

doubt the greatest of the virtuosi, surpasses him only in physical power. Liszt may have varied in his skill, he may have been occasionally out of humor or eccentric, but coarse he never was. Any one who has heard Schubert's 'Wanderer-Fantasia' or Weber's 'Invitation to Dance' by Liszt and later by Rubinstein, knows which of the two was the much nobler and more refined musician." This must be taken *cum grano*, because Hanslick invariably follows the German maxim that about the living nothing but ill should be spoken; and Rubinstein unfortunately is still alive. Hanslick also wrote some years ago (when Liszt unfortunately was still alive), that the interest in his music was entirely inspired by his personality, and that with the last person who knew Liszt the last applause would cease. Perhaps the Viennese critic would be surprised to hear that, at the forty-eight popular concerts given by Mr. Thomas last year in New York, where not one in a thousand, perhaps, had ever seen Liszt, his compositions ranked in frequency of performance immediately after Beethoven and Wagner, who headed the list.

—A number of years ago, while presenting to the readers of the *Nation* (No. 341) fugitive outlines of a rich collection of "Hebraica" and "Judaica," then acquired by the temple Emanu-El of this city, we remarked on the places of publication most frequently met with on the title-pages of that, as of almost every other, Hebrew library. We enumerated the Italian towns, from Venice, Mantua, and Ferrara to Pieve di Sacco, Soncino, and Sabionetta; the Dutch, from Amsterdam and Leyden to Franeker; the German, from Berlin and Leipzig to Altdorf and Rödelheim; the towns of Eastern Europe, from Wilna to Saloniki; and also Basel, Paris, Oxford, Smyrna, and Jerusalem. But America remained unrepresented. The library referred to probably contained none of the Hebrew or "Judaic" books published in this country previous to that date, very few of which deserved a scholar's or book collector's attention. Things have changed since. Jewish literature has taken root in this country, gradually developing with the increase of the Jewish element in our population, with its advance in mercantile and industrial pursuits, in prosperity and culture. There can be no more striking evidence of this than the almost simultaneous appearance on our desk of three eminently scholarly publications by American rabbis. The one is a collection of critical essays in German or English, by Dr. S. Adler, of this city, bearing the Hebrew title 'Qōbēg 'al yād' (New York, 1886). The more important of these essays are "Der Versöhnungstag in der Bibel, sein Ursprung und seine Bedeutung," reprinted from Stade's *Zeitschrift*; "Pharisäismus und Sadducäismus," from Graetz's *Monatschrift*; and "Talmud," one of the most learned and comprehensive contributions which Johnson's Cyclopaedia can boast of. Of Dr. M. Jastrow's, the Philadelphia rabbi's, 'Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babil and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature,' of which the first part is soon to be given to the public (London: Trübner & Co.; New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1886), only a specimen lies before us in print, but we have seen considerable portions of it in manuscript, and it is impossible to exaggerate the conscientious zeal and devotion to philological and antiquarian science of which this stupendous work is the product. It is to be completed in about twelve parts of 96 quarto pages each, which, "if the proper support be extended" by the world of scholars, "will follow each other at intervals of about three to six months." But the work by which American scholarship is, for the first time, made to shine in the domain of Hebrew literature proper is the 'Sepher Iyyōb' ('The Book of Job'), with a new and most elabo-

rate commentary in the language of the text, "by Benjamin Szold, rabbi of the Oheb-Shalom Congregation of Baltimore" (Baltimore, 1886). It is saying much, but we venture to affirm that in future any Hebrew collection of Bible commentators that does not contain this American book will be as defective as if works of Rashi, Aben Ezra, or Kimhi, were absent from its shelves.

#### PERKINS'S FRANCE UNDER MAZARIN.

*France under Mazarin.* With a review of the administration of Richelieu. By James Breck Perkins. G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1886. 8vo, 2 vols.

THE back of these handsome volumes bears the title 'France under Richelieu and Mazarin,' and each title describes with sufficient accuracy, although neither with precision, the scope of the work. The chapters upon Richelieu are much less in amount than those upon Mazarin, and at the same time are considerably more than a mere introduction to the period of the later statesman. Although this strikes one at first sight as somewhat out of proportion, both in relation to the greatness of the men and the importance of the events which they controlled, yet, after all, it serves the author's purposes extremely well. His subject is Mazarin, a man and a period very little known, but so closely dependent upon the more familiar period that preceded it, that it was necessary to give a somewhat complete account of this earlier period—and not a mere sketch—by way of introduction. The book is therefore properly entitled 'France under Mazarin,' and the admirable account of "France under Richelieu," which precedes it, is an integral part of the work.

