

English and Hanoverians counted but eleven thousand. The province of Utrecht surrendered. Holland felt in like mood, for the defenses had been given up one by one. The prince's government had apparently abdicated.

Worst of all, the prince of Orange did really abdicate. Without adequate internal support, deserted by the allies of the republic, the prince stadtholder found himself a "man without a country." The French refused to treat with the republic so long as he was at the head of it, and the patriots desired him gone, while the common people were powerless to help him—reasons enough why he contemplated flight to England. At a gloomy session of the Estates of Holland he admitted that the province could not be defended any longer. On the same day he with his family embarked at Scheveningen for England—an exile from the country which his forefathers had redeemed from Spanish oppression and saved repeatedly from French domination or conquest. The long-threatened French supremacy over Dutch affairs was now an accomplished fact, to be followed during the reign of Napoleon by a complete annexation. On the same fateful day that the prince of Orange left Holland the famous old Dutch republic ceased to exist, the government almost automatically suspending its functions. Its place was taken by the so-called Batavian republic, organized upon French revolutionary principles by the committees of patriots in the various provinces. Thus perished a state which once proudly acclaimed itself as the "Commonwealth of the United Netherlands," which during a short history of two hundred years rivaled, if not eclipsed, the glory that was Greece, which transferred definitely the seat of empire to northwestern Europe, and opened the way out of ecclesiastical bondage and political tyranny to civil liberty and religious freedom, two indispensable attributes of civilization.

MORE'S UTOPIA.

BY C. H. WILLIAMS.

IN the September *Open Court* we touched upon the influences at work to make More interested in the topics discussed in his *Utopia* and which helped to stimulate that interest when it had been aroused. It is our task now to examine the material More had in his possession to assist him in the development of the plan which matured about 1516 into the book *Utopia*.

It was not the practice of sixteenth-century authors to attach

to their books a bibliography of the literature which they found helpful in the preparation of their work. But from hints dropped at different times and places it is possible to reconstruct More's library and to forecast with some amount of certainty the kind of remarks he would have made had he been inspired to preface his work with such an explanatory bibliography.

His preface would inevitably have begun with an eloquent tribute to the value of classical literature. After an elaborate account of its functions in the intellectual development of the young and a plea for more classical education in the schools and universities the author would concentrate his attention upon the Greek writer to whom he owed most. Mention of the name Plato would call for a graceful panegyric from the pen of the disciple and would lead naturally to an explanation of some of the chief debts which More owed to his master. Such remarks would inevitably be followed by the statement that More owed all his love of Greek literature to the fascination of the Platonic works. His jesting spirit found its counterpart in the sparkling wit and cynicism of Socrates with his searching examination of the realities of life and his revelation of truth and falsehood. More's frolicsome soul must have rejoiced in much of the delightful irony of the character whom Plato bequeathed to the world as Socrates. *Utopia* is animated from beginning to end with the spirit of the Socratic dialogues. It owes its very plot and form to the wonderful work of the Greek. More would have no scruples in confessing that the form of *Utopia* was inspired by the dialogues of Plato. He made use of Plato's scheme of expounding knowledge by means of a conversation between two or three characters (one or more of whom had a special message) to present in a dramatic form the message which he himself had for his generation. Nor is this the only admission that he would be bound to make. He borrowed the very idea of his ideal commonwealth from Plato's "Republic," a work which attempted to do for its author's generation what More hoped to accomplish for his own age. The basic idea of the "Republic" was its foundation on principles of communism and this thought More borrowed as the vital idea of his new state. Without it many of the points which he describes as being characteristic of Utopia would have been quite impossible because they owe their very existence to the fact that there was no such thing as private property in the ideal state.

By admissions such as these the author of *Utopia* would justify the statement that he owed all to his knowledge of Platonic litera-

ture. Second to Plato in his influence on More was probably Plutarch, traces of whose works (especially the "Lycurgus") are seen in the *Utopia*. Although he and Erasmus had translated some of Lucian's dialogues which probably proved helpful, More's statement that Greek literature is the most important of classical studies is borne out by the fact that he owed little to any of the Latin authors save Cicero and Seneca. But let him speak for himself: "Wherof he knewe that there ys nothyng extante in the Lattyne tongue that is to anny purpose sauynge a few of Senecaes and Ciceroes doinges."

If the assertion of Mr. Churton Collins is correct there is one other Latin writer whom More would have to mention in his prefatory note. Tacitus's *Germania* certainly coincides in many places with descriptions found in the *Utopia* and it is quite probable that More found the work helpful, if only for geographical suggestions.

We are unable to state with certainty how much More owed to Tacitus but we may have no scruples in putting Augustine's *De civitate Dei* on the list of authorities to receive mention by the author of the ideal commonweal of Utopia. The influence of this work on the newly called lawyer has been seen. He lectured upon it, and his lectures witnessed to the fact that he thoroughly appreciated Augustine's point of view. The early father was building an ideal city, the city of God; he was showing the possibilities which the ideal held and More saw in no uncertain light the significance of that ideal. He too was constructing an ideal city, but he extended Augustine's plan. He built a city and adorned it with all the genius of pagan thought. He fashioned a city of God on earth in which anything of beauty even though it were of earthly origin should find a place. That he altered the views of Augustine and used them for another purpose does not relieve him of the heavy debt—a debt which we may rest assured would be acknowledged by the author of *Utopia*.

