

weak point in the King's College Professor—his subtle intellectuality—the only exclamation of the pupil, as he sent "Yeast" to press was, "I think that I have now explained Maurice to the people." Long before he had known Carlyle, again, he wrote, "More and more I find that these writings of Carlyle's do not lead to gloomy discontent—that theirs is not a dark, but a bright view of life; in reality, more evil speaking against the age and its inhabitants is thundered by the pulpit daily, both Evangelical and Tractarian than Carlyle has been guilty of in all his works." In fact, he liked neither of these parties—the Evangelical was distasteful, because he thought its system cramped, narrow and unscriptural, and the Tractarian, because he believed them to be paltering with the articles and thus trifling with all moral distinctions.

It is necessary now to pass over much interesting matter, and take our stand on the eventful years 1849-50. The "Saint's Tragedy" had been published, but it was rather a *dilletanti* bit of work. The time had arrived when he had a hard struggle before him, and was not to emerge from it, without receiving some heavy blows or being pelted with names hard enough, but not harder than they were to bear. To understand Kingsley's position aright when he attempted to Christianize and humanize the Chartism which was set afloat by the French Revolution of 1848, it is necessary to read not only "Yeast," "Alton Locke," and other elaborate works, but his fugitive writings, some extracts from which are to be found in this volume. Firmly believing that something ought to be done for the working classes—something which would bridge the gulf between the different strata of society—he was yet quite aware that they were blind to their true interests, and were led by honest, but yet blind, leaders. In 1877, we are accustomed to hear pleas for the workmen; people are now willing to listen to rational arguments on the subject, but they were not so thirty years ago. Kingsley, with his collaborators, Maurice, Hare, Froude, Hullah, Hughes, and many more, had to bear the brunt of the battle, of which this generation has reaped the fruit. There was nothing of the Communist, or even of the Democrat, about Kingsley whatever; yet when he saw a social disease he believed that a remedy ought to be, and must be, found, and set about it with all the enthusiasm of a warm-hearted nature. What he desired was not the levelling principles in vogue amongst the lower classes, but a moral and spiritual elevation. What he indicated in his papers on "Politics for the People" was their material up-bringing, and an effort on their part to raise themselves by co-operative exertion. On the other hand, those on "Christian Socialism" were an attempt to secure the recognition, not of a common right to property, but of the universal brotherhood of man. Take one brief sentence from the placard headed "Workingmen of England!"—"You think the Charter would make you free—would to God it would! The Charter is not bad—if the men who use it are not bad. But will the Charter make you free? Will it free you from ten pound bribes? Slavery to beer and gin? Slavery to every sponger who flatters your self-conceit and stirs up bitterness and headlong rage in you? That, I guess, is real slavery; to be a slave to one's stomach, one's pocket, one's own temper. Will the Charter cure that? Friends, you want more than Acts of Parliament can give." That is certainly not the language of a demagogue, and what follows, if we could spare space to quote it, is still less