

time; and this is practically the view placed before the Dunedin audience by the Chicago lecturer. According to the *Evening Star* report the lecturer, asking the question as to the value of such a life, said it had its value; that 'it showed the impossibility of reforming the Church from within, and thus paved the way for Luther's reform from without, and all the advantages of the world's civilisation which the Protestant Reformation gave to us.' In other words, the suggestion is that Savonarola, like Luther, attempted to reform the Church as a Church, the only difference between the two being a difference as to means and method. There is nothing whatever in the history of Savonarola, not a syllable in his preaching or his teaching that would give any warrant for such a conclusion. His conflict with the Pope was in every instance connected with political, moral, or disciplinary issues, and had nothing whatever to do with any questions of doctrine. In every controversy he declared himself 'true son of the Church.' He was a reformer, indeed, but a reformer of morals and men, and never so much as dreamt of changing the constitution, the doctrine, or the nature of the Church. On this point all the authorities are agreed. The Protestant Sismondi admits that 'Savonarola in no way departed from Catholic teaching, but confined his efforts to the restoration of morals and discipline.' 'It did not occur to him,' says Mrs. Oliphant, in *The Making of Florence*, 'to doubt the institutions of his Church or to question her authority.' 'He was no apostle of reform,' says J. A. Symonds in his *History of the Renaissance*. 'The spirit of Savonarola,' writes Macaulay, 'had nothing in common with the spirit, religious or political, of the Protestants of the North.' And Professor Villari, in his two-volume *Life of Savonarola*, sums the whole matter up in the following words: 'To regard him as the leader of a party, a sect, or a system, is an error only to be committed by those unacquainted with the friar and his times. . . . It is impossible to read his books without being firmly convinced that, to the day of his death, Savonarola remained unswervingly faithful to the dogmas of his faith; and that instead of seeking to destroy the unity of the Church, it was his constant desire to render it more complete.' In the face of testimony such as that it is manifestly impossible for our Protestant friends to establish any sort of connection between the devoted and unselfish Savonarola and the turbulent, self-willed, domineering Luther. As to the lecturer's remark about the necessity of reforming the Church from without, we need only point out that though Savonarola failed in his noble effort to effect reformation from within, the Council of Trent tried in after years, and succeeded.

'Through German Eyes.'

Of late years the English people have had more than one opportunity of 'seeing themselves as others see them' and the experience, though it is supposed to be a profitable one, has not usually been over-pleasant. John Bull, however, is getting so used to being criticised by candid friends that he takes it now quite philosophically, and it is probable therefore that the latest disquisition on England, though it seems to be the most vigorous that has yet appeared—and that is saying a good deal—will not receive anything more than a mere passing notice. It is embodied in a little book called 'Happy Go-Lucky Land,' written by Mr. Max Schmidt, and published by T. Fisher Unwin. Mr. Schmidt has lived for upwards of forty years in England, and in this little book he describes with remarkable plainness of speech the impressions and opinions he has formed of the English people during his long stay amongst them. Here is a specimen of his style, which we reprint from our contemporary the *San Francisco Monitor*. After a brief introduction Mr. Schmidt informs his English friends in a general way that, 'Upon the whole, you are the most ignorant of the great nations, and, at the same time, the most self-opinionated. You have more than the pride of a Spaniard, yet you have but an apology for courtesy. You have more than the frivolity of a Frenchman, yet your frivolity is without intelligence. Hardly once, since I have known you, have you entered upon any big undertaking without, at the outset, committing blunders which would have brought shame, if not ruin, upon any other people, yet you scarcely know how to blush, save at the behavior of your neighbors; and certainly you are not ruined.'

'Providence permits you to prosper, and to prosper exceedingly; but only congenital hypocrisy can allow one to suppose that it is because of your merits. Nevertheless, you all do suppose so. You all, I am sure, have a real belief that the Omnipotent congratulates Himself daily on having such fine fellows as yourself as His allies, and that never can He properly repay the debt He owes you. While, therefore, you court national disaster continually, you take the trouble neither to keep dry your powder nor, in any becoming sense of the words, to trust in God.'

