The West Australian 26th May. 1906. } The Morning Herald 30th May 1906.

any positive doctrine or form of church government, as object to certain ceremonies in connection with the national form of worship. It was not until 1619 that Puritanism became identified with those theological beliefs understood as Calvinism. It was held by the Puritans that the Almighty knew from all eternity that there were certain individuals to be among the elect, and others who were to be eternally damned. It was interesting to inquire how came it about that men who considered that their fate had been so far decided should have manifested so much vigour and energy of mind, and should have been as heroic as many of the Puritans and Calvinists undoubtedly were. They had accepted in a general way the Presbyterian faith. Then, in 1644, the Independents, led by Oliver Cromwell, had come to the front, and became very powerful in England, ultimately rising to supreme power. There was in those days, the lecturer said, a considerable difficulty in deciding between inspiration and impulse. Cromwell had taken an active part in moulding that period, and John Milton had also played his part.

Milton, continued Professor Henderson, was born in December, 1608, in Bray-street, Cheapside, London, where he was brought up as a boy. He was first sent to a private tutor, after which he went to St. Paul's, where he had a literary education. That was before he went to Cambridge. He was accustomed to work till 12 o'clock at night from the time he was 10 years of age. At Cambridge he distinguished himself, but was for a period sent down, though for what reason it is difficult to determine. From Cambridge he went to Horton, in Buckinghamshire, where during the next three years he wrote a number of poems. In one of these he clearly showed the influence of outward things upon the soul of man—almost what Archbishop Laud of Canterbury would have had him write. In 1633, Milton had a very deep sympathy with that particular school. Friend, who held that any man who wore lovelocks—a fashion of the time—was for ever damned, wrote a strong denunciation of all plays, to which Milton's "Comus," with virtue and purity for a theme, seemed to be a deliberate answer. This was before the Revolution, when a man need not take one side or the other. But in 1637 the time dawned for Milton to take a side. Trained for the church he had refused to subscribe to certain articles while at the University. He held back, but he did not yet quite drift from the Church, although bitterly denouncing what he considered to be some of its abuses. That was the note of Lycidas. Milton made a violent attack upon the bishops, whom he stigmatised as "blind mouths," and of whom he said that instead of serving they were devouring. So it would be seen that Milton was then drifting more and more, not only Puritanwards, but towards separatism. He took a trip to the Continent, and went to Italy, returning to England in 1639. The struggle had not then broken out. It came in 1642. Meantime Milton was busy with his pupils. After the war he was found on the side of those abusing the Bishops and the King. There were in the Church three parties, viz., the High Church party, led by Bishop Hall, of Exeter; those who adopted a moderate course, represented by Usher; and the root and branch party, who wanted to tear up episcopacy by the roots. Before taking the final plunge Milton had belonged to the root and branch party. But in 1643 the solemn covenant was entered into, and Milton took the oath which identified him with Presbyterianism.

With the Presbyterians, continued Professor Henderson, he had a very stormy time. By 1646 he had come to the conclusion that the new presbyter was but old priest writ large. In that year he drifted away from Presbyterianism and definitely became an Independent, and from that time onward he was in the religious world what Cromwell was among his soldiers—the champion of toleration, drifting towards individualism, but not willing to extend toleration to Roman Catholics. After the ascension of Puritanism to power he became identified with the Government, and in a measure with the Protector, to whom he was made Latin Secretary. For his own part, Professor Henderson said he had never found anything in his reading to persuade him that Milton and Cromwell were close friends or that Cromwell had ever gone to the literary man for advice. He thought it unlikely that they had ever been in the same room together, for it was to be remembered that Milton was at the time but an obscure man. In 1660, soon after the restoration, Milton published a pamphlet entitled "A Ready and Easy Way to Establish a Commonwealth." This showed how far the man was away from sympathy with the people. To understand John Milton it was necessary to realise that he was a man prepared to sacrifice everything, even to life itself, for individual freedom. (Applause.)