Whether the administration of Mazarin is worth relating in this detail is another question. Certainly the foreign relations, with the two great treaties (of Westphalia and the Pyrenees) negotiated in these years, deserve the most careful study; and these chapters are in every way praiseworthy. But the first of these, at all events, was the outcome of Richelieu's policy rather than Mazarin's; and the event which occupied the greater part of this period, and which is here narrated in great detail—the War of the Fronde—is perhaps the dreariest and most characterless chapter of modern history. Its value consists solely in the picture it presents of the utter worthlessness of the governing classes of France; and this has its bearing upon the history of the subsequent hundred and fifty years. It also has its significance in its relation to the previous century. The sixteenth century is a distracted period of French history, and at no time has royalty sunk so low as under the last Valois; but there were heroic characters in this period, some men at least of nobility and earnestness of purpose. The seventeenth century exhibits nothing but meanness and self-seeking, joined with absolute indifference to morality. It is a fact very significant of the change in the times, that nearly every representative of the great Huguenot families of the previous century now professed the religion of the court, having abjured the stern puritanical virtue as well as the religion of their grand-sires.

In estimating the work of one of the world's great men, as Richelieu assuredly was, we have a right to consider not merely whether what he did was brilliantly and successfully done, but also whether it was the best thing to be done. From a statesman of the first order we may demand positive and permanent benefits to the country which he rules. Richelieu's policy may be summed up as two-fold—the greatness of France and the absolute authority of the King. It is in the first of these that he earned, without question, the

rank of a great statesman. The great peril of Europe at just this juncture was in the house of Austria; and Richelieu deserved the thanks of the world for having—from whatever motives—joined hands with Gustavus Adolphus to hold this bigoted and tyrannical power in check. We cannot quite agree with Mr. Perkins's qualified regrets at the outcome of the Thirty Years' War in this regard, expressed at the end of the first volume. All that he says of the fatal results of the war, in "the establishment of the power and separate rights of a multitude of petty sovereigns," is perfectly true. Germany, like France, needed to become a united nation, but not under Ferdinand of Styria. His triumph would have not merely put an end to the disintegration of Germany—a thing much to be desired—but would have at the same time crushed all elements of free government, and have extirpated Protestantism. All Germany would have been reduced to the condition to which Bohemia had been reduced. Better by far the chaos of 200 years, with the germs of a vigorous life ready to start, than the intellectual and moral deadness which Ferdinand would have created.

In France Richelieu did establish a central power, and thus bring France out of the turbulence and misrule of the sixteenth century. But we see in the experience of France something of what Germany escaped. Richelieu was a wiser man than Ferdinand, and was no bigot. He did not trample out the reformed religion as Ferdinand would have done, neither did he wholly destroy provincial autonomy; but he made it easy for a later tyrant to accomplish both. It is to Richelieu's over-strained centralization—and yet less stringent than Germany would have suffered—that France owed the hopeless misgovernment out of which she only made her escape at last through the crisis of the Revolution. France needed a vigorous national life, and Richelieu gave her a despot.

In this we see the limitations of his individuality and his class. As a French nobleman of the seventeenth century, it could not come into his mind to take the welfare of the people into account, or to consider that the nation had a life and interests apart from those of the King. He found the people of France on the whole well-to-do and contented, after the sagacious and economical administration of Sully. He left them poor and exhausted; but this was a thing about which he did not concern himself. He found the provinces of France in the possession of an exaggerated degree of independence. He had not the wisdom to build upon the foundation afforded by these institutions of a long historical growth; he could not comprehend any method of ridding the country of the abuses of this system, except by destroying the system itself. It is true the institutions of self-government—if we can call them so—were very incomplete, and were not strongly rooted in the habits and sentiments of the French people. This Mr. Perkins shows very well. But at least they were capable of development, and this Richelieu could not understand.

We have very little but praise for the work before us. Mr. Perkins begins with a judicious discussion of the work of Richelieu and Mazarin, showing that they did not, as has been sometimes asserted, overthrow all checks upon the royal power and make the King absolute; rather that they organized this already existing absolute power, and neglected to establish checks or to develop free institutions. About a third of the work is given to Richelieu; about a third (six chapters out of twenty) to the Fronde; and three chapters at the end are of a general nature, upon the administration, society, and religion. The reader lays aside the book with a higher estimate of Mazarin's ability and character.

