

pursuit of gain. If English adventurers had in the same way intruded themselves into China and Japan before those countries were opened, it is doubtful whether the Foreign Office would have felt itself bound to protect them in case of a riot (and, for our own part, we may add, as, nevertheless, Popes and saints protected the Jews). Had it appeared that they had been plying trades oppressive and naturally hateful to the people, their misfortune, though it might have excited pity, would have created little surprise. Their case would have been still weaker if they had been acting as instruments of extortion in the service of a tyrant, and had been sharing with him the spoils of the people, as the Jews did under mediæval kings, and as it appears they did also in Egypt under the Ptolemies. Jewish writers, in their natural exasperation (he continues), are heaping contumely on the memory of the Crusaders. By David or Isaiah a Crusader might have been understood: it is impossible that he should be understood by a Jew of the Talmud and the Stock Exchange. The Crusades, like their sequel the struggle against the Ottoman, were in truth a defensive war waged by Christendom against Islam, which, organised for conquest, came victoriously rolling on, with fatalism, despotism, polygamy, slavery, and all the other Eastern vices in its train, till on the plains of Tours it had almost achieved the subjugation of the West. The Holy Sepulchre was the Carroccio of Christendom, though its position, far in advance of the natural line of defence, placed the Christians at a military disadvantage. It is true that in Godfrey and his brethren-in-arms there was a strain of savagery which sometimes totally overpowered the nobler parts of their character; that they carried on their holy war with the ferocity which marked wars generally in those times; and that with their devotion were largely mingled the unextinguished propensity to nomadism, the love of military adventure and the lust of booty. Still they were the half-conscious champions of that which has been incontestably proved by experience to be the higher civilisation, and for the hope that was in them they gave up their lands, their pastimes, and the bowers of their ladies, and went to die on Syrian fields. So long as Christianity is preferred to Islam, we must look with gratitude on the stately tombs of the Crusaders. The world will have become materialist, indeed, when any child of western civilisation can rejoice in abuse of St. Louis or Edward I."

THE JEW'S RELATIONSHIP TO THE MEDIÆVAL CHRISTIAN.

"Now the Jew was a religious alien (continues the writer) and what his own law, if the parts had been changed, would have called a blasphemer, in a religious camp at a crisis of intense excitement and mortal peril. Not only so, but he was not a very distant kinsman, and probably at heart a friend of the enemy, occasionally perhaps even a confederate, grotesque as some of the mediæval stories of Jewish complicity with the Saracens are. (The writer then quotes passages from a Jewish historian, acknowledging and explaining the sympathy of the Jews with Mahomedanism.) It is not necessary (he continues) here to discuss the by-question whether the reign of Islam is that of liberty of conscience, and whether centuries of cruelty to the Jews had really preceded the year 710. As to the main point, the passage quoted is correct. History can cast no cast no blame upon the Jew for feeling and obeying his natural affinity; but on the other hand we must acquit the Christian of anything that with reference to people in that stage of civilisation can reasonably be called demoniac, and pronounce that his rage against the Jew, even when most detestable and sanguinary, falls within the measure of human crime. It is probably conjectured, if it cannot be said to have been proved, that at the time of the crusades, when all men were hastily raising money to equip themselves for the holy war, the Jewish usurer took cruel advantage of his opportunity, and thereby made himself more than usually obnoxious at the moment when he was most in peril. Nor is it by any means certain that he used all possible care to avoid irritating popular feeling. He has always been . . . somewhat apt to presume upon his wealth. . . . The bloodiest and most disgraceful of all the outbreaks of popular violence in England was provoked by the disastrous indiscretion of some wealthy Hebrews who, in defiance of a warning proclamation, as well as of popular sentiment, had intruded themselves upon the coronation of a Crusader king. Even on this occasion, however, behind the religious fanaticism which is set down as the sole incentive to the outburst, there is discernible that which I suspect to have been generally the deeper and more potent cause of popular antipathy. At York, the rioters made for the place where the Jews had deposited their bonds. So, in French history, M. Martin, though he generally treats the outrages against the Jews as religious, and descants on them in the ordinary strain, sometimes lets us see that other causes of animosity were at work. 'Never,' he says in relation to the rising of 1380, 'had the Jews been more hateful to the people than since they had been protected with so much solicitude by the Crown. They abused the need which men had of their capital to suck to the very marrow both the spendthrift nobleman and the necessitous citizen.' The money trade is not more oppressive or odious than any other trade, provided it is not pursued in an