In matters of literature and learning More was not a bigot. Citizen though he was of the great republic of letters which embraced all Europe and extended its privileges to the great men of every nation, More never forgot that he was an Englishman. He never became the cosmopolitan Erasmus was, a man with no abiding city and no strong patriotism. More loved England and things English, and it is hard to believe that such a lover of his country could have found it in his heart to reject anything of artistic value which had been produced in previous years by his English predecessors. As a lover of learning and literature he must have rejoiced

over the finished products of Chaucer. He could not have resisted the sly sarcastic hits which that light-hearted poet aimed at the institutions of his day. More's soul must have been gladdened by the character sketches of the Canterbury pilgrims with their very definite if good-humored attacks on church and state and their severe condemnation of the abuses of the time. Though the *Utopia* is not modeled on any of the Chaucerian works and owes little material directly to them it is scarcely credible that their influence on More was negligible. Chaucer's delightful satire on his age was very suggestive to one who saw very clearly the evils of his own days and must have helped to point out to More the more vulnerable parts of English society and manners which had remained unreformed even after the dashing attack of Chaucer.

It is dangerous to attribute too much importance to works unless we can trace their influence very definitely or have direct mention of them in our author. Perhaps neither test is forthcoming in the case of the early English satirist. Both are certainly evident to prove the influence of the Italian Pico della Mirandola. Mention has already been made of the fact that More translated the works of this author in his early legal days. They made a deep impression on him. He never forgot the inspired language of the Italian as he sang the praises of a contemplative literary life.

When he wrote: "Nowe I lyue at lybertye after myn owne mynde and pleasure whiche I thynke verye fewe of thes greate states and peeres of realmes can saye," his thoughts must have flown back to the days when he translated Pico's words: "I set more by my little house, my study, the pleasure of my books, the rest and peace of my mind, than by all your king's palaces, all your business, all your glory, all the advantage that ye hawke after and all the favor of a court."

He thinks of all that Pico and his thoughts have done for him, how they have ruled his life, reconciling the culture he acquired from his pagan studies with the sweet simplicity of Christian faith, leading him away from the outward show of so much that passed for monasticism and guiding him toward the true religion which is "to visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction and to keep himself unspotted from the world." More owed much of the tolerance which finds expression in the *Utopia* to the Italian Christian who had left all and taken up his stand by the side of the poor and afflicted of his native land. It was Mirandola who first made him realize the futility of royal pomp and the importance of common poverty, who first trained his eye to see the path of the humble

and the afflictions of the poor. Little wonder then that More should occupy so large a place in his preface with a loving tribute to the works of Pico della Mirandola.

Deep as was the influence of the preceding works on the literary style and aspirations of More no one of them in itself is sufficient to account for the production of *Utopia*. That work owes its real inspiration to an event which took place in 1507, the publication in a geographical treatise of a description of Amerigo Vespucci's *Quatuor Americii Vesputii Navigationes*. The Renaissance spirit was in the air. Men were at this time keenly interested in exploration and travel, and we may be certain that no one took a greater interest in voyages of discovery than did this man who embodied the Renaissance spirit. More read with delight the descriptions of new lands and peoples which Vespucci discussed in this little work. He had traveled in North African waters and explored the districts from the Canary Islands to Cape Verde. Here he had discovered a race of people who suggested many of the characteristics of the Utopians. The account proved very helpful to More when he attempted to draw up the customs and institutions of the islanders and was the inspiration of the new commonwealth which he described some nine years later in his book. He weaves the very narrative around a man who had accompanied Amerigo in his journeyings. More would find great difficulty in discharging to the full the obligations under which he rested to Vespucci for his suggestive treatise.

With the message of thanks to Vespucci the long task of his prefatory note would be drawing to an end. Two pleasant labors would remain for More to discharge as only his courtly and accomplished pen could have done. The longer of them would be a fond eulogy of his friend Erasmus to whom he owed so much. The chats had delighted many an hour, the letters they had exchanged, the clever satire of the *Encomium Moriae*, the worldly wisdom of the *Adagia*, the definite attacks of the *Enchiridion* upon the religious hypocrisy of the age, all these sources of inspiration would be mentioned lovingly and a tribute paid to their charming author.

Last of all would be a graceful tribute to a kindred soul. One wonders, but in vain, what would have been the lucid Latin phrase expressing the gratitude of Thomas More to the master spirit who had drawn him from the cloister to a busy life of letters and professional activity. Consciously and otherwise Colet had much to do with the book *Utopia* and his claims upon the author's gratitude would have been unstintingly discharged.

That such an explanatory note was not written was due, as we have said, to the fact that the practice had not yet arisen of attaching bibliographies to works. In More's case it was due also to another and more obvious cause. *Utopia* was written as a *jeu d'esprit* to be circulated among his friends. It was a clever satire written for the benefit of the company of well-informed critics of the age by one of their number who had been out into the world and mingled with its every-day affairs. More wanted to give his friends his idea of the world viewed from the politician's standpoint just as Erasmus gave the circle the impression of a wandering scholar and Colet the wise maxims of an educated reformer. That this was the case is clear from the fact that it appeared in Latin. Bacon wrote his more pretentious works in Latin because he had little faith in the future of the English tongue. More did not make the same mistake. He used Latin because it was the language of the circle of friends and also because it would not be understood by many in the outside world. And *Utopia* was not meant for the crowd. The veiled hints of Book I in which More attacks the royal council chamber, the sly hits at diplomacy, the scarcely veiled condemnation of war, the definite attacks on the extravagance of the English court, all these things were too dangerous to be known to the world at large, too likely to bring down upon their author's head the wrath of royal arrogance had they been openly proclaimed. Discretion, ever a virtue, is supremely so in one who attacks the powers in authority.