The style is for the most part excellent—serious

and perspicuous in discussion and in the delineation of character, animated in narration. Only rarely one finds a slipshod sentence like this (vol. i, p. 272): "Following this success by the capture of Thionville, a thing that had been unsuccessfully attempted in 1639, would show that a man's hand was still at the helm." On page 255 we read: "the two men whom it was believed would enjoy the most favor from the new regent." A characteristic of the style—we think a fault—is the omission of "that" in indirect discourse (p. 87): "Its States met and declared their local rights were violated by the King's edict." The translations from French are as a rule good and idiomatic; on page 395, however, we read: "There are now, sire, ten years that the country is ruined." Mr. Perkins is generally careful to use good English words and phrases; it is therefore a surprise to find the French forms *Escart* (for *Scheldt*, p. 339) and *Fiesque* (for *Fiesco*, vol. ii, p. 4). We note a few misprints. Vol. i, p. 19, Brandenburg for *Brandenburg*; p. 32; l. 11, their for there; p. 95, de Guesclin for du Guesclin; p. 210, councils for counsels; p. 477, canon for cannon.

#### BISHOP KERFOOT.

*Life of the Right Reverend John Bishop Kerfoot, D.D., LL.D., First Bishop of Pittsburgh. With selections from his Diaries and Correspondence. By Hall Harrison, M.A., Rector of St. John's Church, Howard County, Md. 2 vols. James Pott & Co. 1886.*

MR. HARRISON has done the work intrusted to him in a painstaking and judicious manner. He has kept himself for the most part out of sight, and allowed the Bishop to express himself freely and fully in his journals and correspondence. At the same time he has not aimed at any colorless impartiality, but has allowed himself from time to time "the delights of admiration." The book is one that will make its principal appeal to those who find themselves in places similar to that which Bishop Kerfoot occupied, and to those profoundly interested in the ecclesiastical polity and history of the Episcopal Church; to the general public, very little. And yet it is to be desired that those who will read it least should read it most; for it is a book eminently calculated to convince those who were not of the Bishop's fold that here was a good shepherd, an earnest, honest, and industrious man, doing his best in his own way to make love and righteousness abound. There is no better antidote for the keenness of our sectarian animosities than the reading of biographies of men who did not walk with us. Bishop Kerfoot was an ardent, even a passionate Episcopalian; but to read his biography, and especially his own letters and journals, is to be made aware that his Christianity and his manhood transcended his particular opinions.

Bishop Kerfoot was of Scotch-Irish parentage, and was born in Ireland in 1816. His father removed to this country in 1818, and he followed with his mother and three other children the next year. The parents had been Wesleyans. The boy received his first impulse to the Episcopal Church from Dr. Muhlenberg, who came to Lancaster in 1820 and opened a Church Sunday-school. Afterward he attended the Doctor's "Flushing Institute" for a number of years, and received from him a distinctly evangelical impression which faded somewhat as time went on. But so did not his love and admiration for his early teacher till he gave to him such comfort as he could in his last sickness. The most notable incident of his boyhood was the delivery of an address to Lafayette in 1825. It was full of excellent advice and admonition, and a facsimile of the original MS. is a welcome addition to the illustrations of the book. His deacon's orders

were taken in 1837, and he was ordained a priest on his twenty-fourth birthday. For a time much pulled asunder by conflicting demands upon him and his own indefinite desires, in 1842 he assumed the charge of St. James Hall in the diocese of Maryland, then presided over by Bishop Whittingham, one of the most remarkable men of his order in the United States, with whom Kerfoot's relations were most intimate and affectionate until the former's death in 1879, only a year or two before his own.

Financial troubles combined with "minister's sore throat" to make the early years of his life at St. James anxious and harassing, but the ailment insured a trip to England, and the financial difficulties were already lessening, and the school had greatly multiplied its buildings and increased its usefulness, when Kemp Hall, the principal dormitory and place of instruction, was destroyed by fire during a fearful winter storm in January, 1857. Bishop Whittingham "worked up" the event in a manner calculated to make a metropolitan reporter green with envy, and his account has been incorporated in his seventh chapter by Mr. Harrison. Mr. Kerfoot's conduct was certainly deserving of the highest praise. His only thought was for his boys. Until their safety was assured, he did not hesitate to put his own in fearful peril. Bishop Whittingham's account of the disaster was eloquent with an ulterior aim, which he accomplished. Funds came to the rescue of the school, and a new site for it was selected twenty miles from Baltimore, where the unfinished buildings, arrested by the civil war, still make their mute appeal to those who cherish the memories of Whittingham and Kerfoot, for the fulfilment of their hope.