Coming to the point of criticising Milton, Professor Henderson reminded them that he was not dealing with Milton primarily as a figure in literature; he was considering him as the reflex of Puritanism and a character of the time, and asking how far did he manifest a corporate spirit—how did he comport himself among his fellows? Milton had had the peculiar vice of a studious man—he was very sensitive to personal criticism. Yet he frequently used the most violent language in his criticisms of others It was sometimes painful to find that such a man should so far have forgotten his high mission as to indulge in conflicts of mud-slinging, sometimes with blackguards. As a man in organisation John Milton did not believe in equality about anything. He married a very young girl in Oxfordshire, took her from a cavalier's home to his own study in London, and expected that young girl to immediately interest herself in his ideals and to be a companion for him in his rovings of imagination over strange seas of thought. In his disapointment he concluded that he had married a dull and spiritless girl. He even established a record, for he wrote a tract upon divorce during his honeymoon. (Laughter.) He deplored the fact of two carcases joined unnaturally together or, as it might happen, a living soul bound to a dead corpse. While Milton was to be pitied, yet they could not be blind to the fact that he was ever unfair in the demands he made on other people. Still, it was to be said to his honour that when the Cavalier cause was lost and the Puritans won, his wife had come back to him, and not only his wife, but his wife's mother. (Laughter.) Milton lacked a corporate spirit, and individualism meant with him that he was unable to work with his fellows harmoniously. Yet Milton was distinctly heroic. In 1642 he put behind him the great work he wanted to do in order to engage in the struggle for liberty. Years after, although then blind, with his political ideals gone and Cromwell dead, he took up that great work again, and carried it through to the completion of "Paradise Lost." Milton had not only a strenuous mind, but a mind inspired. He believed that he was inspired. When told that if he wrote the second defence of the English people he would be blind, he said, "Then, let blindness come." Speaking of this later, he had said, "I could not but obey that inward monitor that spoke to me from Heaven." His lack of humour was the supreme defect in Milton as a writer. A sense of humour might have saved him; at least, it would have made him less intolerant of his fellows. However, none could fail to admire his magnificent strength of purpose and unswerving fidelity to his convictions. In spite of his affliction and his many misfortunes, at a time when all seemed lost, he had displayed heroic fortitude and an optimism expressed in the concluding lines of "Paradise Lost": "Thou shalt possess within thee a Paradise happier far."

At the conclusion of the lecture a series of lantern slides was shown, illustrative of the man and the times, Prof. Henderson supplying the descriptive narrative.

The Morning Herald
30th May. 1906.

PROFESSOR HENDERSON'S LECTURES

"OLIVER CROMWELL."

If there was a suspicion in the minds of the public that Professor Henderson had chosen as the subjects for his first two lectures in Perth men who have now scarcely more than an academic interest as makers of history in the strenuous Puritan epoch, no such objection could lie against the great character dealt with last night. And with the exaltation of his subject in popular interest, so did the learned lecturer's style rise to a much higher level than before, and so did the attention of the great audience that filled the Town-hall become intensified until it broke out at the conclusion in a round of applause unmistakable in its genuineness and enthusiasm. It was, indeed, a first-class lecture.

Oliver Cromwell, he said, was one of the greatest men in history, and though he felt unable to do justice to the colossal character of his subject he would in his feebleness do his best to give his audience some notion of the great services he had rendered to the English people. Cromwell, socially, was not above the middle class. After a few years at school he was sent to the University of Cambridge, where he showed more proficiency in athletics than in any intellectual pursuits. He did, indeed, display some interest in the subjects of mathematics and cosmography, for the characteristic reason that "they fitted for the public service, for which a man is born." On returning to his home in Huntingdonshire he took a great interest in the lives of the poor people round about him, and supported them against the encroachments of their more powerful neighbors. From the first, in fact, he was marked by a strong religious feeling, and by his sympathy for the poor and distressed, and these characteristics remained with him to the end of his life. He entered Parliament in 1628, but though he said little he worked hard, and in the short space of ten months served on no fewer than eighteen committees, rapidly becoming recognised as a force behind the scenes, and, in the Long Parliament, making his way absolutely to the front. The measure known as the Grand Remonstrance was passed by a very narrow majority, and in conversation with Hampden Cromwell said if it had not passed he would have gone to America on the morrow.