More was particularly anxious that his work should not bring him into conflict with the men and institutions whom he had attacked. He had taken the greatest pains to make it appear a work of fiction. To increase the illusion, and emphasize the air of unreality which shrouded his book he appended a letter to Peter Giles. After profound apologies for the delay which has attended the publication of the account "which you and I together hard maister Raphaell tel and declare." More explains that his son John Clement "who as you knowe was ther present with us" has brought him into a "greate doubte. For wheras Hythlodaye (oneles my memory fayle me) sayde that the bridge of Amaurote, which goeth over the riuer a myle in. lengthe: my Jhon sayeth that ii hundred of those paseis must be plucked awaye for that the ryuer conteyneth there not aboute three hundreth paseie in bredthe." He prays Peter to call the matter "hartely to his remembraunce."

But the matter can be remedied easily if Peter will consult Raphael himself on this point and another which had arisen through carelessness. "For neither we remembered to enquire of hym, nor

he to tell us in what parte of that newe worlde Utopia is situate." This is important because a friend of More, eager to increase religion (*sic*) "is mynded to procure that he maye be sent thether of the byshoppe, yea and that he hymselfe may be made bishop of Utopia."

Peter, like a loyal friend maintains the fiction. In a letter to "The Right Honourable Hierome Buslyde, Prouost of Arien and Counselloure to the Catholike King Charles" he brings the book *Utopia* to his notice with a tribute to More's ability: "Yet the selfe same thinges as ofte as I beholde and consider them drawen and painted oute with master More's pensille, I am therwith so moued so delited, so inflamed and so rapt that sometime me think I am presently conuersaunt euen in the ylande of Utopia." He keeps up the mystery of Utopia by his explanation that its position "by a certen euell and unluckie chaunce escaped us bothe. For when Raphael was speaking therof one of master More's seruantes came to him and whispered in his eare. Wherefore I beyng then of purpose more earnestly addict to heare, one of the company, by reason of cold taken, I thinke, a shippeborde, coughed out so loude that he toke from my hearinge certen of his wordes. But I wil neuer stynte nor rest until I haue gotte the full and exacte knowledge hereof: insomuche that I will be hable perfectly to instruct you, not onely in the longitude or true meridian of the ylande but also in the iust latitude therof."

Thus did friends in that republic of letters loyally assist the production of one another's works.

Peter was a good friend. He it was who prepared the work for its first publication in 1516 by Thierry Martin at Louvain. He appended a copy of verses written in the Utopian tongue and the alphabet of that language and also, as he explained, "garnished the margent of the boke with certain notes." The work was a success. A few months later a new edition came from the press of Gilles de Gourmont at Paris. In 1518 the renowned Froben of Basel produced two handsome editions under the supervision of Erasmus and illustrated by Hans Holbein. The Juntine Press of Venice took the work in hand and issued a fifth edition in 1519 followed next year by another edition at Basel.

Thus far the Latin text had always been published. In 1551 Ralph Robinson translated the work into graceful Elizabethan English, and it found a publisher in Abraham Vele and a patron in Cecil, Lord Burleigh. A second corrected edition came in 1556, followed by a third in 1597 and a fourth in 1624. In 1684 Bishop

Burnet attempted a new translation, but what this work gained in fidelity to the Latin text it lost in style. There have been a few modern editions of the work: that of Dibdin in 1808, of Professor Arber in 1869, the scholarly work of Dr. Lumby in 1879, an edition in 1887 by Roberts, by William Morris in 1893. In 1904 Prof. Cherton Collins published an annotated edition which is in the main that of the Elizabethan version.

THE BOOK ITSELF.

Book I. More starts out by explaining how he was sent by Henry VIII as an ambassador to Bruges to meet representatives of the king of Castile. While on his visit he was met frequently by Peter Giles, a man of learning who introduced him to a stranger, "a man well stricken in age wyth a blake sonne burned face, a large beard, and a cloke caste homely aboute hys shoulders, whom by hys favour and apparel forthwythe I iudged to be a maryner." The stranger by name Raphael Hythlodaye (which denotes one skilled in babble) is well versed in Latin and Greek and has traveled in the company of Amerigo Vespucci. The three sit down in More's garden and chat.

The stranger begins to relate his experiences in foreign lands and to describe the laws and institutions governing these polities especially those of the island of Utopia. Many of these laws are such as our cities might imitate.

After Raphael had entertained them for some time with his description of foreign countries Peter is moved to express his surprise that the stranger had not settled down as an adviser of some royal court, for any king would welcome such a learned counselor. Raphael repudiates the suggestion that any king has any desirable gifts to offer him. More meets this by suggesting that the traveler should do it even at his own cost for the sake of putting into the king's head plans favorable to the commonwealth's prosperity. Raphael replies that this is impossible for two reasons. In the first places princes have more delight in war and chivalry (of which Raphael has no knowledge) than in peaceful pursuits, and secondly the great advisers who have the king's ear despise another man's advice and insist on their own policies. Such an indictment, he adds, is true even of England.

More is naturally interested when he hears that Raphael has visited England, and questions him as to his experiences there. It transpires that Raphael had visited the country shortly after the insurrection of 1497 and during his stay owed much to the good

offices of John Morton, Archbishop of Canterbury and Chancellor. There follows a panegyric on Morton. Raphael goes on to relate an incident which occurred at Morton's table when a lawyer who was present praised the severe law which punished theft with death, though, as he adds, "he coulde not chewse but greatly wonder and maruell, howe and by what euill lucke it should so cum to passe that theues neuertheles were in euery place so ryffe and ranke." Raphael felt bound to reply that this was not to be wondered at since such a punishment for theft exceeded the limits of justice and was harmful to the commonwealth. For it is too drastic a punishment and only results in greater crimes such as murder. What was wrong, he added, was the social system which provided no means for men to earn a living and forced them "fyrste to steale and then to dye." He proceeds to enumerate some of the unemployed—old soldiers, retainers, serving men who when they are turned adrift are good for nothing.

