

stitution; its active functions have entirely passed into more efficient keeping. The natural and judicious freedom which existed under the Restoration and the July Monarchy enabled the Tribune and the Press to give wider and fuller expression to public opinion; in presence of unclouded and far-reaching light, the circumscribed artificial lustre which had glimmered in the *salon* disappeared.

Edinburgh Review (Jan.) "Spenser as a Philosophic Poet." It sometimes happens that some eminent characteristic of a great poet has almost escaped observation, owing to the degree in which other characteristics, more attractive to the many, have also belonged to him. Spenser is an instance of this. If it were asked what chiefly constitutes the merit of his poetry, the answer would commonly be, its descriptive power, or its chivalrous sentiment, or its exquisite sense of beauty; yet the quality which he himself desiderated most for his chief work was one not often found in union with these, viz.: sound and true philosophic thought. This is the characteristic which this elaborate article seeks to illustrate. It was the characteristic which chiefly won for him the praise of Shakespeare:—

'Spenser to me, whose *deep conceit* is such
As, passing all conceit, needs no defence;'

and it was doubtless the merit to which he owed the influence which Milton acknowledged that Spenser's poetry had exercised over his own. There is more of philosophy in one book of the "*Faery Queen*" than in all the cantos of his Italian models. The numerous passages cited from the several books of this classic poem certainly bear out the writer's opinion. The numerous admirers of Spenser will be delighted with this discriminating and highly appreciative review of Spenser's works, which is based on Dr. Grosart's edition, in 8 volumes, which recently appeared in London.

Fortnightly Review (Jan.) "Coleridge as a Spiritual Thinker," by Tulloch. The writer proposes to look at Coleridge as a religious thinker, and to ask what is the meaning and value of his work in this respect, now that we can calmly and fully judge it. If Coleridge was anything, he was not only in his own view, but in the view of his generation, a religious philosopher. It is not only the testimony of men like Hare, Sterling, Maurice, Cardinal Newman, but of John Stuart Mill, that his teaching awakened and freshened all contemporary thought. He was recognized, with all his faults, as a truly great thinker, who raised the mind of the time and gave it new and wide impulses. If English literature ever regains the higher tone of its earlier national life—the tone of Hooker and Milton and Jeremy Taylor—Coleridge will be again acknowledged as "a true sovereign of English thought." He will take rank in the same line of spiritual genius. He has the same elevation of feeling, the same profound grasp of moral and spiritual ideas, the same wide range of vision. There is

everywhere the play of great power—of imagination as well as reason—of spiritual perception as well as logical subtlety. To speak of Coleridge in this manner, may seem absurd to some who think mainly of his life, and the fatal failure which characterized it. We advise such to read this brief but telling article.

Contemporary Review (Feb.) "Catholicism and Apologetics," by Principal Fairbairn. After a brief notice of two recent works by English Catholics, the "Philosophy of Theism," and the "Philosophy of Religion," the paper proceeds to discuss the questions which they have raised:—In what measure has the English Catholic movement helped to a constructive philosophy of religion? To what extent has it, in the age, if not of denial, yet of transition and of the inquiry which leans to doubt, contributed at once to conserve and quicken the Christian faith, making it credible to living mind, real to the men who feel that their religious beliefs are the dearest to the heart, but the hardest to the intellect, and the least practicable or relevant to the life? These are questions it is easy to ask, but very difficult to discuss judiciously or even judiciously, while the most difficult thing of all is to find a just and sufficient answer. Underneath all such questions others still more fundamental lie, and the principles implied in the deeper must always regulate the criticism and the determination of the more superficial. "The writer is clearly conscious that his attitude to religion and our religious problems is one, and the attitude of the Roman Catholic another, and very different; and it would be simple impertinence in him to ignore the difference, or enforce his own canons of criticism on the Catholic mind. He does not mean to judge those who have found refuge and peace in Catholicism—indeed, he would not do so if he could. If it has made its converts happier and better men, it has done a work for which all good men ought to be grateful. But the question that now concerns us in no way relates to the sufficiency of Catholicism for Catholics, but to the adequacy and relevance of what may be termed its special apologetic to the spirits possessed and oppressed by the problems of the time. The power of Catholicism to satisfy convinced religious men in search of the best organized and most authoritative Christianity is one thing, and its ability to answer the questions and win the faith of the perplexed and critical mind is another thing altogether. This is a matter we are all free to discuss, nay, every man concerned for the future of faith is bound to discuss it, and the frankest will always be the fairest discussion." The discussion is candid and thorough, and the paper will be read with interest.

Nineteenth Century (Jan.) has some papers that will repay perusal, such as "Cæsarism," by Earl Cowper; "Will Russia Conquer India?" by Arminius Vaméry; "Charles Lamb," by Algernon Charles Swinburne, and "The Savage," by Prof. Max Müller.