★

Mr. Schmidt then descends to particulars. The British Government, the Army, the Navy, the Church, the Education System, the British devotion to sports, are all dealt with in the same drastic fashion, and denounced in terms which Kipling

himself might almost envy. Then Mr. Schmidt sets himself to describe the social life of the people, and begins with the casual intimation that Britain is 'the most drunken of nations.' Here is the introduction, as given in the *Monitor*, of his chapter on 'British Drunkenness':—'One of the most depressing, and, indeed, sickening characters of the British Empire at home and over sea, is the prevalence of habitual and swinish drunkenness. The vice is not confined to any class, nor is it invariably the outcome of misery and want. Especially in Scotland, and in some of the colonies it is common among people who are ostentatiously, and, perhaps, in their way, sincerely religious. It is not, as elsewhere, almost entirely restricted to men. In the streets of all your big cities a drunken woman is so common an object as to be scarcely remarkable.' If this sort of thing came from what Mr. Dooley calls the 'rapid-fire pote' Kipling, or from our own *Bulletin* no one would feel at all astonished, but it does give one a shock of mild surprise to find anyone with the unaggressive name of Schmidt letting off such a fusillade. One thing is certain. If Mr. Schmidt expects to get any sale in the 'Happy-Go-Lucky Land' for any of his future publications he will have to revise his vocabulary and cultivate the apparently neglected art of 'breaking it gently.'

An Anglican View of the King's Oath.

It is sincerely to be hoped that the agitation for securing a change in the terms of the blasphemous Coronation Oath which the King is, under the existing law, compelled to take, will not be allowed to die away or slacken off, for while there is undoubtedly an overwhelming weight of public opinion throughout the Empire against the odious Declaration it is equally certain that the Imperial Government are not themselves sufficiently interested in the matter to make any active move in the direction of reform unless the force of this public opinion is brought very strongly to bear upon them. In this connection we are glad to note that the Catholics of Ontario, Canada, have recently sent a vigorous and outspoken protest to the Home Government against the insults levelled against the King's Catholic subjects by this impious oath, this being the second remonstrance from Canada on the subject. We note also that the matter still engages the attention, from time to time, of various Protestant bodies and the general trend of enlightened non-Catholic opinion is strongly against the oath. At a recent Anglican Synod held in Goulburn, New South Wales, the Rev. J. A. Newth moved a formal resolution protesting against the insult to Catholics involved in making the King declare their doctrines 'superstitious and idolatrous,' and in doing so gave perhaps the best exposition of the objections to the oath that we have yet seen. The rev. gentleman's speech not having been fully reported, the *Catholic Press* wrote to him for his manuscript and the extract which we give below is taken from our contemporary's full report of the address.

★

After referring in a very gentlemanly and Christian way to the doctrinal differences between the Church of England and the Catholic Church, Mr. Newth continued: 'And because, forsooth, we do not hold Rome's doctrine of the invocation of saints and of the Mass, we must insist on the King's making a declaration that they are "superstitious and idolatrous," must we? The Presbyterians in the General Assembly in Sydney have said "No," even the Wesleyan Methodists in their conference have said "No," and we, I hope, for the credit of the diocese, will also say "No." In the first place, because it is absurd for the King to have to make this declaration; for the King is not a theologian, and no one supposes him to be competent to lay down the law on these vexed theological questions, to really know anything about them, and why, therefore, should he be expected to say anything about them? In the second place, because it seems preposterous that the King, who is only the temporal head of the Church of England, should, as a condition of receiving the Crown, be subjected to a more rigid religious test than is demanded of even the Archbishop of Canterbury, its spiritual head; for the Archbishop of Canterbury is, I need hardly say, only required to give a general assent to the 39 Articles as a whole, and not to declare that he receives what they say of the Mass, etc., "without mental reservation of any kind whatsoever"—in the third place, because it is no real safeguard, for if the King were secretly a Romanist, it is not likely that he would not find some way of making the declaration for all that. He might be advised, perhaps, that it was virtually an oath taken under compulsion, and, therefore, null and void; or that he might take it "without any mental reservation of any kind" that his subjects were entitled to claim of him, or with some other grain of salt that might be offered.'

'And last, but not least, we object to this oath, because it is wrong, because it amounts to persecution, for which no good cause can be shown, wounding to the quick as it does a large and influential section of the community, many of whom fill the highest positions of rank and honor in the Empire, and are among the most loyal of his Majesty's subjects. No wonder