"But," suggests the lawyer, "in them as men of stowte stomackes, bolder sprytes and manlyer currages than handy crafte men and plowe men be, doth consyste the whole powre strengthe and puissance of our host when we must fyghte in battail." This brings up the subject of military preparations and war. Having dealt with these Raphael proceeds to mention other important causes of poverty and crime. Sheep farming meets with severe treatment. "Your shepe that were wont to be so myke and tame and so smal eaters now, as I heare saie, be become so greate deuowrers, and so wylde, that they eate up and swallow down the very men them selves. They consume, destroy, and deuoure hole fieldes, howses and cities." Sheep farming has caused a rise in prices. In addition to all this, the rich are very extravagant. If poverty is to be reduced reforms must be introduced on Raphael's plan:

"Caste out thies pernycious abomynacyons: make a lawe that they whyche plucked downe fermes and townes of husbandrye, shall buylde them up agayne or els yelde and uprender the possessyon of them to suche as wyll goo to the coste of buyldynge them anewe. Suffer not thies ryche men to bye up all, to ingrosse and forstalle and with theyr monopolye to kepe the market alone as please them. Let not so manye be brought up in ydlenes: lett husbandrye and tyl-lage be restored agayne: let clothe workynge be renewed: that there maye be honest labours for thys ydell sorte to passe theyre tyme in profytablye, whyche hytherto other pouertye hathe caused to be theues or elles nowe be other vagabondes or ydell seruynge men and shortlye wylbe theues."

The lawyer would have replied to these schemes but the Cardinal cut him short and asked Raphael why he thought death too great a punishment for theft and with what would he replace it. Raphael suggests as alternatives the Roman system of sending thieves to state quarries and keeping them chained for life, or the plan of a Persian clan whom he had visited, among whom thieves lose their rights and become public slaves. At this juncture a lively quarrel between a jester and a friar is depicted and an opportunity is given the author to make several subtle thrusts at the friars. After a little difficulty the Cardinal restores order and this ends the account of Raphael's English travels.

The conversation returns to the original question of entering royal service. More still holds that it should be done if only for the sake of the commonwealth, but Raphael argues that kings will not hear philosophers unless they themselves value philosophy. Here follows an account of a contemporary council chamber in which each of the great men is seen trying to win the day without a thought as to the potentialities of the plans of their rivals. This in turn is followed by a brilliant criticism of Henry VIII's futile alliance with France though it is subtly veiled under the names of Utopia and the Achorians. Raphael explains that he would be quite out of place in a council chamber for his plans would never be understood.

The hopelessness of contemporary politics makes him think of the "wyse and godlye ordynances of the Utopians amonge whom wyth verye few lawes all thynges be so well and wealthele ordered." His praise of that country is met by Peter's, "Surely it shall be harde for you to make me believe there is better order in that newe lande then is here in thies countreyes that wee knowe."

It is to meet this challenge and to satisfy More's "I pray you and beseeche you descrybe unto us the Island," that after dinner Raphael proceeds to offer some observations on the land, cities, peoples, manners, ordinances, laws and all interesting things to be found in Utopia.

Book II. In the course of his remarks on Utopia Raphael mentions the following facts which distinguish that commonwealth from European states. The island of Utopia is an elective monarchy which guards against tyranny by the threat of deposition of the despot. The inhabitants of the island live in healthy well-planned cities where communal principles have free play.

"The stretes be appoynted and set forth verye commodious and handsome, bothe for carriage and also agaynst the wyndes. The houses be of fayre and gorgious buyldyng and in the streete

syde they stonde ioyned together in a longe rowe throughe the hole streete without anye partition or separacion. The stretes be twenty fote brode. On the backe syde of the houses, through the hole lengthe of the strete, lye large gardeynes whyche be closed in round about with the backe part of the stretes. Euery house hath two doores: one into the strete and a posternne door on the backsyde into the gardyne. . . . Euerye man that wyll maye goo yn, for there is nothyng wythen the howses that ys pryuate or annye mannes owne. And euerye X yeaere they change their howses by lotte."

Such a communal system prevents trade rivalry among the inhabitants and does away with greed for more possessions. Instead of a self-centered activity every one labors for the good of the community and considerations of public welfare outweigh all selfish aims. To reach such a state all luxury and idleness must be abolished. No one is allowed to live on the labors of another. Every one has to take a share in the manual work necessary to the upkeep of the commonweal. Under such a system it is found that no man need work for more than six hours a day. The suggestion is made that every one take his turn at town and country life alternately so that no one is condemned for life to a distasteful occupation. The Utopians recognize the value of education and it is to enable every one to be properly trained that such a labor system has been introduced. A great part of the eighteen hours which is not spent in manual work can be devoted to training the intellect and acquiring some knowledge of the arts and sciences.

Most of the virtues of Utopia owe their origin to the stress laid on education. It is because the Utopians have been well trained to exercise their reasoning powers that they have such a sane outlook on life. They are brought up to despise the precious metals and gems. "By all meanes that may be, they procure to haue gold and siluer among them in reproche and infamy." "For they marueyle that annye men be soo folyshe as to haue delyte and pleasure in the gylsterynge of a lytyll tryfelynge stone, whyche maye beholde annye of the starres, or elles the soone yt selfe." They are not the slaves of fashion. On the contrary "their clokes thoroughe owte the hole Ilande be all of one colour and that is the naturall colour of the wool." Vanity in all its forms is distasteful to them. "Also as they count and reckon very lyttel wytte to be in hym that regardeth not natural bewtie and comeliness so to helpe the same with payntinges is taken for a vayne and a wanton pryde not without great infamye."