Mr. Harrison's chapters for the period coinciding with the civil war derive considerable interest from the fact that the College of St. James—it had grown from a school into a college of some sort—was situated in a region which became the tramping ground of the contending armies. Principal Kerfoot, like Bishop Whittingham, was a thorough Unionist, but he found no reason to complain of the Bishop's admonitory circular to his clergy, instructing them, in case Maryland seceded, to omit the usual prayer for the President, of the United States. First an Episcopalian, and then a patriot. But so many of the St. James boys were from the South that the school lost a majority of its students on account of the principal's position and the various exigencies of the situation. Things went from bad to worse. In June, 1861, the College grounds became the site of the first encampment of Union soldiers in a Southern State. In 1862 an authorized prayer for Union victories stirred up a great commotion, and in July of that year the last public commencement was held. Then came Antietam, and Dr. Kerfoot's letters and journals abound in interesting particulars of the invasion. The College life went on in 1863 with lessening numbers till Lee crossed the Potomac in June. Mr. Harrison finds it necessary to apologize for Dr. Kerfoot's characterization of the conduct of the retreating rebel army; but no apology was needed. The College rectory and other buildings were ransacked and plundered without mercy. Dr. Kerfoot went into the hospitals and worked until his health broke down. In October the College entered on another year with about thirty students. The work continued fitfully throughout the year. In August, 1864, Early came raiding into Maryland, and Dr. Kerfoot was made a prisoner and put on his parole to secure Dr. Boyd's release from the Union prison at Wheeling, Va. Failing of this, he was to go to Richmond.

There is a very interesting appendix to chapter xi, giving an account of this whole business. Particularly interesting is the account of Dr.

Kerfoot's meeting with Bishop Whittingham in Baltimore, after he had given his parole. The Bishop insisted that Dr. Kerfoot had no right to put the Government in a position where it even implicitly accorded to the South the rights of a belligerent. He would send him to Fortress Monroe until the war was over. Bishop Whittingham was nothing if not logical, and he had the courage of his convictions even when they involved a friend in a very miserable plight. The Government was of a less Roman firmness, and Dr. Boyd's release discharged Dr. Kerfoot from his parole; but no attempt was made to resume the College work at St. James.

This ruin of so many hopes after more than twenty years of faithful service was followed by a year as President of Trinity College, Hartford, Conn. The position did not prove congenial. There was no family life as at St. James, and the boys were given to all manner of collegiate silliness. He had, however, done something to establish himself in the esteem of the students and the confidence of the trustees when, in the fall of 1865, he was elected Bishop of Pittsburgh. The general convention immediately preceding his election was an exceedingly important one, and its action was extremely characteristic of the Episcopal Church in dealing with the problems of the war. Mr. Horace Binney offered a resolution that the House of Bishops, in the religious services appointed for a day of special thanksgiving, should advise especial thanks "for the removal of the great occasion of national dissension and estrangement to which our late troubles were due." Bishop Whittingham was the principal opponent of this resolution in the upper house and Dr. Kerfoot in the lower. It was buried under an overwhelming majority. It was perhaps the prudent temper exhibited by Dr. Kerfoot on this occasion that marked him as a fit person to preside over the new diocese of Pittsburgh, permission to form which had been granted at the general convention. He did not accept the office without much urgency from without and much inward questioning. From the time of his consecration till his death he proved by his executive ability and by his personal influence that no mistake had been made in his election. His heart was in his work and his judgment was generally just. That the diocese was newly organized, and that Presbyterianism was everywhere in the ascendant, made the eager Churchman's life a very busy one. Illness and ecclesiastical business took him to Europe several times. He was a member of the first Lambeth Conference in 1867, of the second in 1877, and of the Bonn Conference in 1874. His relation to the ritualistic controversy is the subject of two or three of Mr. Harrison's most interesting chapters. His position was substantially the same as that of Bishop Whittingham. So far as ritualism was an æsthetic matter, concerned with the beautifying of churches and the enrichment of their services, he was himself a ritualist. It was with the doctrinal elements of the movement as they bore upon baptism and the eucharist and the use of confession—its Romanizing tendencies—that he had no sympathy.

The last years of his life had much sickness and sorrow to impair their happiness; and also great disappointment on account of the failure of a plan of church extension in Mexico to make good his expectations. He died July 10, 1881. The impression we derive from his biography is that his character was much greater than his talents, and that these were mainly of the executive order. He had strong affections, and he was widely and profoundly revered and loved. His church had never any reason to suspect his loyalty. The different pictures of his face, among the illustrations of the book, are full of interest. That representing him in his early manhood is