After briefly describing the transitional stage which the art of war had reached in that age in the displacement of the bow by the musket, and the paramount importance in battle of the shock of heavy cavalry, the lecturer said that in such circumstances Cromwell recognised the importance of character in soldiers, and saw that to cope with the Cavaliers who formed the forces of King Charles the Parliament must have men with "stuff of conscience" in them; that the inward qualities of the individual must determine his value; and that, for himself, he must have "a man who knows what he fights for, and loves what he knows." The view of war that he held was that when the forces met face to face the kindest policy was to strike quickly and strike hard, knowing that milder methods only prolonged the agony. The battle of Marston Moor, which was the turning point in the war, was won principally by his superior tactics, and the presence of mind he showed in the crisis of the engagement. At a moment when he was in victorious pursuit of the flying enemy, he kept his passions well in hand, and when almost any man might have been tempted to push his immediate advantage to the utmost deliberately turned his men and came to the assistance of his less fortunate and less skilful comrades.

After glancing at the triangular duel that was then fought between the King, the Parliament, and the army, and the action of Charles in delivering himself into the hands of the Scots, Professor Henderson asked what was Cromwell doing all this time? His soldiers thought he was playing the courtier to the King, and his own troops were actualy mutinying in their discontent. According to Gardiner, who had devoted nearly forty years of his life to the subject, and was the best authority on the period, the general was by no means playing the hypocrite, as some ill-informed people seemed to imagine, but was risking his own life to save Charles, in the hope that he might be induced to reign as a constitutional monarch. He promised the King that he would do his utmost to put him on the throne again if he would only grant two things—constitutionalism on the throne and toleration in religion. He was no mere revolutionary; but a man in whom conservatism and a liking for monarchy were deeply ingrained—but it must be a monarchy properly limited. He even offered to leave England and go to serve in Germaany if Charles would give proper guarantees to reign so, but, owing to the perfidy of the King, the scheme fell through. Recognising that Charles could not be trusted, he determined that he must be brought to justice; and the result was that the second civil war broke out, the King was captured, tried, and put to death.

Referring to the Irish campaign which followed, the lecturer said he would not try to justify or excuse the massacres of Drogheda and Wexford, but he would ask his hearers to remember that Cromwell was fulfilling the instructions of the Government in England, that he gave the besieged warning of what would happen if they did not surrender, and that it all happened in the 17th and not in the 20th century. War was war, and in war it was not a man's duty to be kind to his enemy, but to do his utmost to harry him out of existence. Let them not deal in sentiment when it came to discussing the horrible affairs of a battlefield, for it would not do. There was plenty of wanton cruelty in the Continent at that time, but none was found in Cromwell. Then came his triumphant Scottish campaign and his return to London. The people ran out in their thousands to meet him in tumultuous enthusiasm, but the object of it all was not inclined to exaggerate the value of such an evidence of popularity, remarking, "There would be a mightier crowd to see me hanged." He denounced the Parliament, because it had not effected any reforms, accused the members of various crimes, and turned them all out in his decisive way. The powers of Government were soon afterwards placed in his hands, and he tried to rule under his famous instrument of Government. If he failed to solve the difficulty of the English system, so had all his successors right down to 1832, when the great Reform Bill became law.

The Protector was the first English statesman with a definite colonial policy, and used his utmost and continued endeavors to get a better class of people for the oversea possessions, realising that men of character—always character—and not criminals, were required to make a prosperous colony. He saw the importance of the navy to a country in England's position, and spent enormous sums in making it strong and efficient—in one year lavishing, in fact, more than half his gross revenue on it. There was no time to discuss his foreign policy, but in passing it must be remarked that the brightest pages in the history of England were those which marked the conduct of Cromwell in this direction. He conceived it to be his country's duty to protect the weak against the strong in Europe, and he frequenly did so in the most effectual manner.