It is to the benefits of education that the Utopians owe their

sane ideas on such things as gambling, hunting and hawking. "For what is there (saye they) in castynge the dice upon a table which thu hast done so often, that if theire were anye pleasure in it yet the ofte use myghte make the werye thereof? Or what delite can ther be, and not rather dyspleasure, in hearynge the barkynge and howlynge of dogges? Or what greater pleasure is there to be felte when a dogge followeth an hare then when a dogge followeth a dogge? for one thyng is done in both, that is to saye runninge: if thou haste pleasure therein. But if the hope of slaughter, and the expectation of tearynge in pieces the beaste dothe please the, thou shouldest rather be moued with pitie to see a seely innocent hare murdered of a dogge: the weake of the stronger: the fearefull of the feare: the innocent of the cruell and unmercyfull." Or again "For they counte huntynge the loweste, vyleste, and moste abiecte parte of bocherye."

Europeans are deceived by the glamor which veils the reality of war. But in Utopia "Warre or battel as a thinge verrye beastelye and yet to no kynde of beastes in so muche use as it to man they do detest and abhorre and contrary to the custome almost of all other natyons thye cownte nothing so much against glorie as glory gotten in warre." It is the policy of the Utopians to avoid war wherever possible and to try to achieve their aims by diplomacy. "They rejoyse and avaunte themselves yf they vaynquishe and oppresse theire enemyes by crafte and deceyte." (It is one of More's ironic comments on the European diplomacy of his age.)

Since war is an evil the Utopians "thruste no man forthe into warre agaynste his will bycause they believe yf annye man be fearefull and faynte hearted of nature he wyll not onelye doo no manfull and hardye act hymself but also be occasyon of cowardeness to hys fellowes." War is a painful necessity which it is the duty of Utopians to avoid if possible. If thrust upon them they strive to be victorious and in their victory they do not forget to make the vanquished pay the cost of war.

Utopia is a land where physical strength is cultivated and admired. But weakness and old age are not despised. The old are honored for their worldly wisdom, the sick are cared for in hospitals and fed with the most delicate luxuries procurable. Elaborate hospitals are provided and isolation wards for contagious diseases. The sick are visited and nursed back to health with a care unknown in contemporary Europe. In their treatment of disease the Utopians anticipate some modern suggestions—should a person be afflicted with a disease which racks him with pain and offers him no hope

of cure he is advised by the priests to make an end of his misery by suicide. Such self-condemned men are held in the highest esteem and buried with full honors. But the scheme is not meant to justify suicide. "He that kylleth himself before that the pryestes and the counsell have allowed the cause of hys death hym as unworthy both of the earth and of fyer they cast unburied into some stinkyng mar-rish."

In depicting the Utopian character More is able to get several sly hits at the men and institutions of his day. Referring to their love of a simple legal system he playfully tells his fellow lawyers that the Utopians "utterly exclude and bannyshe all proctours and sergeauntes at lawe which craftely handell matters and subtelly dispute of the lawes. For they thynke it most mete that every man shoulde pleade his owne matter and tell the same tale before the iudge that he would tel to his man of lawe. So shal there be less circumstaunce of wordes and the truth shal soner come to light whiles the iudge with a discrete iudgment doth waye the wordes of hym whom no lawier hath instructe with deceit."

Monasticism with its self-punishments and fasts comes in for attack. "But yet to despise the comelynes of bewtye, to waste the bodylye strengthe, to tourne nymblenes into sloughishnes, to consume and make feble the boddye with fastynge, to do iniury to health and to reject the other pleasaunte motions of nature (onles a man neglects thies hys commoditytes, whyles he doth wyth a feruent zeale procure the wealth of others, or the commen proffytte, for the whyche pleasure forborne he is in hope of a greater pleasure at Goddes hand els for a vayne shaddowe of vertue, for the wealth and proffette of no man, to punyshe hym selfe or to the intente he maye be able corragiouslye to suffre aduersityes whyche perchaunce shall neuer come to hym: thys to doo they thynke it a poynte of extreame madnes and a token of a man cruelly minded towards hymselfe and unkynde toward nature...."

More's attacks on war we have seen already. His opinion of treaties is no better. "The mo and holier cerymonies the league is knytte up with, the soner it is broken by some cauillation founde in the woordes."

Literature and learning are held in great esteem. They are always ready to learn and never weary of welcoming strangers to their country provided they bring news of other lands and teach them something new. All that the ancients taught in music, logic, arithmetic, geometry they have discovered for themselves, but the hairsplitting of the scholastic logician, which More refers to in very

cutting sarcasm, has not troubled them. Astronomy appeals to them and their knowledge of it is quite as deep as that of European scholars, but astrology receives condemnation as a superstition not a science.

Their moral philosophy is a curious medley of Epicureanism, Stoicism and Christianity. The Utopians believe that true pleasure is the end of life: that life should be lived according to nature and should be controlled by reason. This philosophical outlook is modified by certain religious and theological principles such as the belief that the immortal soul is ordained by God to happiness, that rewards and punishments are given for the acts of man on earth.

