the present day who are working in the same spirit cannot be estimated. It will be seen more and more as time goes by that few men during so short a period have done such permanent work for their people.

If the spirit of Lee had prevailed in the South and the spirit of Lincoln had prevailed in the North, the South would now be far ahead of where she is.

Northerners will doubtless claim that if the spirit of Lee had dominated the South Reconstruction measures would never have been resorted to. On the other hand, Southerners will maintain that if the spirit of Lincoln had been in evidence in the years succeeding the war, injustice to the negro and the horrors of

the Ku Klux clans would never have been. Be that as it may, the greatest duty that now devolves upon the people of both sections is to make prevalent the spirit of these two men, both of them singularly magnanimous and entirely sympathetic with the other's point of view.

The Beginnings of Christianity¹

PROFESSOR WERNLE'S second volume is characterized by the same merits and defects, the latter somewhat accentuated, as its predecessor, which we reviewed May 7. It is concerned with the sub-apostolic age in the earliest period of the second century. The primitive enthusiasm, faith as personal loyalty to Jesus, and spiritual ethics regulated by such faith, had been succeeded by organization, by faith regarded as a treasured deposit of doctrine, and legalistic ethics regulated by precepts. Legends had begun to grow, pseudonymous writings to appear, and the earliest writings to be interpolated. While the original controversy with the Jews still raged, internal dissension now threatened the Church. The sect of theosophists known as Gnostics arose, exhibiting tendencies to fantastic speculation and immorality. In opposing these, the Church leaders appealed to the authority of the Apostles, and their writings were brought together as the authoritative canon, *i. e.*, rule, of Christian truth. This collection, made to meet the exigency of the conflict, dates, as Professor Wernle rightly holds, from the first decade of the second century—a valuable concession to sound criticism by a writer who exhibits much that is not sound, and that can only be accounted for by the exigencies of the theory which it is made to sustain.

That theory is virtually this: Whatever passages in the New Testament have been cited by ecclesiastics or con-

troversialists to buttress inordinate pretensions were originally fabricated by them, and foisted into the earliest writings. So it has become "the fate of Jesus" to be made "the author of exclusiveness and fanaticism," and "the fate of Paul" that his picture has been "entirely painted over," so that the real Jesus and the real Paul passed mostly out of knowledge. Here, indeed, a fact must be admitted—an obscuration of the genuinely historic characters in current estimation. But the alleged cause of it—an extreme corruption of the canonical writings in the interest of ecclesiasticism—rests on the pure assumption that whatever untenable propositions have been pressed out of the Gospel must first have been illicitly written into the Gospel.

According to Professor Wernle, Jesus himself tells us that "without the Church there is no salvation," and Paul says the same. In view of the fact that this nowhere appears in so many words, it is explained that whenever "Christ and the faith" are insisted on as a condition of salvation, as in Paul's exhortation to his jailer, what is meant is "the Church." Professor Wernle sees ecclesiasticism everywhere; this is natural; he lives where there is an excess of it. But he seems too ready to burn the house in order to destroy the rats.

Another remarkable discovery is the alleged origin of the Table Discourses of Jesus. The Gnostics, in their self-conceit as spiritual *illuminati*, were essentially schismatic. Professor Wernle assumes that the discourses at the Last Supper were composed long after "to guide the Church safely through the Gnostic troubles." Jesus' concluding prayer for the disciples, "that they all

¹ *The Beginnings of Christianity*. By Paul Wernle, Professor of Church History at the University of Basel. Translated by the Rev. G. A. Bienemann, M.A., and Edited, with an Introduction, by the Rev. W. D. Morrison, L.L.D. Vol. II. *The Development of the Church*. G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York. (Theological Translations Library, Vol. XV11.)