

"If you do not see the *Classical Review*, I may mention a notice by A. Plummer of Professor Abbott's Essays. He says,—'The fourth essay, which will be new to most English readers, is one more nail in the coffin of the craze, which to some minds seems to be so wonderfully attractive, that *'poicin'* in the Eucharistic formula of the N. T. has a sacrificial meaning.' He refers for an instance of the craze to the *Guardian*, 28 April, 1892, and adds that the Greek fathers uniformly treat *touto poieile* as meaning "perform this action," even while holding, as many of them do, very high notions of a Eucharistic sacrifice."

The feeling that a protest is needful is being widely admitted, and the fact that even the High-Church London *Guardian* recently declared Mr. Sadler's manual unsuitable as an authoritative text-book, will have appealed to some minds impervious to other reasonings. For ourselves, as has been sufficiently shown, we protest not against Mr. Sadler's personality, or his party, but only against his fallacies. Let him remove these and write a good book, and we will heartily wish him popularity, and rejoice at his success.

LORD SHERBROOKE.

It speaks largely for the intelligent interest taken in the affairs of England, that our city newspapers published accurate and comparatively full notices of the life of a statesman who for more than ten years had entirely disappeared from the public stage. Every man is in a measure unique, as every leaf in a forest differs from another; and yet, surely, never was a man so dissimilar, as was Robert Lowe, from all the prevalent types of the different careers which he successively (and successfully) followed.

His zenith was in the year 1866, and then he became (for a brief time indeed), the arbiter of English destinies. No other speaker probably, in ancient or modern times, has exercised such a sway. A strong conservative speech delivered from the Liberal benches (or *vice-versa*), always creates a sensation, but very seldom has a government been overthrown by speeches delivered from its own side of the house. And at no time, within the memory of man, was so splendid a galaxy of orators gathered in the House of Commons. Gladstone and Disraeli, in their prime, Bright and Horsman, Bulwer-Lytton and Hardy, John Stuart Mill and Henry Fawcett; of lawyers Coleridge and his great rival of the western circuit, Sir John Karslake, not to mention Sir Roundell Palmer and Sir Hugh Cairns,—only a speaker of the first order could command a hearing.

And Mr. Lowe did not seem to possess the qualifications. He was no newly discovered genius; everybody knew about him. He had made his mark always, but never a very lofty mark. At Oxford he had taken brilliant honors, and had become the most successful of private tutors. He had signalized himself in the debates of the Union Society, and had taken part in that famous discussion (immortalized in the '*Uniomachia*,') when the future Archbishop of Canterbury was fined a guinea for disobedience to the chairman's order. Then he had crossed the ocean, and had entered political life

in Australia, an extraordinary step in those days. Only considerable private interest could have brought him so soon to the front in Sydney politics, but both as a lawyer and a member of the local Legislature, he made a considerable reputation. On his return to England, he entered Parliament for the family borough of Calne, belonging to the Marquis of Lansdowne, and obtained subordinate office in one of Lord Palmerston's later administrations. He introduced and carried an Education Act, which embodied the famous principle of "Payment by results," a great step in advance for the time. But the alteration of a report, made without any dishonorable motive, but only in a too characteristically arbitrary manner, gave an opening to his foes. The late Prime Minister, then Lord Robert Cecil, was a keen free-lance on the conservative side, a brilliant contributor to the *Saturday Review*, and never dreaming then of being one day a marquis and prime minister of England. He pounced upon the opportunity, and carried a resolution of censure in the House of Commons. Lord Palmerston stood by all his colleagues to the last, but he had to recognise that this political Jonah must leave the ship, and so Mr. Lowe's resignation was accepted. After Lord Palmerston's death in 1865 the short-lived Russell-Gladstone ministry was formed, and the famous Reform Bill introduced the next year. This, it will be remembered, was the mildest of all homeopathic remedies; almost a conservative measure when compared to the sweeping "Household Suffrage bill," which was eventually carried by the other side. But it served Mr. Lowe's purpose. Whether his original radical opinions had been altered by the missiles of the Kidderminster mob, or whether his academical Whiggism had always been antagonistic to an extension of the franchise, would be hard to decide. Suffice it to say that he not only got together the third party, known from Mr. Bright's epigram as the "Cave of Adullam," but also delivered against the Reform Bill a series of masterly speeches, incisive in utterance, classical in literary style, and entirely in harmony with the prepossessions of the English country gentlemen who listened to him. The political philosophy was not new, it was Edmund Burke's "Old Whiggism," expressed in language of which Burke himself would not have been ashamed. In vain John Bright ridiculed the denizens of the Cave, in vain Mr. Gladstone summed up the debate on the second reading by a speech which he himself never surpassed in eloquence, the division gave only a majority of 5 votes to the government, and soon after the entry into committee, the bill was defeated by an insidious amendment introduced by a denizen of the Cave, Lord Dunkellin.

Mr. Lowe had triumphed. Men spoke of him as a possible prime minister. When Lord Derby was sent for, he offered a place in his cabinet to the redoubtable member for Calne. Why did he not accept? Perhaps he had an intuition of the future policy of the Conservatives, and that a Reform Bill far more sweeping and radical was eventually to be introduced. Perhaps he revolted against the type of old, uncompromising toryism which he should have met,—who knows? So he remained in opposition, and when the famous resolutions on the Irish Church were brought forward