In the last chapter of the work More rises to a height of speculative idealism hardly to be surpassed. He is discussing the religions of the island: "For there be dyuers kyndes of religion not onely in sondry parts of the Ilande but also in dyuers places of every citie;" "All however agree in believing that there is one supreme Deity the maker and ruler of the hole worlde." The keynote of the Utopian regime is toleration. The Christian fanatic is exiled "not as a despyser of religion but as a seditious person and a rayser up of dissention among the people." One person is deprived of toleration. The atheist has no sympathy. Utopians believe implicitly in the immortality of the soul. Death has for them no sting. They approach it gladly and submit to it in peaceful confidence. Funeral rites are glad not mournful because death is part of the divine order of human affairs. The priesthood is open to women. Priests are overseers of all divine matters, censors of public morals, instructors of the young and peacemakers.

The highest flight of fancy is the description of the religious service. More speaks of religious emotion and mysticism inspired by the softened twilight of the Utopian church. No sect or creed is allowed to obtrude itself: men of all beliefs congregate to worship the supreme Deity in simple fashion. Religious rites and ceremonies are performed at home. Nothing to which any sect could take offense is done in the state church. The worship is marked by great reverence, joyful music and solemn prayer. The service is plain and not narrowed down to any sectarian form.

The ideal is a glorious one. That even its own author failed to realize it in practice is hardly to be wondered at much less censured by the present generation for with all our increased knowledge we have failed to realize Sir Thomas More's ideal.

The concluding passages of the *Utopia* are too good to be left

unquoted. They reveal the author's purpose when he wrote his work.

"Nowe I haue declared and descrybyd unto yowe as truly as I coulede, the fourme and ordre of that commen wealthe which verely in my iudgement is not onely the beste but also that which alone of good ryght may clayme and take upon it the name of a commenwealthe or publyque weale. For in other places they speake stil of the commen wealthe but euerye man procureth hys owne pryuate wealthe. Here where nothyng is pryuate the commen affayres be earnestly loked upon....

"Here nowe woulde I see yf anye man dare be so bolde as to compare with thys equitye the iustice of other natyons. Among whom I forsake God if I can fynde any signe or token of equitie and iustice. For what iustice is this that a ryche goldsmythe or an usurer....should have a pleausant and a welthy lyuyng other by Idilnes or by unnecessary busynes? when in the meane tyme poore labourers, carters, yronsmaythes, carpenters and plowmen by so greate and continual toyle....do yet get so harde and poore a lyuing and lyue so wretched a lyfe that the state and condition of the labouring beastes maye seme meche better and welthier....

"Therefore when I consider and way in my mind all thies commen wealthes which now a dayes any where do flourish so God helpe me I can perceauce pothing but a certain conspiracy of riche men procuringe theire own commodities under the name and title of the commen wealth....

"So must I nedes confesse and graunte that many thinges be in the utopian weal publyque which in our cities I may rather wisshe for than hoope after."

With this acknowledgment of its idealism the *Utopia* ends. It remains to examine the work as a whole and to draw some conclusions as to its value and importance.

ITS SIGNIFICANCE.

Bearing in mind the genial love of fun of the author we shall do well not to take the work too seriously. It is a satire—More's contribution to the lively literature of his jovial humanist friends. It expressed the views of the little band on many subjects. Its attacks on friars, monasticism, war, society, were not new. Such views had been expressed by his friends in many conversations, and had seen the light in Erasmus's works. The *Utopia* is the shadow cast by coming events. It is the harbinger of change, of social evolution, religious reform and political reconstruction. But its

satire is different from anything that had gone before. It is a kind and genial work which hurts no one with bitter insinuation or contemptuous insult. Nevertheless, its geniality does not destroy its influence. Its satire does not blast its victim by its bitterness but it often raises a laugh against him and makes him look a fool. It is fatal for a man or institution to lose prestige through the slashes of a ridiculous humor, and many sixteenth-century men and institutions felt the cuts of More's *Utopia*.

As a satire its chief merit lies in the way in which it is concealed. The trick of the prefatory letter, the air of unreality which pervades the whole work, disarms suspicion and yet does not allow one's interest to flag. The author's main object was to ridicule existing governments, particularly that of England. Erasmus distinctly states that More had his own country in mind all the while when he wrote *Utopia*. As we have seen, the work abounds in attacks upon Henry VIII or his diplomacy, his wars, his extravagance. But there is nothing definite to attack in it. The satire is cleverly concealed and the vague comparisons between Europe in general and the ideal state of Utopia completely disarmed the critics who might be looking for mention of England by name.

It is this original treatment which differentiates the *Utopia* from the work of satirists like Chaucer and the author of *Piers Plowman*. They state the evils of their times in good set terms and proceed to condemn them violently. More often ignored the present but by his skilful painting of an ideal world he tempts his reader almost unconsciously to compare the ideal with the sixteenth-century reality. Others too often speak at their audiences through their characters, More hides the fact that he is speaking and Raphael seems to be depicting a real commonwealth. They have never any real solution to the problems which they mention; they are content to draw up a long and severe indictment of the age. More is not satisfied with criticism. He has schemes of reform to bring before the public, and a remedy for every evil he depicts.

It is this air of practicality about the whole work which makes the *Utopia* so valuable. True, it would live in literature were it only for the fact that it is a unique exposition in bold terms of man's real sympathies just when he is being drawn into an office which he heartily dislikes. Surely no courtier ever wrote such dangerous heresies before. But that is not the *Utopia's* greatest claim to perpetuity.

