

THAT Mr. Lilly, of whom we were speaking the other day, should be at once a Roman Catholic and a Rationalist, is not so wonderful when we find that he is a Roman Catholic of the school of Cardinal Newman. Whether he was one of the converts does not appear; but it appears plainly that he considers them the salt of the Church, and thinks that they redeemed Catholicism in England from a very low condition when they joined it. Evidently this singular rivulet of proselytism, though it has fallen into the main stream of Roman Catholicism, has not blended with it. How should it? Newman was not a mere mass-priest or a pupil of the Jesuits. He was a sceptical philosopher in search of a religious system; and though he has found his religious system he is still a sceptical philosopher. Such webs of dialectic as his Faith never wove. In one of his Roman Catholic books he gives a list of the most portentous of the miracles and relics, including the House of Loretto which came from Palestine to Italy by leaping through the air, the Holy Coat of Treves, and the Liquefaction of the Blood of St. Januarius. Then he vehemently professes his belief in them all; but the effort of swallowing is perfectly perceptible. You see plainly that, having made up his mind that the system is his only refuge, he forces his intellect into compliance with his results. His real position as an intellectual sceptic devising reasons for embracing a faith appears in all his writings, especially in that curious attempt to prove that unreason is reasonable, the Grammar of Assent. To say of him, as Mr. Lilly does, that his chief guide is Butler's doctrine of Probability, is putting the same thing into other words. It is evident that he detests the Syllabus, which is the perfect expression of the mind of Rome, though he pretends, and probably persuades himself, that what he hates is the violence of the faction by which the Syllabus was framed. A greater contrast there cannot be than there is between the orthodoxy of Cardinal Wiseman and the philosophy of Cardinal Newman. There is a clever picture representing the horrible disenchantment of an enthusiastic novice when, in place of the ideal ascetics of his imagination, he finds himself among the real monks. We think of it when we read Newman. The late Pope, a thorough-going Ultramontane, who had begun to fancy himself in hypostatic union with the Trinity, looked askance at the great Convert. The present Pope, among other symptoms of his comparative liberalism, makes the author of "Development" a Cardinal. So that if Archbishop Lynch looks closely he will find, even within the pale of ostensible unity, there are some interesting shades of difference. Mr. Lilly contemplates without reprobation the hypothesis that the "Hebrew narratives" are a set of fables. We should like to hear him on the House of Loretto, the Holy Coat and the Liquefaction of the Blood of St. Januarius.

MR. LILLY is not quite correct, we venture to think, in his account of the origin of Tractarianism. He traces it to the influence in the minds of its founders of revived Sacramentalism and Butler's doctrine of Certitude, or rather of Probability. Revived Sacramentalism was of course a vital part of the system, and there can be no doubt that Butler's strange doctrine is the fancied anchor to which Dr. Newman's barque is moored on the shoreless sea of doubt. But the origin of the movement, historically, is clear enough, and is stated with a rather surprising frankness in one of the earliest of the "Tracts for the Times." The progress of Liberalism in England, at the period of the Reform Bill, threatened to withdraw from the clergy the support of the State. A party among them then began to look about for some other support, and they found it in Apostolical Succession and in the Catholic theory of the Sacraments. "Hitherto," says the writer of the Tract to his fellow-clergymen, "you have been upheld by your birth, your education, your wealth, your connection; should those secular advantages cease on what must Christ's ministers depend? Is not this a serious practical question? We know how miserable is the state of religious bodies not supported by the State. Look at the dissenters on all sides of you, and you will see at once that their ministers, depending simply on the people, become the creatures of the people. Are you content that this should be your case?" It is fair to say that with the love of clerical authority, here somewhat unreservedly displayed, was combined a poetic ideal of the Church which gradually found its historic type in the Church of the Middle Ages. The Romanticist Reaction was at that time going on in European literature and art; and Walter Scott may in virtue of his mediævalism be regarded as a precursor of Newman. The mediæval beauties and the semi-monastic life of the Oxford Colleges also played an important part; and at that time Science was still an exile from the University, so that theological and æsthetic influences reigned alone. Newman's secession after all was probably involuntary; he most likely looked forward to remaining the leader of a mediævalizing party in the Anglican Church; but some of his disciples having been led by him to the brink of Roman Catholicism took the plunge, and he had no logical ground

for refusing to follow. He and his friends have tried for us at their own risk and cost whether the right way lay in that direction; and for this we ought to be grateful.

