

REVIEWS.

sions in this respect of more than one English author. We shall continue to do so as long as necessary, but hope that before the lapse of much time English authors who extend their explorations to the legal fields of our American cousins will be induced to "cross the line," and make use of some of the fruit which we have in such abundance for their use, and which we can assure them is worthy of their acceptance.

We do not intend here to give a summary of the contents of the book. The original work is so well known as to render this unnecessary. But we may say that the second is printed in larger type and on better paper than the first edition. This perhaps may be explained by reason of the change of law publishers. The present publishers (Messrs. Stevens & Haynes) are taking the lead of older houses in London in the law-publishing business. They deserve to do so. Their enterprise and business ability merit great praise, and, better still, substantial patronage.

THE LAW MAGAZINE AND REVIEW. April, July and August, 1872. No. III., New Series. London: Butterworths.

This is now a "monthly journal of jurisprudence for both branches of the legal profession at home and abroad." From the three numbers of the new series which have reached us, we should say that this valuable review will not lose caste by the change from a quarterly to a monthly; it will be even more acceptable in that it will be more frequent. The August number concludes "Notes on the Temple Church." We make room for that part of it which speaks of the Master of the Temple:—

"The master of the Temple has always held a position of honour. The greatest name in the list is undoubtedly that of the "judicious Hooker." In the Life of Richard Hooker, prefixed to the edition of his works, in 1666, it is mentioned that, in 1585, a Mr. Aloy, master of the Temple, died—a man so well loved, says the biographer, that he went by the name of Father Aloy. His predecessor, and the only one since the Reform, had been Mr. Ermstead. Hooker succeeded him, being selected thereto on account of his saint like life. He was then thirty-four years old.* He at once entered into controversy

with the lecturer, a Mr. Walter Travers. The latter was a friend of Cartwright, and one of the great leaders of the Presbyterian school, which had given forth Martin Mar-prelate, and other books and pamphlets, which were disturbing the peace of Elizabeth and the Anglican party. It is said that Travers had hoped to be appointed master of the Temple, and to put his Presbyterian views of church government into practice. He was a man of blameless life, and, even according to his enemies, of great learning. His great offence was that he had taken orders at Antwerp. He kept up a correspondence with Beza at Geneva, and with others of his way of thinking in Scotland. Hooker and Travers seem to have preached in opposition to each other. They followed, says the biographers of Hooker, the apostolic example; for as Paul withstood Peter to the face, so did Hooker withstand Travers. 'The forenoon sermon spake Canterbury; and the afternoons, Geneva.' This was clearly dangerous, and the Archbishop of Canterbury prohibited Travers from preaching. Travers petitioned the Queen in Council. The latter refused to interfere. Whereupon the petition was published, and Hooker had to reply to it. The two great points in dispute show how entirely the 'great vital truths' of one generation are apt to be looked on as mere curiosities by succeeding ones. We dig them from the great sepulchre of dead and buried controversies merely to suggest a moral. They were, first, that Hooker had declared 'That the assurance of what we believe by the Word of God is not to us so certain as that which we perceive by sense;' and secondly, that he had ventured on the monstrous assertion, 'That he doubted not but that God was merciful to save many of our forefathers living heretofore in Popish superstitions, forasmuch as they sinned ignorantly'—a horrible piece of latitudinarianism which in these days would pass unchallenged. Hooker was gentle enough as well as 'judicious,' but he could hit out very neatly. Take this, for example, 'Your next argument consists of railing and of reasons; to your railing I say nothing; to your reasons, I say what follows.' The controversy divided the lawyers into two parties: the younger going mostly with Travers. The life in the Temple was too busy for the gentle Hooker and, in 1591, he petitioned to be removed, and had another living presented to him. His 'Ecclesiastical Polity' was written whilst living in the Temple, and was the result of the controversy just mentioned. Hooker's marriage hardly seems to justify the adjective 'judicious,' which usually accompanies his name. Recovering from an illness, he came to the conclusion that it was well he should marry. Instead, however, of looking out for a wife, he commissioned his landlady

* Life of Hooker: Hooker's Works, p. 9, edition, folio, 1666.