Its chief importance lies in the fact that it is a political pamphlet of the utmost value, a reformer's handbook to the social prob-

lems of the age and a practical attempt at reconstruction. More's object was not to draw a picture of the new Europe which was to rise out of the swirling flood of social change consequent on the collapse of medievalism. All he wished to do was to set men thinking and to put into working order in an actual society some of the ideas whose practicability contemporaries denied. They ridiculed the doctrines of Lollardy and medieval socialism. He built a commonwealth founded on communism where he disproved the sixteenth century assumption that some were born to labor and others to employ. He showed communism at work and the results which flowed from its success. They scorned the idea of free thought and toleration. He showed how these things could be and even though he failed to regulate his life by his own ideals it is no condemnation of the ideal, rather is it a tribute to the sensitive genius of his imagination which could grasp such vague and unheard-of visions and set them down concretely before the eyes of an admiring crowd of readers. Contemporaries emphasized the value of treasure, honors etc. He showed how unimportant all these things could be. They never thought of exercising the virtues of kindness and charity. He showed them how impoverished human life would be if graces such as these were never brought to bear upon the ugly cruel facts of suffering and pain.

The objection is sometimes made that the *Utopia* is an absurd exaggeration. So it is. More meant it to be so in order that the changes he suggested should be understood by those who read his work. In his attempt to excite the interest of his contemporaries in the subject which he thought was all-important if England was to be a progressive nation. More often made deliberate exaggerations. He wanted to make men think. He saw that the great evil of his age was that men were content to leave matters connected with the commonwealth to chance. They never tried to understand the problems of their age, and until they did begin to think of social questions there could be no great improvement. The *Utopia* was intended to be a stimulant to thought. Had it fallen for examination into the hands of some twentieth-century reviewer his criticism would be in some such words as these: "Mr. More has written a highly entertaining and stimulating book. We cannot agree with many of the whimsical suggestions which fill his pages and show the academic and somewhat theoretical nature of his thought. But there are many good ideas which we commend to the thoughtful attention of those who are interested in social reform. The book abounds with brilliant thoughts and is a very original

treatise on an important question." And indeed not even the most superficial reader could fail to see originality in the *Utopia*. The book was a new departure in political literature. It was a clever work of fiction which attracted attention and made men think. That was the object More had in mind and he achieved his aim.

The ideal state depicted in the *Utopia* was not meant to be a plan for English reformers to adhere to, line for line. Many of its suggestions were far too unpractical for a nation set in the world among other states to adopt *en bloc*. There were grave objection to many of the ideas expressed in the *Utopia*. Not a few of the damaging criticisms made by Aristotle upon the communistic schemes of Plato can be urged with quite as much success against More's plans. Nor can the scheme of education he outlined be accepted as perfection. The products of that scheme have many serious faults. We feel that the Utopians were not a pleasant people. They give one the impression that they were intellectual prigs. They are not lovable. Education has made them cold and rational and has transformed them from men into mere automata open to no suggestions of sentiment, softened by no emotions, moved by none of the passions that inspire common men. Like Pater's ideal man they "burn always with a hard gemlike flame." They are extremely practical—even war is turned into a paying business affair by the levying of indemnities—but we miss the romantic touch in their character which would have brought them into closer connection with ordinary mortals.

These people as drawn for us by More seem to be supermen in embryo, whose characters do not attract our sympathy or win our admiration. And even if they did appeal to us it does not seem as though the human race could evolve their characteristic qualities for many generations. The Utopians are the product of an educational system which would have to be introduced in the nation which adopted the Utopian ideal and it would take a long time to develop such a system. Heredity and the influences of any other obstacles would have to be removed before the system would begin to make itself felt in the development of character.

These and similar remarks are what the critic who takes More's suggestion seriously would level at the book. They do nothing to destroy the value of the *Utopia*, but they show us very clearly what the author had in mind when he wrote his work. More painted no New Jerusalem that any disciple of his could bring to earth before he reached the limits of the appointed threescore years and ten. His state was not intended as a model for a nation in the ordinary world.

More's state was definitely οὐ τόπος. It was a brilliant suggestive example of what could be done if men had the courage to initiate revolutionary changes. The secret of his work lay in the emphasis it placed upon the need for change if men desired social evolution. To show what he was aiming at More made changes and revealed the influence they had on civilization. He did not make his suggestions as though they were the only changes possible or desirable. They were examples of how reforms would work, and the benefits that would accrue to civilization by the policy of change.

Some of the thinkers of the time saw the point that More was laboring to present and they followed his lead. That is the reason for the rapid advance of social reforms during the next few generations. The *Utopia* did a great work by teaching men to think on social questions. And that is where we must still look for its value. Even though many of its ideals are fanciful, not all of them are meaningless to the world even in the twentieth century. Many of the problems with which it deals are still important. If Thomas More could pay a visit to our age he would not feel a stranger. There would be many things to interest him, things quite familiar to him from his sixteenth-century experiences. More would come to us filled with his old enthusiasm for social questions and eager to see how we have solved the problems that had worried him. Some of our solutions would undoubtedly be pleasing to him. More would be proud of modern England because she has realized the great importance of the problem of town life. He would be glad to see that there is growing up a desire for well built pleasant towns and garden cities. His sympathy could not fail to be attracted by our attempts at town planning. Our care of the sick and impotent would meet with More's approval. Hospitals and well-organized schemes for medical attendance, the thorough supervision of our schoolchildren by officers of health, baby crèches and a thousand other schemes of modern reformers would delight the man whose life was spent in stimulating interest in such problems in the sixteenth century.

His keen enthusiasm for education would enable him to see the value of libraries, museums, and other places intended to be used for the enlightenment of our population. He would be glad to see that men to-day realize the value of education and make some attempts to train the young. Such an enlightened outlook would be very pleasing to the man who lived in an age when such views on education were unknown.