LORD SALISBURY'S manifesto appears to have been framed with skill and delivered with effect. The exact line taken by him upon the different questions we shall know better when we have the full text. The *Standard*, which praises the manifesto as a whole, finds a want of firmness of tone in the part relating to Ireland. It is difficult to see how firmness of tone on the Irish question could have been expected of a leader on the eve of an election for success in which he notoriously depends on the Parnellite vote. Such a position is unique in the history of British Statesmanship, and it has its peculiar exigencies, to which even the haughtiest patrician and the loudest professor of loyalty, if he wishes to escape the ire of Mr. Parnell, must bow. Lord Salisbury is above all things an aristocrat. He is thoroughly and sincerely convinced that upon the existence of an hereditary nobility depend social order, national greatness, public virtue and, above all, chivalry and honour. The special object of his hatred is commercial wealth, which, with its vulgar pretensions to power, treads on the heel of aristocracy. The blow struck at the possessors of that wealth in his speech was dealt, we may be sure, from his very heart. He would be as willing to plunder the millocrats as Mr. Chamberlain would to plunder the landowners. The Established Church he now cherishes mainly, it is believed, as a bulwark of aristocracy; for the strong High Church sentiments with which he set out in life are said to have greatly yielded to the influence of intercourse with the secular world and of Science, which the Marquis himself cultivates in his laboratory at Hatfield. The Monarchy is of course the indispensable coping-stone of aristocracy, and as such must be upheld. Everything else, not excepting the Union, Lord Salisbury probably is ready in case of supreme necessity to treat as tubs for the whale, and in lavish promises of philanthropic legislation, so far as the cities are concerned, he vies with the liberality of Mr. Chamberlain. But he cannot confine the semi-Socialistic movement to the cities. Supposing that he retains power he will have with his own patrician hands to abolish primogeniture and entail, and he can hardly fail to see that when the great estates are broken up, as assuredly they will be if primogeniture and entail are abolished, titles will lose their magic and hereditary aristocracy will fall. Lord Salisbury's game is desperate in the end, even if, by grace of Mr. Parnell, he obtains a majority now.

FOR the present Lord Salisbury has a most effective coadjutor in Mr. Chamberlain, whose passionate desire to become at once Prime Minister must, unless the whole spirit of English society has undergone a marvellous change, be hurrying him beyond his mark. It is impossible not to mistrust the motives of a man who, having made a large fortune by methods as far as possible from Socialistic, when the object of his pursuit changes and satiety of wealth has awakened the lust of power, hoists the Socialistic flag, appeals to the instincts of a plundering proletariat, and promises to let it levy blackmail on property if it will only gratify his ambition. Mr. Chamberlain in his eagerness to be first has broken all the honourable rules of public life. He has courted popularity on the stump at the expense of his colleagues in the Cabinet; he has betrayed two of them, Mr. W. E. Forster and Lord Spencer, for whose acts he, as a member of the Government, was just as responsible as they were themselves. He courted with ignominious assiduity, and by offers of consenting to the virtual Dismemberment of the nation, the favour of Mr. Parnell, and turned round only when Mr. Parnell had actually spurned him back to the side of patriotism and loyalty. His Socialistic and Disunionist proposals are thrown out obviously for the purpose of catching votes, and are explained away or modified as soon as it appears that the fish does not rise or that there is danger of a reaction. His ability is unquestionable; but it lies mainly in the line of caucus organization, and in this he has so able a coadjutor in Mr. Schnadhorst that it is difficult to say how much of the work which has covered England with a web of caucuses, of which he is the head centre, is his own and how much is that of his lieutenant. It has evidently been his policy to use Mr. Gladstone as his stalking-horse, at the same time securing to himself the succession: and the aged Monarch of the Liberal Party, though not open to gross adulation, is open to skilful infusions and even to a refined kind of flattery. It is certainly no injustice to Mr. Chamberlain to say that his sense of the blessings which the nation would reap from his Premiership is so strong that he would rather wreck the Liberal Party than not be its chief. That he may wreck the Liberal Party is not impossible. Mr. Gladstone's manifesto had restored to the party a union which would have almost certainly given it the victory. But Mr. Chamberlain is fast undoing the work. It is not unlikely that this formed a topic of earnest talk at Hawarden.