illiberal and grasping spirit; but there are money-lenders of different kinds; there is usury which is fair lending, and there is usury which is extortion; there are mortgagees who do not want to foreclose, and there are mortgagees who do. A tyranny not less grinding or hateful than that of an armed conqueror or a political despot may be exercised by a confederacy of crafty operators, which has got the money of a country into its hands and makes a ruthless use of its power. In the chronicle of Jocelyn de Brakelond we find an example of the prodigious usance by which a debt to a Hebrew money-lender grew; and we are not surprised or much scandalised on learning from a subsequent page of the Chronicle, that the worthy Abbot Samson procured letters from the King empowering him to compel all Jews to quit St. Edmondsbury, on the condition, however, that they should be allowed to take with them their chattels and the price of their houses and lands. It was the period of the Crusades, and Samson was an enthusiast, it was true; yet we cannot doubt, looking to what had preceded, that his main object was to save his people from the bloodsuckers. The Jews had a strong tendency to congregate at Oxford, a large portion of which is said at one time to have been in their hands. We may believe that they were partly, perhaps chiefly, drawn to it as a seat of learning and science; but a university city also affords special opportunities for usury, and as the Universities in the Middle Ages were distinctly liberal, it seems probable that here again the conflict which took place had a social and economical rather than a theological cause."

THE JEWS IN ENGLAND.

"INTO England," says Professor Goldwin Smith again, "the Jews streamed after the Conquest, as they follow in the train of modern wars; and we may be sure that their presence was not the least part of the calamity which befell the hapless people.

Through them the Norman and Angevin Kings were enabled to organise vicarious extortion, and though the King squeezed the sponge when it had sucked up the money of the people, this process while it filled his coffers did not restore the popularity of the unfortunate [Jews]. Nor does it seem that the Jew, to make up for his exactions, when he had amassed wealth, bore himself meekly towards the natives. Our highest authority on Mediæval history, Mr. Freeman, says:—'In the wake of the Conqueror the Jews of Rouen found their way to London, and before long we find settlements of the Hebrew race in the chief cities and boroughs of England—at York, Winchester, Lincoln, Bristol, Oxford, and even at the gate of the Abbot of St. Edmonds and St. Albans. They came as the King's special men, or more truly as his special chattels, strangers alike to the Church and the commonwealth, but strong in the protection of a master who commonly found it his interest to protect them against all others. Hated, feared, and loathed, but far too deeply feared to be scorned or oppressed, they stalked defiantly among the people of the land, on whose wants they thrived, safe from harm or insult, save now and then, when popular wrath burst all bounds, when their proud mansions and fortified quarters could shelter them no longer from raging crowds, who were eager to wash out their debts in the blood of their creditors. The romantic picture of the despised, trembling Jew, cringing before every Christian whom he meets, is, in any age of English history, simply a romantic picture.' The suppleness of the Oriental, which made him willing to be the chattel for the sake of the royal protection in his trade, might diminish the respect of the people for him, but would not diminish their hatred or their fear. Like the expulsion of the Jews from St. Edmondsbury by Abbot Samson, the banishment of the whole race from England by Edward I. was unquestionably intended by the King and welcomed by the nation as a measure of social reform and relief to the people. The execution of the measure was marked by savage outbursts of popular passion against the objects of general hatred; and Jewish writers may be easily forgiven for denouncing Edward as one of a set of 'insolent, rapacious, and unprincipled tyrants whose virtues, if they happened to possess any, were overshadowed by their crimes.' But this is not history. Edward was as great, as noble-minded, and as beneficent a King as ever sat upon the English throne; and he must have made no small fiscal sacrifice in sending away the luckless race whose craft had filled his coffers and those of his predecessors. The situation was throughout miserable; its consequences while it lasted were deplorable; its termination was hideous and heart-rending: but the English people had never invited the Jews to England."

THE JEW FALSELY ACCREDITED.

"AGAIN (continues the Professor) it is constantly asserted that the Jews, during the Middle Ages, were rendering some brilliant services to civilisation when their beneficent efforts were arrested by the intolerance and folly of Christianity. Christendom, it is said, was wasting itself in the pursuit of a spiritual ideal, in crusades, in religious art, and scholastic philosophy, while the Jew was promoting the real welfare of mankind, by founding medicine and developing trade. Scholastic philosophy need hardly shrink from comparison in point of practical utility with the Talmud."