But in his wanderings around the world our visitor must meet

with many things to give him pain. How sad at heart a London slum would make him! What a load of sorrow would oppress him as he saw the sights of poverty that meet the observant passer-by in any of our streets! In his visits to the factories and workshops of our great industrial districts he would not be able to prevent the thought that all the sights he saw proved plainly that many of his schemes were yet ideals. We have not reached the stage at which all work a little and no one is condemned to spend more than six hours a day in manual labor. We still have slaves of industry and while this is the case we cannot hope for any real scheme of education. We have technical schools and evening classes. These would win More's sympathy; but he could not refrain from pointing out that while we have our present labor system these can be of little use. He would not be satisfied with our system and would realize that even modern England still has far to go before it is *Utopia*.

More would be very much in sympathy with all these serious problems that we have to solve. He would know how difficult they are and how they worried thoughtful men of his generation. Such questions as the reconciliation of church and state was one that was beginning to trouble people in his day. He had a scheme of settlement. England to-day is bothered with the same problem. Modern thinkers are trying to settle the problem of the church's position and are talking of a reconciliation of the sects and the formation of a national church. We seem to be returning to a solution something like the one proposed by Sir Thomas More. This problem calls upon the modern world to solve it as does the greater question of the future of the state. What are to be the lines of progress along which the state will travel in the future? More's generation had to face the same question. The author of *Utopia* found the answer in communism and advocated it as the solution of a number of the troubles in the commonwealth. More realized the futility of social work without radical reform. He began by altering the state and founding it again on communistic principles. The modern world has not decided whether More was right. Meanwhile it has not tampered with the state and has made no vital changes in the distribution of wealth. The question must be settled before we can have great reform. And men to-day are wondering whether More was right and whether they will be well or ill advised in following the example of the *Utopia*.

Looking at the world to-day, More would be sorely disap-

pointed. To his distress he would discover that the tragedy of war still occupies the stage of human history. His soul was sickened at the brutal means adopted by his age to settle national disputes. What would he say if he could see the ghastly scenes that make us sad to-day—devastation, death, calamities of all kinds everywhere. His great soul would go out in sympathy to us—a generation which he thought had grasped the meaning of civilized society, and which has solved so many social problems only to be beaten by the most appalling and yet the most absurd of all of them. We know the great calamity of war better even than Sir Thomas More could know it, and this fact alone would bring some consolation to the great man's disappointed soul. Sad at heart he would be at our failure to stop war but idealist as he was he could not be too pessimistic. The fact that the world is sick of war would give him hope, and he would turn to us with an encouraging promise that great progress would be bound to come after the calamity if men would grasp their opportunities. And so with all the things that he had seen. Praise would be ever on his lips at any signs of progress he could see: and even if at times he saw our failures he would pass them with a word of comfort that would bid us pull ourselves together and begin to solve the problems still ahead. What he would insist upon is that we shall always need reform. He wrote his *Utopia* as a vindication of change in the body politic and he would still maintain his profound belief in the efficacy of reform.

Every age brings its own problems but no age solves them all and what it does not solve it passes on to its successors. Many sixteenth-century difficulties have been settled for all time, but many more have lingered as festering sores in the body politic growing worse as time goes by and the conditions of modern life irritate them. Then we muddle on and all because no statesman has been bold enough to apply the remedies of the man who knew his age and prescribed for many of its complaints. Our age lacks courage to make the great reforms and wherever we are cowardly we make no progress. We are on the threshold of a new age. The proud edifice of modern civilization is being tried as by fire and no man knows as yet what parts of it will stand the test. Much has already fallen in and other things will be destroyed before the end of the disaster. Such destruction forces on us schemes for reconstruction. In the work which must begin almost at once men will have to be courageous. They will have a great work before them and they will need inspiration. They must seek it everywhere and at all

times. It must be said of them as it was said of the Utopians "for they have delyte to heare what ys done in everye lande."

They could do many worse things than start their search for inspiration in the *Utopia* of Sir Thomas More.

EARLY DUTCH ART.

BY THE EDITOR.

IN presenting in this number the significance of Dutch history for the Anglo-Saxon world we should mention that the Netherlands form an important link in the development of modern civilization. It is here that almost every industry developed at the end of the Middle Ages and at the beginning of modern times, and the little Dutch republic, brave little Holland as it has been aptly called, was the first people that dominated the seas though small enough in proportion of number to be easily thrown out by the English when that nation entered into the first period of its strength.

It was in Holland that the English printers learned their trade; the first English book was printed by Caxton in Holland. Weaving too was imported into England from Holland. The commercial centers of the world were to be found in these days in the Dutch cities including Belgian Antwerp, Bruges, Ghent and other Flemish cities.

In art, however, their influence has been of lasting significance. Soon after the Renaissance of Italy artistic life showed itself in the Netherlands, and here there originated a peculiar style influenced by but independent of the Italian Renaissance. The old school of Dutch painters were peculiar in their imitation of nature. It is astonishing how true to life they were in reproducing their own surroundings, even where they presented the ideals of religious or classical subjects. The first great masters of the Dutch school are the Brothers Hubert and Jan van Eyck who painted the altarpiece of Ghent, and how natural are the faces pictured there! The work was begun by Hubert, but when he died in 1426 it was continued by his brother Jan who completed it in 1432. Our frontispiece represents one detail in which the Virgin is represented as the Queen of Heaven. It is true she is adorned with a fantastic crown but otherwise she is a Dutch woman dressed in the gorgeous style of the rich merchants' wives. Another detail which we reproduce shows