All this time he had fearful difficultie to contend with at home, and all that induced him to keep his position was his strong conviction that he was an instrument in the hands of Providence to settle the affairs of England. His last words were a prayer that the Almighty might pardon those who were hostile to himself, and might strengthen those who were fighting for his cause on earth.

Summing up the man's character, Professor Henderson said that Mr. Gardiner and Mr. Firth knew more about him even than Carlyle, and they agreed that, though no saint, he was a man who strove to do his duty in circumstances of enormous difficulty. He excelled not so much in originating ideas as in selecting those ideas which were reducible to practice. He believed in toleration, because, as a leader of soldiers, he had found all sects fighting side by side, and ready to shed their blood for the State; and he did not think the State had any right to require that their ideas should square. He would tolerate all creeds and all sects, and it could not be proved that he ever persecuted a single man on account of his religious opinions, but, on the other hand, did his best to save every unfortunate person who was molested on that account. He thought it was a statesman's duty to shape those great forces that run through the hearts and minds of the body politic, and to direct them to ends that were both just and noble; but he always refused to cast his lines too far ahead for fear of crossing the designs of Providence.

The lecturer, in an eloquent peroration, said he was appalled by the amount of prejudice still existing in the minds of Englishmen against the man who fought so strenuously for constitutional reforms and civil and religious liberty, the man who gave his life—and a magnificent life it was—in the service of the best interests of his countrymen. For he was a representative Englishman, and in condemning him men condemned England itself.

Morning Herald 4th June
1906.

PROFESSOR HENDERSON'S LECTURES

"WORDSWORTH."

The first lecture of the second series in connection with the Adelaide University extension movement in Perth was delivered by Professor Henderson in the Mechanics' Institute on Friday evening. The subject was "Wordsworth," and the hall was crowded with people, standing room even being unobtainable. Mr. Jas. Longmore presided, and announced that on Monday the lecture on "Tennyson" would be delivered in that hall, and on Wednesday the lecture on "Browning" in the Town-hall.

The lecturer said that he had chosen Wordsworth for his first lecture as that poet occupied a distinct place as a poet of nature. He was not only a poet who sang—he had a message for the world. Wordsworth was born in the year 1770 at Cockermouth, in Cumberland. He was not a particularly attractive youth, for he was ill-tempered, somewhat fretful, and violent. Nevertheless, he manifested a disposition, even in his youth, to think seriously about life. He was educated at Cambridge, and then went to London, where he first realised that his interest in nature was stronger even than his interest in human beings. What Wordsworth saw was the brighter side and the gentler aspect of nature, rather than the stormy side; through nature was revealed to him the God of love, the spirit of peace. His visit to the Continent worked a great change in the poet. The French Revolution had a vast influence upon his mental development, and brought about in him a glowing enthusiasm for the ideals of the revolutionary party. He was destined to receive a shock, however, for there came the massacres, and his friends said to him—"Look, this is the result of your contention for freedom and equality." This was his first experience of the tragic possibilities of human life. He suffered doubt, despair, and pain after the ascendancy of Napoleon, whom he hated, and he wrote:—

"I find nothing great;
Nothing is left which I van venerate;
So that a doubt almost within me
springs
Of Providence. Such emptiness at
length
Seems at the heart of all things."

It was fortunate at this period that Wordsworth had a sister who understood him better than he did himself, and was able to bring him back on to the right track. She influenced him to write again the song of joy and love, and not that of passion, for which he was not fitted. There were two well-marked stages in the development of his appreciation of nature—(a) the ecstatic enjoyment of things in early life; (b) the sober joy "in years that bring the philosophic mind." In both, natural objects were idealised. Wordsworth invested ordinary things in nature with light and life; he had taught us how to discover beauty in things that cost little or nothing, and had suggested thoughts of far-reaching importance in a democratic age.

During the course of his address, Professor Henderson recited from the works of the poet many interesting passages, exemplifying the characteristics of Wordsworth at various periods of his life.