

Silent there would have been no revolt, and no United Netherlands. The lecturer then spoke in deprecating terms of the common prejudice against the leader of a revolt, showing that no personal motive could have had any influence in directing William's action. At the time of the outbreak he was a Roman Catholic, he had been a trusted friend of the Emperor Charles V., whose armies he had led, and who leaned on his shoulder when reading the words which conveyed his resignation of the Imperial crown. He entered on the struggle from pure love of his country when that struggle had been forced upon him, and he carried it through in a spirit of devotion and self-sacrifice which has few, if any, parallels, perhaps the only one being that of William III. of the Netherlands and of England against Louis XIV. When he was implored not to persevere in the struggle, in which, he was told, he should see the ruin of his country, he replied that there was one way of preventing that. "How?" "By dying in the last ditch." In such a spirit as this William the Third's great ancestor entered upon his struggle against Philip.

The lecturer then showed how Philip came to be ruler of the Netherlands; how they had, from independent provinces, passed under the rule of the Dukes of Burgundy, the last of whom, Charles the Bold, died leaving but one daughter, who was the grandmother of Charles V., the latter bequeathing Spain and the Netherlands to Philip II.

Charles V. was himself a Fleming and knew his people thoroughly, but being himself disliked by the Spaniards, he brought up his son Philip as one, and succeeded but too well. Philip became a Spaniard, mentally, morally and religiously, a narrow-minded fanatic, who thought to win the favour of heaven by persecuting all who refused to bow to Rome, and whose sole redeeming feature was the way in which, when dying, he bore the most frightful agonies with heroic courage. William, on the other hand, was a man with the instinct of freedom, who became Governor of Holland, Zealand, and Utrecht at twenty-two, but who really began his public life at twenty-six, in 1559. The epithet of "the Silent" was not bestowed on him for any morose disposition, for his temperament was Southern rather than Northern, but because he could hold his tongue. When, as a hostage at the court of France, he was out hunting one day with Henry II., the latter divulged to him casually that he and Philip had made a treaty to exterminate Protestantism. William, though horror-stricken, held his tongue, and by doing so was enabled to frustrate Philip's plans, while thirteen years later there occurred in France the massacre of St. Bartholemew, by the orders of the "*Rex Christianissimus*," Charles IX. In 1559, Margaret of Parma, Philip's half-sister, came as regent to introduce the Inquisition and the work began in 1561.

Professor Clark then went on to speak of the edict which proclaimed to people found reading or circulating the writings of Luther and Calvin, that if they persevered they would be burnt, if they recanted they would be beheaded or buried alive. He spoke of the programme of the Inquisition, viz: arrest on suspicion, examination by torture, then burning; how Egmont wrote to the king and visited him, and came back delighted with the promises Philip made and never fulfilled, considering it unnecessary to keep faith with heretics; how the confederacy of "the Beggars," "*Les Guees*," was formed, and tried to get the grievances redressed, while William though their friend, did not approve of this movement; how he was finally driven into opposition by Margaret's revoking the concessions, to which William had obtained her consent on behalf of the citizens of Antwerp, and by the institution of a new oath which required all persons with any authority to swear to obey Philip no matter what he did; how, at this point, Alma, a man of

iron will, and the evil genius of the Netherlands, came on the scene; and how after nine years he boasted he had executed 18,000 men. Professor Clark then touched on the siege of Harlem in 1574, when, after surrendering on condition that their lives should be spared, over 2,000 of the people were ruthlessly put to the sword, and on that of Leyden, which William rescued in the nick of time. He then rapidly sketched William's other efforts for his country, and drew a striking picture of his assassination by a Roman Catholic fanatic, to whom he had himself given the money with which the pistol was bought. His dying words were, "My God, have mercy on me, and on this poor people."

The lecturer maintained that William was no rebel, that he took the same stand as the Barons at Runnymede, and that he obeyed always the laws of his own country, though not those of Spain. He made a United Netherlands possible, and no man did more towards saving the cause of Reform. In his youth he was brave, true and intelligent. In manhood he displayed the qualities of profound statesmanship, patriotism, generalship. As he grew older he became more deeply religious. He was free from ambition, for he spent his patrimony in defence of his country, and he was always ready to serve under any other, provided it was for his country. Cromwell was beneath him, for Cromwell deteriorated, while William became nobler as he grew older. The only name the lecturer could place beside his, was that of George Washington.

ROBERT BROWNING.

The third public lecture was delivered on Saturday afternoon, February the 8th, in the Convocation Hall, by Professor Cappon, of Queen's University. As a lover of Browning he must have been delighted to find so large a number interested, or wishing to be interested in his subject—Robert Browning. The lecturer's delivery was calm and measured, his voice low but clear, and for an hour he kept his large audience interested. His introduction was a tracing out of the tendency of our century—especially in Poetry. This tendency he described as an endeavour to get face to face with nature, to deal with the realities of things, even though in the attempt conventional forms and usages must be set aside. This endeavour culminated in the prose work of Carlyle and Emerson and in the poetical work of Browning. Without attempting to estimate Browning's place in literature, the lecturer passed on to analyse his method, and here he showed keen appreciation of his subject. "*The Grammarian's Funeral*" was subjected to a searching analysis as illustrating Browning's art and one of his favourite lines of thought—That apparent failure is often greater than low success. He then went on to defend Browning against being misunderstood in his teaching as to the object of life. He pointed out that the sacrifice of all secondary aims to the one great object, which Browning insists on, freed his teaching from the charge of Egoism. Browning teaches, he said, that each man must live *his* life according to his natural bent. Here we could wish that the lecturer had drawn a careful distinction between the meaning which these words may bear as understood from Browning's or Goethe's point of view. The last thing that any one could say is that Browning's teaching is Egoistic. Who, that has ever read the tragedy, can lose from his heart the image of the noble "*Luria*." The lecturer brought out one of Browning's strongest points, when he drew attention to the Poet's catholicity of sympathy, whereby he is enabled to draw, with true discernment, characters taken from all ages and countries. Browning's versification was then dealt with and it was shown that if it at times lacked lyrical